

Lecture Time, From:		Table C.	(Dr.) A. Apandkar
receive time, From.	1140	To: 1240	On (Date): 18 01 2019 Valid till: 17 01 2020
Course Name:	-	TYBBC NS	
Subject / Topic:	1	Vau III	Ind allow the last
Evaluator's Name:	Cap	t. S. Bhatn	nagar 2 Capt. Pratap Kane
On the scale of 1 of 5, listed below. Please in necessary.	browns man	CHIEF CHIEF CHIEF IN THIS	on the right. Attach additional comments as

SI. No	Assessment by Evaluator	Rating	Comments  work explained  objectioes)	
1.	Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.	4		
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	Good presen	
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	organised	
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	yes	
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	yes	
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	yes	
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	the attraction occaponse was	
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	4	Yes	
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students	5	Yes	



	respectfully.
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  Yes
In the e	vent the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.
Name &	Sig. of Evaluator 1:
	Esig. of Evaluator 1: capt. 8. Bhatnagar /
Name &	Esig. of Evaluator 2: Capt. Pratap Kane Wave
Name &	Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt. (Dr.) A. Apand Kar
1. Self	HOD/Princip (Name & Signature  Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student
eval	uation & how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement it your teaching
9	Teaching BSc (NO)/OCTO/GTFC comme.
	Shadent sygestions discussed with Come incluy
	inglimetal.
	ning need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback coulty/instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal
3. Trai	ning programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).
4. Nam	e of training course, In-house/external/seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with



<ol> <li>Evaluation of Effectiveness of training impart (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedback need initially)</li> </ol>	rted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one :
	and inclining the
6. <u>Remark</u> : (Tick appropriately):  Significant Improvement,  Needs further improvem	Satisfactory Improvement, nent, Any other remarks (state clearly):
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	1 Date:
me & Sig of Evaluation 2	Trapar/4 18 01/2019
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. 3. Bha me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt. Pratap me & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt (Dr.) A.	Kan e War Date: 18 01 2019  Apandkar Date: 18 01 2019.



		Capt.		ahadeo	Makane
Lecture Time, From:	1040	To: 1140	On	(Date): 05 02 19	Valid till: 04 02 2 t
Course Name:		3488c N			101/00/20
Subject / Topic:	ST	VPCP TI		na.	
Evaluator's Name:	1. Ca	pt. A. Kun	nar	2. Capt.	S. Pradhay
On the scale of 1 of 5, listed below. Please in necessary.	please indi	icate the extent to wh	nich the f	faculty meets the	teaching criteria

Sl. 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.	- 4	Crood
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	Very well prepared
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	well organisted
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	clear
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	yes
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	4	Always
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	Best
8,	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	4	yes
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students	5	1915



	respectfully.		
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	4	yes
In the	event the performance is below average or p	poor the evaluators s	hould specify reason.
Name	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. A	· Kumar	(Par
Name a	e cr cr r c	Pradhan	Ja.
Name &	& Sig. of Officer/Instructor	7. D. Maka	ne Dan
			HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)
eval	f-Evaluation: State your teaching activities luation & how you have dealt with their sug ut your teaching	during the past year ggestions & make a s	, summarise the student self-evaluative statement
	STUDENTS ARE EN	COURAGED	TO ASK QUESTION
	about the Topic u		
	PPT ARE MADE !	FOR GOOD	understaning
	MOVIES ARE SHOW		
2. Trai	ining need for faculty identified based on aculty /instructors and self evaluation re	Training evaluato port by faculty/inst	rs report, student feedback ructors by HOD/Principal
	NA	4	
3. Trai	ning programme suggested by HOD for	the faculty /Instruc	tor (if any).
	NA		
	e of training course, In-house/external /s	seminar attended by	faculty/ Instructor with



<ol> <li>Evaluation of Effectiveness of training in (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feed need initially)</li> </ol>	parted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : back/Training Evaluators who identified the
NA	
5. Remark: (Tick appropriately):  Significant Improveme  Needs further improvements	nt,   Satisfactory Improvement,  vement,  Any other remarks (state clearly
NK.	
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	mal Date: 05 02 19
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:  (apt. A. Kume & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  (apt. S. Prad)  me & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:	han 27. Date: 05 02 119
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:  Capt A Ku  me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:	han 27. Date: 05 02 119
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:  (apt. A. Kume & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  (apt. S. Prad)  me & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:	ha- 7. Date: 05 02 19



5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training in HOD/ Principal / Based on student feed need initially)	nparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : back/Training Evaluators who identified the
6. <u>F</u>	temark: (Tick appropriately):  Significant Improveme  Needs further impro	ent, Satisfactory Improvement, ovement, Any other remarks (state clearly):
ame a	& Sig. of Evaluator 1:	Date:
ame	& Sig. of Evaluator 1:  Capt. Mak  & Sig. of Evaluator 2:	Cane Date: 21 01 19
ame è	& Sig. of Evaluator 1:  Capt. Mak  Sig. of Evaluator 2:  Capt. S. Prad  Sig. of Officer/Instructor:  Capt. A. K.	Date: 21 01 19  han - Date: 31 01 19  umas Date: 21 01 19.
ime d	Capt. Mak Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt. S. Prad	Date: 21 01 19  Lan - 27 Date: 31 01 19  Lan - 27 Date: 21 01 19  HOD/Princips
me à	Capt. Mak Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt. S. Prad	han Tr Date



Lecture Time, From:		Tre	12		On (Data	1-	L. Wallist all	1.	
Lecture Time, From:	0830	1"	0930	-	06	2 19	OS I	02	20.
Course Name:			188c 1			t tababa			
Subject / Topic:			critime						
Evaluator's Name:			Prakash			Capt.	A. cl	1000	lhry
On the scale of 1 of 5, listed below. Please in necessary.	please indic	cate	the extent to wh	hich	the faculty	meets the	teaching c	riteria	

Sl. 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	Well	
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	4	Yes	
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	well planned	
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	5	Very dear .	
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	Good presentation	
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	Excellent .	
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	4	Yes	
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	4	ly reat management	
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students	5	Excellent.	



-	respectfully.		
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	Very dear
In the	event the performance is below average or p	poor the evaluators should	specify reason.
Name	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt Pr	rakash Joaq	.902
Name .	A 401 A 401 A	· Choudhay	1 mg
Name o	& Sig of Officer/Instructors	Pratap Kave.	House
			HOD/Principal
eva	f-Evaluation: State your teaching activities luation & how you have dealt with their sugut your teaching		
Teo	ching B. SILMS/GTFC	oi.	
	& A session at end of e		0
En	glish language vocabel	my enhancement	ut-encourage
de	very the progress of ea	ed beturo.	Otherwise
tea	abing conducted as Ho.	13:Ed lang	1.1 Broadure
2. Tra	ining need for faculty identified based or aculty /instructors and self evaluation re	Training evaluators rep	ort, student feedback
3. Tra	ining programme suggested by HOD for	the faculty /Instructor (i	f any).
	The second secon		
	ne of training course, In-house/external /s	seminar attended by fact	ilty/ Instructor with



<ol> <li>Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparts (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedback / need initially)</li> </ol>	ed to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : Training Evaluators who identified the
. <u>Remark</u> : (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Needs further improvemen	Satisfactory Improvement, at, Any other remarks (state clearly)
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. P. To ag.	Date: 06 02 19
ne & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt. P. Kave	Date: 06 02 19
. Auto	106 02 19.
Prepared by: Head Management Systems	HOD/Princip (Name & Signature



Evaluated Officer's /	Instructor's	Name: Capt.	Ajay	Kum	ar	
Lecture Time, From:	1140	1.70		2019	Valid till:	120
Course Name:	T	488c NS		12011	130 01	120
Subject / Topic:		laval Arc	Litectur	e Til		
Evaluator's Name:		t. M. Mako				han
On the scale of 1 of 5,	please indi	cate the extent to whi	ch the faculty	meets the	teaching crite	ria

listed below. Please include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.

SL 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.	.4	Very
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	prepared
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	Very were
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	Very good
5,	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	2	Yes
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	4	Systematic
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	encelleur
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	2	very men managed
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students	4	Yes



	respectfully.	b I	
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	Very were summarized.
In the c	event the performance is below average or po	oor the evaluators sho	
Name &	& Sig. of Evaluator 1:		
N.Y	Capt. M. M	Takane -	Hu
Name 2	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. M. M.	radhan -	£7.
Name d	& Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt. A	Kumar	die
			HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)
eval	Evaluation: State your teaching activities of uation & how you have dealt with their suggest out your teaching	during the past year, s gestions & make a se	summarise the student If-evaluative statement
Reco	up of the previous lecoure e	very time.	verify me
lino	lesstanding of me cand	lidates at	regular interval.
by	asking question. Taking	q questions	from me Candidas
	the at end of he lee		
2. I rai on fa	ning need for faculty identified based on aculty /instructors and self evaluation rep	Training evaluators ort by faculty/instr	report, student feedback uctors by HOD/Principal
3. Trai	ning programme suggested by HOD for t	he faculty /Instructo	r (if any).
4. Nam dura	e of training course, In-house/external /se tion:	minar attended by t	faculty/ Instructor with



Lecture Time, From:		To:	0n (Date):	· U	Valid till:	
	0930	To: 1020	06 02	119	05/02/	20.
Course Name:			18	1		
Subject / Topic:		Nau TV	0.01			
Evaluator's Name:		t. M. Ma	Cane 2.	ant.	P. Kone	,

Sl. 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	Good
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	4	yes
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	Yes
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	5	Yes Excellent
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	4	Good
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	yes
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	yes
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	4	Well managed
_	Respect: The faculty treated all students	5	Good



	respectfully.		
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	4	Yes
In the e	event the performance is below average or po	or the evaluators shou	ld specify reason.
Name &	& Sig. of Evaluator 1:		
	Capt. M.D	. Makane =	Mu
Name &	& Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt Prod	ap Kane	More
Name &	& Sig. of Officer/Instructors	Bhatnagar	A
		0 /	Lela
			HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)
eval	Evaluation: State your teaching activities d uation & how you have dealt with their sugg ut your teaching	uring the past year, su estions & make a self-	mmarise the student evaluative statement
9		- 1 N	1 1 1 1
in.	the subjects beach and u	acorporate the	m'unto my
	dio-visial beaching metho		2,0
ريك 2. Trai on f	ining need for faculty identified based on Taculty /instructors and self evaluation repo	Training evaluators r	eport, student feedback etors by HOD/Principal
. Trai	ning programme suggested by HOD for th	ne faculty /Instructor	(if any).
	e of training course, In-house/external /section:	minar attended by fa	culty/ Instructor with



5 5	
5. Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedback / I	to Faculty/Instance
(HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedback /I need initially)	raining Evaluators who identified it
	and identified the
. Remark: (Tick appropriately):	
Significant Improvement,	Пен
Needs further improvement	Satisfactory Improvement,
interimprovement	Any other remail
introduction improvement	Any other remarks (state clearly
, and the improvement	Any other remarks (state clearly
	Any other remarks (state clearly
	Any other remarks (state clearly
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1	+ ∐ Any other remarks (state clearly
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	Date: 06 02 10
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1; me & Sig. of Evaluator 2; Capt. P. t.	Date: 06 02 10
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:  (apt · M· Makane)  me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  (apt · P. Kane)  me & Sig. of Officer/Instructor	Date: 06 02 19  Wowe Date: 06 02 19
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:  (apt · M· Makane)  me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  (apt · P. Kane)  me & Sig. of Officer/Instructor	Date: 06 02 19  Date: 06 02 19  Date: 06 02 19
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1; me & Sig. of Evaluator 2; Capt. P. t.	Date: 06 02 19  Wowe Date: 06 02 19
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:  (apt · M· Makane)  me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  (apt · P. Kane)  me & Sig. of Officer/Instructor	Date: 06 02 19  Date: 06 02 19  Date: 06 02 19
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:  (apt · M· Makane)  me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  (apt · P. Kane)  me & Sig. of Officer/Instructor	Date: 06 02 19  Date: 06 02 19  Date: 06 02 19

#### TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN' Faculty / Visiting Faculty Evaluation Form



	Faculty / Visiting Fac	ulty Eva	luation Form
Eva	lusted Officer's Name: CAPT - S - Pradhan	10	Faculty   Visiting Faculty
Lect	ure Time, From 0930 To: 1030	)	on (Date) 18   09   20   9
Cou	rse Name: B.Sc. (Nautical Scie		18 104 12019
Subj	ect / Topic: EUS — Types of You  PAR  (initial evaluation- within probation perio	WS &	
inclu	he scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which t de comments in the column on the right. Attach addition	he person onal comme	meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please ants as necessary.
-	ccellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Aver	age, 1- Po	or, NA- Not Applicable
SI.	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	
2,	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	well prepared.
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4.	
4.	Clarify: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	5	
5.	Expertise Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	
6.	Comprehension: 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.	5	
8.	Classroom Management Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	5	
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.	4	
	event the performance is below average or poor the ele & Sig. of Evaluator 1:		
	e & Sig. of Evaluator 1: CAPT P. K. ie & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CAPT Day	vuma-	0
	ie & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: CAPT . S. Prac	dian .	1
For	Probation Period Evaluation Remarks by		NIA
			CIV-
			HOD/ Principal

WPBF-7.1- 01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems #30" Sup 2019

(Name & Signature)

Page 1 of 2 Approved by: Chairman

	PART II: For Regular / Visiting 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.' section2.1).
	49.94 out 50
	b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:
	Strength - motivating teacher heaknen - None
	Weaknen - None
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 teaching:
	Teaching Mars / Evs to Bisc(NS). Recap of Leedine every time.
3.	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty / instructors and self-evaluation report by faculty.
	NIL
3.	Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty (if any).
	NIC
4.	Name of training course, In-house/external/seminar attended by faculty with duration:
	None
5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one: (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)
	NA
	Remark: (Tick appropriately) :  Significant Improvement,  Satisfactory Improvement,
6	Remark: (Tick appropriately):   Significant Improvement, Satisfactory improvement,  Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly):
	NA
	tame & Sig. of Evaluator 1: CAPT. P. Kane Wasse Date 18/09/19
	Pame & Sig of Evaluator 2: CAPT. A. Kumar D. Date 18/09/19
	tame & Sig. of Officer/Instructor COPT . S. Pradhan 91. Date 18/09/19
	1,2×
	HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)

WPH-7.1- 01-02 Prepares by: Head Management Systems

0.76 Sep 2019

Ray - 01

Page 2 of 2 Approved by: Chairman

TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN' FACULTY EVALUATION FORM Evaluated Officer's / Instructor's Name: Lecture Time, From on (Date) Course Name: Subject / Topic: Evaluator's Name:

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.	Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.	5	Objectives cleared
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	4	Very well Brepared
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	Digarised
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	Yes
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	4	Yes .
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	Yes
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	4	The students overronse was
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	5	Yes
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.	4	Yes
	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	4	Yes

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/Instructor:

HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)

Capt. (Dr.) Ashetosh Apandkar

Principal Page 1 of 2 Training Ship Rahaman

	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
	AND DE SECTION
2.	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal
	NA
3.	Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).
	N F
- 21	Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with duration:
4.	Name of training course, in-house/external/seminar attended by faculty/ instructor with duration.
5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : (HOD/ Principal
	/ Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)
	AN
6.	Remark: (Tick appropriately): Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement,  Needs further Improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly):
	Needs further improvement, ☐ Any other remarks (state clearly):
	NAME OF THE PARTY
1	Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. P. Kane House Date 12 4 19 Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt. & Bhatnagar Date: 12 4 19  October 10 14 19
- 9	Name & Sig of Evaluator 2: Capt. 8. Bhatnagar / Date: 12 4 19
- 17	Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt. A. Choudhry Date: 12/4/19.
3	varie a sig of Olivernish octor.
	and the second s
	HOD/Printepal
	(Name & Signature)  Capt. (Dr.) Ashotosh Apandk
-	Promured by: Head Management Systems Approved Street Management
	Training Ship Rahaman



		. K. Prasad.		
0930	To: 1030	On (Date):	Valid till:	
PS	R GP.II		11011041020	
MEK ALE Parts.				
1. C.	-pt. P.B.JO	ag 2. capt.	Agarkaz	
	0930 PS ME	PSR GP.II MEK ALE	12/07/201	

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.

Sl. 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.	. 4	
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.	5	
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	
6.	Comprehension: 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	
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	5	
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students	5	



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: Capt · P. B. Tury with the standard of Evaluator 2: Capt · P. B. Tury with the standard of Evaluator 2: Capt · P. B. Tury with the standard of Evaluation: Mx. N. K. Pansad · Capt · P. B. Tury with the standard of Evaluation: Mx. N. K. Pansad · Capt · P. B. Tury with the standard of 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.  Steadard guite responsitive. Gues fraganseer least factory.  Least Carducted at the feedure end · Bell Safis factory.  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal MIL.  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  Note that the suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  Note that the suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).		respectfully.		
In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. P. B. Trans.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt. A Jan Kan Ward.  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Mr. N. K. Arnsad. HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)  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  Stadents quite responsive. Buestian/auswer  Lessian Conducted at the freeful end.  All Safisfactory:  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  NIL  4. Name of training course, In-house/external/seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with		summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	-
Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:  No. N. K. Porsad.  HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)  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  Stackerts quite respenditive. Questian fauseur  Lesgian Carducted at the facture end.  All Safis factory:  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).	In the	event the performance is below average or poo	or the evaluators should	specify reason.
Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Mr. N. K. Porsacl. Challed HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)  1. Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the statement evaluation & how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching  Stadkents guite respensive Questian ausever  Lesgran Carducted at the feeture end.  All Safisfactory:  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  NIL  4. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with	Name	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt . P.	B. Joors of	i.
HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)  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  Steedarts guiste respensitive. Buestanfauswer  Lessian Conducted at the teature end.  All Safisfactory:  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  NIL  4. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with	Name	& Sig. of Evaluator 2: C∞p ← , A	garkaz Ma	1
(Name & Signature)  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  Steedlents guite respensive. Questianswer  Lessian Conducted at the teature and .  Bell Safisfactory:  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty finstructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  NIL  4. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with	Name	& Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Mr. N. K.	. Arnsad. (	THE
(Name & Signature)  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  Steedlents guite respensive. Questical surfaces from facustic at the feeture end.  Bession Conducted at the feeture end.  Bell safisfactory:  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  NIL  4. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with				HOD/Principal
evaluation & how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching  Steedents guite respensitive. Questian/ausover  Lessian Carducted at the teature end.  But Safis factory:  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  NIL  4. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with				
Session Conducted at the teature and.  All Safisfactory:  2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).  NIL  4. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with	eva	duation & how you have dealt with their sugge out your teaching	estions & make a self-e	valuative statement
2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  NIL  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).	5	tadents quite respon	nitire. Ques	transaver
2. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal  3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).	8	ession Conducted at	the teet	ene end.
3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).    A		All Satisfactorys.		
3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).    A				
3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).    A				
3. Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).	2. Tr	aining need for faculty identified based on f faculty /instructors and self evaluation rep	Fraining evaluators re ort by faculty/instruc	port, student feedback tors by HOD/Principal
4. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with		NIL		
4. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with	2 Te	sining programme suggested by HOD for t	he faculty /Instructor	(if any).
	5, 11		in	
			eminar attended by fa	culty/ Instructor with



	CATION FORM
5. Evaluation of Effectiveness of training impa (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedbac need initially)	rted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : k /Training Evaluators who identified the
6. Remark: (Tick appropriately):  Significant Improvement,  Needs further improven	☐ Satisfactory Improvement, nent, ☐ Any other remarks (state clearly):
Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt . P. B. J	1000 grit Date: 02/04/2019
ame & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt - Agarl	Prasad Date: 02/04/2019 Prasad Date: 02/04/2019
	HOD/Principal
Prepared by: Head Management Systems	(Name & Signature) Approved by: Chairman

Evaluated Officer's / Instructor's Name: Yarag



Lecture Time, From 1550

1650 on (Date)

Course Name:

Subject / Topic:

Evaluator's Name:

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.	Accoment by Fredricker	Rating	Comments
1.	Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.	4	Kood
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	Very well Prepared
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	well organised
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	Clear 1
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	YES
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	4	YES
7	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	BEST
В.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	4	YES
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.	5	YES
0.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	4	YES

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/Instructor:

HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)

Capt. (Dr.) Ashutosh Apandkar

Principal 1 of 2 Training Ship Rahaman

1.	Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, s how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a teaching	
	stillad & Med . Indiana	
2.	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by	
	NA	
3.	Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor	or (if any).
4.	Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by	faculty/ Instructor with duration:
5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty/Instru / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified	actor by ANY one : (HOD/ Principal the need initially)
6.	Remark: (Tick appropriately) :  Significant Improvement,  Needs further improvement,	Satisfactory Improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly):
,	Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. A - Choudhry  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt. S. Pradhan  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Mr. Parag Aguihatri	Date: 5 2 19 Date: 5 2 19 Date: 5 2 19
		HOD/Principal (Name & Signature) Capt. (Dr.) Ashetosh Apandkal
7	Prepared by: Head Management Systems	Approved Ship Ranaman



Lecture Time, From:	1340	To: 1440	On (Date):	9 Valid	till:
Course Name:		FYB8c N	18	1 20	101120
Subject / Topic:	Nantical Physics & Electronics II				
Evaluator's Name:	1. Ca	pt. M. Mak	ave 2.	ot . A. I	

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	, Good
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	4	Well
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	well
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	Good
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	4	Excellent
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	-5	Good
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	4	rusponded
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	5	Good
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students	5	Excellent



	respectfully.		
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	4	Good
In the e	event the performance is below average or p	oor the evaluators should	d specify reason.
Name &	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. M.	Makane +	bu
Name &	P. Circ of Evaluation 7:	Kumar R	2
Name &	& Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Shasha	nt Phonde	1000
			HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)
eval	-Evaluation: State your teaching activities uation & how you have dealt with their sug ut your teaching	during the past year, sun gestions & make a self-e	nmarise the student
<del>-&gt;</del>	Explain the topics wi	th the help	of electronic
(	component and circuit he And also corried out h	for better uni	derstanding.
	ession.		
	The state of the s	V.	Marie La Tal
	ining need for faculty identified based on aculty /instructors and self evaluation rep		
3. Trai	ning programme suggested by HOD for t	the faculty /Instructor (	(if any).
	e of training course, In-house/external /s- tion:	eminar attended by fac	ulty/ Instructor with



<ol> <li>Evaluation of Effectiveness of training impa (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedbaceneed initially)</li> </ol>	rted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY k /Training Evaluators who ident	one :
Remark: (Tick appropriately):  Significant Improvement,  Needs further improve	Satisfactory Improvement, nent, Any other remarks (state	e clearly
ne & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. M. Makane & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Capt. A. Kumane & Sig. of Officer/Instructor;		119
Shashank Pho	Date: 29 01	119
	//	plla



Evalua	ted Officer's / Instructor's Name:	armendra	Pander
Lectur	e Time, From: 0830 To: 0930	On (Date):	
Course	Name:	18	171 10716420
Subjec	/Tonio		, Ti
Evalua	tor's Name: 1.	sad. 2. me	. Flay Bahal.
listed b necessa	scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent t elow. Please include comments in the colu	o which the faculty me imn on the right. Attac	ets the teaching criteria h additional comments as
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.	-4	very clear
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	4	resy well
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	Chood
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	very clear
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	4	really expertise
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	yes yes
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was		1

8.

explanations.

management skills

attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear

Classroom Management: Faculty

demonstrated effective classroom

Respect: The faculty treated all students

yes.



	respectfully.		
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	v. 900d
n the e	event the performance is below average or	poor the evaluators she	ould specify reason.
Vame &	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mr. N. Pr	and.	CHI
Vame d	The state of the s	the same of the last of the la	D'You)
Name o	& Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mr. Ajay & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Mr. Dha	umi-dra Po	ndey. (#)
			HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)
eva	If-Evaluation: State your teaching activities aluation & how you have dealt with their subout your teaching	es during the past year, uggestions & make a's	en-evaluative statement
Т		- werk wit	
		ing - Paobl	
9	. (4) EX	ercise.	
1.5		1829	
2. Tr	aining need for faculty identified based faculty /instructors and self evaluation	on Training evaluate report by faculty/ins	rs report, student feedback tructors by HOD/Principal
3. Tı	raining programme suggested by HOD f	or the faculty /Instru	ctor (II any).
4 N	ame of training course, In-house/externs	al /seminar attended	by faculty/ Instructor with
4. N	uration:	transaummannen i Nilliansis a	THE STATE OF THE S



5. Evaluation of Effectiveness of training impa (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedbac need initially)	rted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : k/Training Evaluators who identified the
6. Remark: (Tick appropriately):  Significant Improvement,  Needs further improven	Satisfactory Improvement, nent, Any other remarks (state clearly)
ame & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	
Mr. N. Pour	Date: 05 02 19
ame & Sig. of Evaluator 2:	
ame & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:	05 02 19
Mr. D. Pande	Date:
0	4. 2 05 02 19.
	00
	4
	HOD/Principa
Prepared by: Head Management Systems	(Name & Signature
Propared by, Head Management Systems	Approved by: Chairman



Evaluated Officer's /		Name: Mrs.	Manisha 80	ongwave.
Lecture Time, From:	1440	To: 1540	On (Date):	
Course Name:		FYBSC NO		14/1/20.
Subject / Topic:			ics & Electro	T asia
Evaluator's Name:	Cap	t. S. Bhata	COO 2 Mr. S.	Plande
On the scale of 1 of 5, listed below. Please in necessary.	please indi	icate the extent to whi	the faculty meets the in the right. Attach additi	teaching criteria

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	Objective well
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	Very well prepared
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	Good organisation
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	5	Well eleaned
5,	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	4	Good Eaglertize
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	yes
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	Good
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	5	Good
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students	4	Yes



	respectfully.		
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	4	8/ youd
In the	event the performance is below average or p	oor the evaluators should	specify reason.
Name	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. 3.	Bhadnagar	h
Name	& Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mr. Sha	shark Phonde	1 28
Name	& Sig of Officer/Instructors	long same.	4.0
			HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)
eva	If-Evaluation: State your teaching activities aluation & how you have dealt with their sug out your teaching	during the past year, sum gestions & make a self-ev	marise the student valuative statement
	captain the topics with +		
	day lefe example. Solv	ing no- of nur	ericals of
	genral dife. And conduct	bug Question/ 4	numer session
2	· to generalize the unders	landing the top	pics of student.
	Moretto Name 1	434	
2. Tra	aining need for faculty identified based on faculty /instructors and self evaluation rep	Training evaluators report by faculty/instructo	ort, student feedback ers by HOD/Principal
3. Tr	aining programme suggested by HOD for	the faculty /Instructor (i	f any)
	aming programme suggested by 11019 lot	ine incurry runni detor (i	any).
4 No.	ma of training source. In housefests and to	aminor attanded by free	ltv/ Instructor with
	me of training course, In-house/external /s ration:	emmar attended by fact	ity/ instructor with



o Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : nining Evaluators who identified the
☐ Satisfactory Improvement, ☐ Any other remarks (state clearly)
, wate clearly,
Date:
150119
Date: 15 01 19



Eva	luated Officer's / I	nstructor's Name:		N FORM	
	ture Time, From:	550 To: 1650	On (	lote.	Volid till.
Cou	rse Name:	F488c		011/19	Valid till: 29 01 20
Subj	ect / Topic:		N8		
Evah	uator's Name:	Capt A. Che	11 (01	nmunica 2.	tion skills
	Americani, 4- Abor	And the second s			
I. N	Assessin	e Average, 3- Average, 2-	Below Avera		
l. N	Objective: The	faculty made a clear objectives of the	Contract Course Processes		A- Not Applicable Comments
L'N	Objective: The statement of the session at the be appropriate time	faculty made a clear objectives of the	Contract Course Processes		A- Not Applicable

Respect: The faculty treated all students

Excellent



	respectfully.		
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	4	Good
In the e	vent the performance is below average or poor	r the evaluators shou	ld specify reason.
Name &	& Sig. of Evaluator 1:		11 MM
	Capt. A. Ch	oudhy	Millet
Name &	E Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mr. N. Pra	red /	Cont
Name &	Sig. of Officer/Instructor:		M water
	M3. C. S.	amson.	Wou
			HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)
evali	Evaluation: State your teaching activities dur nation & how you have dealt with their sugges at your teaching	ing the past year, sur tions & make a self-	mmarise the student
	- 47		
	- 5		
_	4		
TET 1		1.7	
on fa	ning need for faculty identified based on Tra culty /instructors and self evaluation report	aining evaluators re	port, student feedback
			iors by 110D/11mcipal
Total	L. Hone		
. Irain	ing programme suggested by HOD for the	faculty /Instructor (	if any).
75			
Nome	of tended on some and the second of the seco		
durat	of training course, In-house/external /semi ion:	nar attended by fac	ulty/ Instructor with



5. Evaluation of Effectiveness (HOD/ Principal / D	s of training imparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one :
need initially)	s of training imparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one: on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the
. 1.	
6. Remark: (Tick appropriate)	(v) :
☐ Signific	ant Improvement
☐ Needs	further improvement,
	(one clearly)
	(ome clearly)
ma 6. 61	(vine clearly)
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	
me & Sig. of Evaluation 3	· A. Choudhy Why Date: 130 1110
me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:	A. Choudhy Date: 130/1/19
me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  Tr. N  ne & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:	J. Prasad CAD Date: 20/1/19
me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  Tr. N  ne & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:	A. Choudhy Date: 130/1/19
me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  Tr. N  ne & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:	J. Prasad CA Date: 20/1/19  C. Sausa Magor Date:
me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  Tr. N  ne & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:	J. Prasad CA Date: 20/1/19  C. Sausa Magor Date:



# TRAINING SHIP RAHAMAN FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

Evaluated Officer's /	Instructor's	Name: Ms. K	iomal War	IKOLE.
Lecture Time, From:	1040	To: 1140		Valid till:   21-07-2020
Course Name:	PSR	2-GP.	GPII	12.01.020
Subject / Topic:	Com	puter - 1x	I.S. WORD.	
Evaluator's Name:			9G1 2CAPT. 8	R. R. IRANI

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

Sl. 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	
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	4	
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	Organismi.
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	5	Clear
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	Expert
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	QAA
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	4	
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students	LLc	



# TRAINING SHIP RAHAMAN FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

	respectfully.	S.T.TON TORN	1
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	-
In the e	vent the performance is below average or poo	or the evaluators shoul	d specify reason.
Name &	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt . P. B.	JOAG. 9	2h-
Name &	E Sig. of Evaluator 1: Copt. P.B.	ant Mil	20.
Name &	Sig. of Officer/Instructor:	The Kara	
	Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Ms. Kom	AL WAYKO	LE. Xuante
			HOD/Principal
evan	Evaluation: State your teaching activities duration & how you have dealt with their suggest your teaching	ring the past year, sun stions & make a self-e	(Name & Signature) nmarise the student evaluative statement
Eco	dier teaching in TS Choma	kya. Joined	TSR on.
6th	Mpy 2019.		
- The	ought Computer Science to ?	B.Sc (NS) fo	r 34ears (2016)
The	ought Engineering subject	o to B.E	stiduts at
Sh	ah & Anchor Engg College, Ch	embur for	14eou (2014-2015)
Train	ning need for faculty identified based on Tr culty /instructors and self evaluation report	aining evaluators re-	nort student feedback
	ilty to undergo VICT		
ron	n 22-04-2019 to 05	-05-2-019	
Train	ing programme suggested by HOD for the	faculty /Instructor (	if any).
7	ICT DONE 22/4/20	19 to 05-1	05-2019.
Name	of training course, In-house/external/semi	nar attended by fact	ilty/ Instructor with



# TRAINING SHIP RAHAMAN FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

5. Evaluation of Effectiveness 5.	
<ol> <li>Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imp (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedbaneed initially)</li> </ol>	parted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : ack /Training Evaluators who identified the
Effective training.	
8.	
5. <u>Remark</u> : (Tick appropriately) :  Significant Improvement  Needs further improve	t, Satisfactory Improvement, ement, Any other remarks (state clearly
	//////////////////////////////////////
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Canada Da O	T
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: C-pt P. B.	Joag Date: 22/7/2599
me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:	Joseg Date: 22/7/259
me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:	Joseg Date: 22/7/259 A.R.R. Janu) Date: 22 Just 2019 L Waykofe Date: 22/7/19.
me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: C-pt. P. B. me & Sig. of Evaluator 2:  Mexico (Cap me & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Ms. Koma	Joseg Date: 22/7/2599  # R.R. Ikmy Date: 22/14/2599  L Waykole Date: 22/7/19.



# TRAINING SHIP RAHAMAN STAFF/FACULTY TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION FORM

Th. 17. 19	rticipant:	Fau	ty long	outer Science.	Name	Na	utical.
Ref. 1	Fraining	VI	CT.		imparte	d on:	22 4 10
		**********		ART A			4/5/19
A C.		SSESSMEN	)F THE TR				
trainin The St	ff member alor ng gained by th taff member w	ould rate him	f as achievii	ess his/her enhancement	in rating		
i- na	raly Any, 2=L	ittle, 3=Fair,	Good Amou	= = Excellent Achieven	nent		
S. No.		BE EVALUA	-	TO BE SEED OF THE PARTY OF THE	SELT	SIG	POINTS
02	How much	the training a	values to yo	and has it improved the	confider	nce	14
		as the mater					3
03	1		and work shop				3
04	Would help technically i	you in pract	: I implementa	on and Do you feel mor	e sound		4
0.5	In your Opin	nion is it w	the money	it			3
REMA	RKS ON SUM	MARY OF	IE TRAINE	1			0
he HO		the staff me :		with the staff member: the achievement of the			
he HO ttended he HO -Hardl	D along with t l D would rate ly Any, 2=Littl	the staff me : the staff me le, 3-Fairly	er would as a ber as achieving Good Amo	vith the staff member:	n ratine s		5
he HO ttended he HO Hardl	D along with to be along with to be along with the beautiful to be along the beautiful to be along with the beautiful to be along the be	the staff me the staff me le, 3-Fairly E EVALU.	ber as achieving Good Ame	with the staff member: the achievement of the the knowledge /skills i 5=Excellent Achievem	n rating s ent	cale 1-	5 POINTS
he HO ttended he HO Hardl	D along with to be along with to be along with the beautiful to be along the beautiful to be al	the staff medie, 3-Fairly  E EVALUATE EVALUATE THE STAFF STA	ber as achieving Good Ame	with the staff member: the achievement of the the knowledge /skills i 5=Excellent Achievem sused and how is the c	n rating s ent	cale 1-	POINTS
he HO ttended he HO Hard! No.	D along with I  D would rate y Any, 2=Littl  FIELD TO B  How effective  How did you	the staff medie, 3-Fairly  E EVALUATE EVALUATE THE TRANSPORTER TO THE TRANSPORTER TO THE STAFF T	ber as achievis Good Amo  ber as achievis Good Amo  knowled bernber per	the achievement of the the knowledge /skills if 5=Excellent Achievem used and how is the coing with the training	n rating s ent onfidence	cale 1-	POINTS
he HO ttended he HO Hard!	D along with to be a long with to be a long with the beautiful and the staff individual is to be a long with the beautiful and the staff individual is to be a long with the beautiful and the staff individual is to be a long with the beautiful and the staff individual is to be a long with the beautiful and the beautif	the staff medie, 3-Fairly  E EVALUATE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE T	ber as achieving Good Amore Dember per bernber per bernber per bernberde with inically in a second control of the control of t	the achievement of the the knowledge /skills if 5=Excellent Achievem sused and how is the coing with the training tkshops effectively and I subject	n rating s ent onfidence	cale 1-	POINTS
he HO Itended he HO Hardl No.	D along with to be a long with to be a long with to be a long with the beautiful property of the staff of the	the staff medle, 3-Fairly  E EVALUATE THE FINANCE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	ber as achieving Good Ame Day knowledge nember per nember per ne practical w	the achievement of the the knowledge /skills if 5=Excellent Achievem sused and how is the coing with the training tkshops effectively and I subject	n rating s ent onfidence	cale 1-	POINTS 05
he HO ttended he HO Hardl No.	D along with to be along with to be along with to be along with the beautiful distribution of the staff of th	the staff medie, 3-Fairly  E EVALUATE The true of the staff medien in the staff medien	ber as achieving Good Amore Dember per bernber per bernber per bernberde with inically in a second control of the control of t	the achievement of the the knowledge /skills if 5=Excellent Achievem sused and how is the co- ing with the training tkshops effectively and I subject and	n rating s ent onfidence	cale 1-	5 POINTS 05 04 04
he HO Itended he HO Hardl No.	D along with to be a long with to be a long with to be a long with the beautiful property of the staff of the	the staff medie, 3-Fairly  E EVALUATE EVALUATION The sound tical implements on is this  The re	ber as achieving Good Amore Dember per bernber per ber	the achievement of the the knowledge /skills in 5=Excellent Achievem used and how is the coming with the training with the training with the training atkshops effectively and I subject and the effort were to the terminal training to the effort were to the terminal training training the effort were to the terminal training t	onfidence	e el this	5 POINTS 05 04 04
he HO ttended he HO Hardl No.	D along with I  D would rate y Any, 2=Littl  FIELD TO B  How effective How did you  Did the staff individual is I  Was the pract In your Opini  REMARKS:	the staff medie, 3-Fairly  E EVALUATE EVALUATION The sound tical implements on is this  The re	ber as achieving Good Amore Dember per bernber per ber	the achievement of the the knowledge /skills in S=Excellent Achievement of the sused and how is the coing with the training with the training subject and how the effort	onfidence	e el this	90INTS 05 04 04 04
he HO ttended he HO Hardl No.  I  OD'S  Cot e	D along with I  D would rate y Any, 2=Littl  FIELD TO B  How effective How did you  Did the staff individual is I  Was the pract In your Opini  REMARKS:	the staff medie, 3-Fairly  E EVALUATE EVALUATE THE TRANSPORT OF THE TRANSP	ber as achieving Good Amore Dember per bernber per ber	the achievement of the the knowledge /skills in 5=Excellent Achievem used and how is the coming with the training with the training with the training atkshops effectively and I subject and the effort were to the terminal training to the effort were to the terminal training training the effort were to the terminal training t	onfidence	e el this	90INTS 05 04 04 04



	re Time, From 1550 To: 1650		on (Date) 14   01   2024
	and the section	110)	Valid till-13/01/200
200	B.S.C. (Nauhcal Scient	1 - A1	
abje	ot/Topic: Navigation (IV) (TY	/- ()	3
clud	(New appointment- at interview / Initial evaluation- ne scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which de comments in the column on the right. Attach additi- cellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Ave	the person onal comm	meets the teaching criteria listed below. Plea ents as necessary.
St.	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	well explained.
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	3	well prepared.
3	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	well organized
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	, ,	G00'd
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	15	very good
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	) >	YES
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to studen questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	. 3	YEI
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	4	well managed.
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.	5	Yes
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	e 4	well summanised.
	me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: (ADT . P - Ka	ne P	hall
Na	me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CAPT. A. KL	mar.	02 1
Na	me & Sig. of Officer. (APT (DR.) · A	APANE	NAR. LJ
For	r new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Re	marks by	
	NA		

(Name & Signature)

#### PART II: For Regular Faculty

Evaluation on the basis of tra	ainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'.  Italied in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section).
a) Credit Points earned (carcu	rated in accordance with Cir Crecinial article Overlain Circumstance
	culty identified by trainees in their feedback:
Strength - Expe	nined.
how you hav	eaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & we dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your
Horing as princip	al of TSR. Taking GTF 4B.SC (NS) 1027A
. Training need for faculty ide and self-evaluation report by	Illuied pased out training a training
NO	
. Training programme sugges	sted by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).
None	
Name of training course, In-	-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration:
. Evaluation of Effectiveness student feedback /Training	of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on Evaluators who identified the need initially)
NA	
5. Remark: (Tick appropriately	y):  Significant Improvement,  Satisfactory Improvement,  Needs further improvement,  Any other remarks (state clearly):
NA NA	
Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	CADT. P. Kane. Home Date 14/01/20
Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2:	CAPT. A. Kumar. 12 1. Pate: 14/01/20
Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor.	CAPT. (DR.). A. Alandkar Jose 14/01/2
	Principal, VSR (Name & Signature)
	(Name & signature)

WPIF-7.1-01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems

26th Sep 2019

Rev- 02



-	re Time, From 1440 To: 1540		on (Date) 24   61   2020
ours		1-TY	Valid HI 23/01/2021
ubje	ect/Topic: N. Asch - Bilging - Pe	ermeal	silia of Comparement
	11.000		000
	PAR (Now appointment- at interview / Initial evaluation- wi	T1	on period / regular faculty evaluation)
a dh	ne scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the		
clu	de comments in the column on the right. Attach addition	nal commer	nts as necessary.
Ex	cellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Avera	age, <b>1</b> - Pool	r, NA- Not Applicable
SI.	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	very good.
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	well prepared.
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	well organised.
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	mill clear
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	YES
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	4	yes .
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	YES
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	5	well managed.
9,	Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.	4	4स
10.	Summation; Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	well dummanized.
In th	e event the performance is below average or poor the	evaluators s	should specify reason.
	me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: (PPT . P. 14		
Na	me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: COPT - M-	D mak	cane D
	me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CAPT - M- me & Sig. of Officer: CAPT - D'a	y Ken	mar D_
	new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Rem		
POI			1/2
_	NA		No.
	7		

WPIF-7.1- 01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems 26<sup>st</sup> Sep 2019

Page 1 of 2 Approved by: Chairman

Rev- 02

	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).  49-66/50
	b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:  Strength - Very Sincered weaknes - NU  Well organized.  Disciplined.
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 teaching:  Toucing Nav-Brch for BSC. Students suggestions discurred by
3.	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty.
3.	Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).
4.	Name of training course, in-house/external/seminar attended by faculty with duration:  50ff SKill draining (one day) on 03/08/2017.
5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on 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):
	ne & Sig. of Evaluator 1: CAPT. P. Icane. Ware Date: 24/01/20
	ne & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CAPT - MD Makane. M Date: 24/01/20 ne & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: CAST Pian Kor. (2) Date: 24/01/20

Principal TSR (Name & Signature)

### TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN' Faculty / Visiting Faculty Evaluation Form



Course Name: PSR-GP Subject / Topic: General Ship Knowledge Container BRT Syste  PARTI  (Initial evaluation-within probation period / regular & visiting faculty evaluation)  On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.  5- Excellant, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA- Not Applicable  SI. Assessment by Evaluator  1. Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.  2. Preparation: 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 5. Clearly Explained material clearly.  5. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated affective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of fedure / 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 2: Name 2 of Fedurators.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Name 2 of Fedurators.		Faculty / Visiting Fac		iluation Form
Course Name: PSR-GP Subject / Topic: General Ship Knowledge Container BRT Syste  PARTI  (Initial evaluation- within probation period / regular & visiting faculty evaluation)  On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.  5. Excellant, 4. Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA-Not Applicable  SI  No.  1. Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.  2. Preparation: 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 5. Clearly Explained material clearly.  5. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  8. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated affective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  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: Capt. S. P. R. J.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Name A. Pantara Tabulay.  Name & Sig. of Officer/Restructor: Capt. P. B. Tong.		1.61	ag	© Faculty □ Visiting Faculty on (Date) 06 09 2.019
Subject / Topic: General Swip Knowledge Container BRT Syste  PART I  (Initial evaluation- within probation period / regular & visiting faculty evaluation)  On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.  Excellent, 4-Above Average, 3-Average, 2-Below Average, 1-Poor, NA-Not Applicable  SI.  No.  Assessment by Evaluator  1. Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.  2. Preparation: 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. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/tepic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  11. Objective: The faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  12. In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  13. Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: May PRATAA Jahan Jahan Markey Mark		se Name: PCR-CP		Color of the Color
(Initial evaluation- within probation period / regular & visiting faculty evaluation)  On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below 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. Assessment by Evaluator  No. Assessment by Evaluator  No. Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.  2. Preparation: 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. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated affective classroom management skills demonst		ect/Topic: General Ship Knowled	dae	Container BRT System
On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below 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.  Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.  2. Preparation: 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 instructional material clearly.  4. Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.  5. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated affective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  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 2: M.Y. P.R.A.T.A.P. J.A.B.H.Y.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.				2112
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. Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.  2. Preparation: 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 instructional material clearly.  4. Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.  5. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated affective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  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 2: M.Y. P.R.A.T.A.P. J.A.B.H.Y.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.  Name & Sig. of Officer/instructor: Cupt. P. B. J.O.g.				
SExcellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA-Not Applicable  SI. 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.  2. Preparation: 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. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being faught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  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 appoint reason.  Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. R. John T. John T. John T. John T. John T. John T. P. R. John T. John T. John T. John T. John T. John	On ti	he scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which to de comments in the column on the right. Attach addition	he person onal comm	meets the teaching criteria listed below. Pleas nents as necessary.
1. Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.  2. Preparation: 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. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills.  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  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: Capt. S. P. Ruf.  Name & Sig. of Officer/hestructor: Capt. P. B. Tong. The summation of the content of the summation of the summatio				
1. Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.  2. Preparation: 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. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated of effective classroom management skills demonstrated effective classroom management skills.  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture 1 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: Capt. S. P. Ruf.  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt. P. B. Toog. The state of the state of the summation o	1920 CH	Assessment by Evaluator	Rating	Comments
2. Preparation: 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. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated of effective classroom management skills.  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  11. In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: My. PRATAP JASHAV.  Name & Sig. of Officer/liestructor: Capt. P. B. Jong. The state of the present of the present of the state of the present of the state of t	2000	objectives of the session at the beginning or at	5	YES.
organised manner as per the plan of instruction.  4. Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.  5. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategles as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Clearly Explained.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Clearly Explained.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Clearly Explained.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty demonstrated of the faculty demonstrated affective classroom management skills.  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  11. The event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  12. Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Myr. PRATAP JASHAY JASHAY Name & Sig. of Officer/Restructor: Capt. P. B. Joag. T.	2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the	5	v.God.
5. Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills.  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  11. In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  12. Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: MY. PRATAP JASHAY:  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt. P. B. Jong.	3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	YES.
subject/topic being taught.  6. Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills.  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  11. In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  12. Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. S.P. Rof.  Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. B. Jong.	4.		5	clearly Explained.
student understanding and modified teaching STES QST.  7. Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summalion: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  11. In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  12. Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: MY. PRATAP JASHAY.  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt. P. B. Jong. Technology.	5.	The state of the s	5	Expert.
questions & comments & provided clear explanations.  8. Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  10. Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.  11. In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  12. Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. S. P. Roy.  13. Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. B. Joag.	6.	student understanding and modified teaching	5	YES QRA
effective classroom management skills  9. Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.  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: Capt. S. P. Ruy.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: My. PRATAP JASHAV.  Name & Sig. of Officer/lestructor: Capt. P. B. Jong.	7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	5	YES.
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: Copt. S. P. Ruy.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: My. PRATAP JASHAV.  Name & Sig. of Officer/lastructor: Copt. P. B. Jong. Tashav.	8.		4	Good.
n the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Copt. S. P. Ruf.  Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: tqv. PRATAP JASHAV.  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Copt. P. B. Jong. 73.	9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.	2	Marie and the second se
Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Copt. S.P. Roy. My. PRATAD JASHAV.  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Copt. P. B. Jong. 72.	10.	lecture / concluding of practical in an effective	4	Good.
Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt . P. B. Jong . 72.				should specify reason.
Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Capt . P. B. Jong . 92.		ne & Sig. of Evaluator 2: MY. PRATAD	JAR	HAV. SHOP
				196.
For Probation Period Evaluation Remarks by — NA —	For		_0	NA-
1 1				1 /

HOD/ Principal (Name & Signature)

	PART II: For Regular / Visiting Faculty
1.	
1.	of ballices recuback in part Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'.
	a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section2
10	49.90 ont of 50.
	b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:
	Strength: knowledge experience tracking skills.
	Weaknen: NIL
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 teaching.
	Teaching GP & BSc (NS). Continued Improvement on Ski
3.	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty instructors and self-evaluation report by faculty.
	- NIT -
3.	Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty (if any).
	Safe Skill training Attended One Day Course "New You Name of training course, In-house external seminar attended by faculty with duration:
4.	Name of training course, In-house(external/seminar attended by faculty with duration:
	"New You" - Employee Bronding for Suggest One Day
	"New Yor" - Employee Bronding for Success One Day External Course arronged on Compus on 03.08201
5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one: (HOD/ Principal / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)
	Excellent feed back from Students.
6.	Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement,
	□ Needs further improvement, □ Any other remarks (state clearly):
	- NA -
	1)
Name	e & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt . S. P. Roy Date: 06 09 19  e & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mv. PRATAP JADHAV . Date: 06 109 19
Name	8 Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mr. PRATAP JADHAY . Date: 06 109 19
Name	& Sig of Officer/Instructor: Capt . P. B. Jogo 4 To Date: 05/00/18

HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)

#### TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN' FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

Evaluated Officer's / Instructor's Name: CAPT- A - AGHARNAR

# 0930 To: 1030 on (Date) 24 DEC 2019 Valid till: 23 DEL 2010 Lecture Time, From 2

Course Name:

Subject / Topic:

T.G SYSTEM

Evaluator's Name:

1. CAPT. P. KANE

2 CAPT. M. MAKANE

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.	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.	4	OBJECTIVES CLEAR
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	WELL PREBARED
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	4 5
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	5	VERY CLEAR
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	4	465
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	4	healthing mygerstanging.
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	1-	465
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills		415
9.	Respect The faculty treated all students respectfully.	4	465
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	wert concluded

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/instructor:

CAPT P KANE Glove

HOD/Principal (Name & Signature)

	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
	Practical views shown for better understanding
	Gracked views shown for better understanding
	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal
	NA
	Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any).
	Paining programme suggested by the service of the s
0	Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with duration:
	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : (HOD/ Principal
	/ Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)
	/ Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who Identified the need Initially)
	/ Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the feed initially)
	Remark: (Tick appropriately):  Significant Improvement,
	Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the field into any)   No.   No.
	Name & Sig of Evaluator 1: CAPT P KANE Was Date: 24 th Dec 2019  Name & Sig of Evaluator 2: CAPT P KANE Date: 24 th Dec 2019
	Name & Sig of Evaluator 1: CAPT P KANE Was Date: 24 th Dec 2019  Name & Sig of Evaluator 2: CAPT P KANE Date: 24 th Dec 2019
	Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CAST OF MAKANE The Date: 24th DEC 2019  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: CAST A-RGHARKAR Myhards  Date: 24th DEC 2019
	Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CAST OF MAKANE The Date: 24th DEL 2019  Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: CAST A-RGHARKAR Bywards  Date: 24th DEL 2019



ectur	re Time, From 1550 To: 1650		on (Date) 23  01   2020
	e Name: 1 11-1 Naubial criente	1 TY	Valid +111 - 22/01/2021
Subje	ct/Topic: Shipping Mgmt - Del	legation	
ncluo	(New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- will e scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the de comments in the column on the right. Attach addition cellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average.	e person me nal comment	ets the teaching criteria listed below. Please is as necessary.
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	well prepared objects
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	4	very good
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	4	well organized.
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	5	nell clear
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	YEL
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	yer
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	4	Good
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	4	well managed.
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.	5	YES
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	hell summarised
	me & Sig. of Evaluator 1:   (Apt. M-D)	evaluators s Makan	should specify reason.
	me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: CAPT - M-D  me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CAPT - P- K  me & Sig. of Officer: CAPT - P- K	y kum	Hone
	r new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Ren		
	N/A		1 el

26th Sep 2019

Page 1 of 2 Approved by: Chairman Rev- 02

WPIF-7.1-01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems

	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).
	48.32/50
	b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:
	Strengths - Experienced. treatmen - Nilknowledgeable - priciplined.
	-knowledgeable
	- priciplined.
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 teaching:
	Taking Marlaw Ship Mgont BPLK   EUS for BSC (NG)

	W. The state of th
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 teaching:
	Taking marlaw Ship mgont / BPLK   EUS for B:50 (NG)
3.	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty.
	No -
3.	Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).
	None
4.	Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration:  Soft Skill braining (Iday) by TSR
5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)
	NA
6.	Remark: (Tick appropriately) :  Significant Improvement,  Satisfactory Improvement,  Needs further improvement,  Any other remarks (state clearly):
	NA

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1:

Date: 23/01/2020

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2:

Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:

Date: 23/01/2020

23 01 2020

Date:

Principal, ∜SR (Name & Signature)



valu	ated Officer's N	lame: CA-PT	m.D.1	makan	e	☐ Faculty	✓ ☐ Visiting Faculty
	e Time, From	0930	To:	1030			on (Date) 22 01 2020
cours	e Name:	D.C. INA	utical	Science	e) FY	V	alid till -21/01/2021
Subje	ct / Topic:	N-Arch/	FY)-	Sheng	n un	ler star	al dynamic Cone
nclud	e scale of 1 of e comments in	tment- at interview	v / Initial e the exter e right. A	PAR valuation- w it to which th ttach addition	T I ithin probati ne person m nal commer	on period / regu eets the teachi its as necessal	ular faculty evaluation) ng criteria listed below. Please ry
SI.	1-7-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1	Assessment by Ev		DOION AFOR	Rating		Comments
No. 1.	Objective: The	faculty made a c	ear stater	ment of the ning or at	4	Goo	d
2.	Preparation: T	he faculty was was ecessary materials.	rell prepa	red for the	5	Well	prepared
3.	Organisation: organised man	Faculty presented oner as per the plan	the mat n of instru	terial in an otion.	4	well	prepared organised Clear
4,	Clarity: The material clearly	faculty presente	d the i	nstructional	4	heli	Clear
5.	Expertise: For subject/topic b	aculty displayed eing taught.	expertis	e in the	5	YE	1
6.	Comprehension student und strategies as r		periodical modified	y checked teaching	4	YE	7
7.	Responsivene	ss: The faculty wa omments & provide	s attentive d clear ex	e to student planations.	5	4000	d
8.	Classroom I effective class	Management: Fa room managemen		emonstrated	4	well	managed.
9.	Respect: The	faculty treated all s	tudents re	espectfully.	5	YE	
10.	Summation: I lecture / cor manner.	Faculty carried or including of pract	at the su ical in a	mmation of an effective	4	hell	summarised.
Nar	e event the per ne & Sig. of Ev ne & Sig. of Ev ne & Sig. of Of	raluator 2:	CART	· P. K	ane.	should specify  or  flowe  cane D	
For	new appointm	ent & Probation P				960	
	- 1	IA					1 el
						-	1
						2 5	Principal/TSR (Name & Signature)

WPIF-7,1-01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems 26th Sep 2019 Rev- 02

_	
	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)
	47.13/50
	b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:
	b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by damages in order to be a larger to the state of
	Strength - Experience . Weaknen - None .  Disciplined .
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 you teaching:
	Taking Nav. Breh for Fy, vpcp for Fylsy & SOT III for Ty.
2000	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on facult and self-evaluation report by faculty.
	No.
	Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).
	Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration:
*	(1) I day soft skill fraining course at TIR
	(ii) I day NAAC Peer team visit.
	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)
	NA
6.	Remark: (Tick appropriately):  Significant Improvement,  Needs further improvement,  Any other remarks (state clearly)

CAPT. P. Kane. Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CAPT. M.D Makane. Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:

21/01/20 Date:

21/01/20

21/0/20

Principal, TSR (Name & Signature)

Date:

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1:



ectu	are Time, From 1550 To: 1	600	on (Date) 28  01   2020
our	se Name: B.S.C. (Nautical Sc		
ubje	ect/Topic English Communic	ation - con	
clu	(New appointment- at interview / initial evaluate scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to de comments in the column on the right. Attack collent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Belove	which the person n additional comme	neets the teaching criteria listed below. Plea ints as necessary.
SI. No.	Assessment by Evaluator	Rating	Comments
1.	Objective: The faculty made a clear statement objectives of the session at the beginning another appropriate time.		well clear
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared class & with necessary materials.	for the	good
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material organised manner as per the plan of instruction	in an 4	well organised.
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instrumaterial clearly.	ictional 5	well clear
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise subject/topic being taught.	n the 5	Excellent
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically of student understanding and modified to strategies as required.	hecked eaching 5	good
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to questions & comments & provided clear explan		good
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demon effective classroom management skills	strated 5	well managed
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students respect	effully.	Excellent good.
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summa lecture / concluding of practical in an e- manner.	tion of ffective	good.
	e event the performance is below average or p	cor the evaluators	should specify reason.
Nan	me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: LAPT . (	hane )	ar. 12
Nan	me & Sig. of Officer. M.C. Chi	arlotte So	men Hamson
For	new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation	on Remarks by	1 1
	7/24 7/4		1 00

WPIF-7.1-01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems 26th Sep 2019

Rev- 02

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)
46-93/50
) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:
Strengty - Experience · Weaknen - None.  - Disciplined  - Sincere
- Sincere
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:
aking English lecture for B-SC/DNS/GP Students.
raining need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty.
NO
Fraining programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).
None
lame of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration:
ITF- well being workshop (4 days) by ITF, NUST & FSUS
Soft skill training (1 day) by TSP
evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)
N/A
Remark: (Tick appropriately) :   Significant Improvement,   Satisfactory Improvement,
Remark: (Tick appropriately) : ☐ Significant Improvement, ☐ Satisfactory Improvement, ☐ Needs further Improvement, ☐ Any other remarks (state clearly):

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1:

CAPT. P. Karne

Date: 28/01/2020

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CADT . Bay to

Date: 28 01 2020

Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:

Vamson

28/01/2020

Principal TSR (Name & Signature)

Date:

Approved by: Chairman



/aiui	ated Officer's N	lame: (V) 1)	hammond	ra landey		☐ Visiting Faculty
ctu	re Time, From	1340	To: 14	40		on (Date) 25/01/2020
ours	e Name:	B.S.C. (Na	utical sui	ence) (sy	) Vali	id AU -24/01/2021
ıbje	ct / Topic:	Mahema	ACC - S	impson's y	s rule.	
				PARTI		
	(New appoin	tment- at interviev	v / initial evaluat	ion- within probati	on period / regu	ular faculty evaluation)
n th	e scale of 1 of	5, please indicate	the extent to w	hich the person m	eets the teaching	ng criteria listed below. Pleas
cluc	le comments in	the column on the Average, 3- Av	erage. 2- Below	Average, 1- Poo	r, NA- Not Appl	icable
SI.		Assessment by Ev		Rating	iledistra	Comments
1.	Objective: The	faculty made a c	lear statement of	f the	. 11	11001
	objectives of another approp	the session at t	the beginning of	or at 4		Clear
2.	Preparation: 1	he faculty was wecessary materials	vell prepared fo	r the 4	well	prepared.
3.	Organisation: organised mar	Faculty presented oner as per the pla	the material in of instruction.	n an 4	hell	organised.
4.	Clarity: The material clear	faculty presente y.	ed the instruc	tional 4	C	lear II
5.	Expertise: F subject/topic b	aculty displayed eing taught.	expertise in	the 4		/ei
6.	Comprehension student und strategies as r	erstanding and	periodically che modified tea	ching 5	У	E
7.	Responsivens	ss: The faculty was omments & provide	as attentive to st ad clear explana	udent tions. 4	Y	es
В.	Classroom defective class	Management: Fa room managemen	aculty demons it skills	trated 4	Wel/	managed
9.	Respect: The	faculty treated all	students respect	fully.		YA
10.	Summation: lecture / commanner.	Faculty carried or ncluding of prac	ut the summati tical in an eff	on of 4	Y	BAM
n th	e event the per	formance is below	v average or po	or the evaluators	should specify	reason.
	me & Sig. of Ev					
	me & Sig. of Ev	valuator 2:	Ms. C. C	amson	Mamaen	
	me & Sig. of O		Mr. Dho	umsen ur en endra	Pandey	1. (th)
For	r new appointm	ent & Probation P	eriod Evaluatio	n Remarks by	-MA	
	N	A			No.	A
_	- 1100	177.00		2		11

WPIF-7.1- 01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems 26th Sep 2019

Rev- 02

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)
18.89/50
b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:
Strength - Very Soft Spoken Weakness -NIL
The state of the s
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:
Icaching Many for B-SC-(HS) & DNS.
Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty.
NO -
Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).
Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration:
None I day soft skill toaining by TSR
0
Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)
NIA
Remark: (Tick appropriately) :  Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement,
☐ Needs further improvement, ☐ Any other remarks (state clearly):
N/A

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2:

Mr. C. Samson Man Mr. Dharmondra Pande

Date:

Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:

Date:

Principal TSR (Name & Signature)

WPIF-7.1-01-02

26th Sep 2019

Rev- 02

Prepared by: Head Management Systems



	Faculty / Visiting Facult	y EVAI	LUATION FORM
ecti Cour Subj	usted Officer's Name: PARAG AGNIHO  ure Time, From 1000 To: 1100  se Name: ROSC  ect / Topic: RADAR   FUNDAMENT  (New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- with the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the comments in the column on the right. Affach addition	TAL	meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please
SI.	cellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Aven	Rating	oor, NA- Not Applicable Comments
No.	Assessment by Evaluator  Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the	rainy	
1.	objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time.	5	Clear Statement of the Object
2	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	5	Well prepared
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	Well organised
4	Clarity. The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	5	Very good presentation
Ď.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	5	Excellent Comprehension
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	and expertise
7-	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	4	Very good respinsiveness
8	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	5	00
9	Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.	5	Effective classroom many e All students treated respect
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	5	Effective Summation of the t
the	e event the performance is below average or poor the	evaluator	s should specify reason
	ne & Sig. of Evaluator 1: CAPT P. S. D.		V *1/10
Van	ne & Sig. of Evaluator 2. CAPT - A . Azart A	KKAR	Ghalves
Van	ne & Sig of Officer PARAG- AGNIT	ISTOIL	DK Amilit.
ar	new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Rem.	arks by	1

Principal, TSR (Name & Signature)

#### PART II: For Regular Faculty

1	. Evaluation on the basis	of trainees' feedback	in part 'Trainee's Evalu	ation of the Faculty'.	
	a) Credit Points earned	calculated in accordance	with CIP checklist under 'O	iverali Performance & Mgmit. 'secti	on).
		4-9			
	b) Strength & weakness	of faculty identified b	y trainees in their feedt	pack:	
	Knowledge, E Method of explo Good teaching	openince uning abilities	Very good	Knowledge buth R in theony	
2.	Self-Evaluation: State you how you teaching	ur teaching activities di have dealt with their s	uggestions & make a self	narise the student evaluation & evaluative statement about yo	ur
	Identified the d	Afficities forces	I by the candid	ates regarding Radas	the
3.	Training need for faculty and self-evaluation repor	identified based on T t by faculty.	raining evaluators repo	rt, student feedback on facu	lty
3.	Training programme sug	gested by CIC/Princip	pal for the faculty (if any	1.	
	-			1	
4.	Name of training course, —	In-house/external /se	minar attended by facu	lty with duration:	
5.	Evaluation of Effectivenes student feedback /Trainin			e : (CIC/Principal, / Based on /)	
6.	Remark: (Tick appropriate			sfactory improvement, other remarks (state clearly)	k=
Nam	e & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	CAPT. P. S. D	ANDEKAR flood ARRAR Byhan	Date 16/Jan/2	1020
Vam	e & Sig. of Evaluator 2:	CAPT A. AGN.	ARRAR Behard	Base 06 Jan h	
Vam	e & Sig. of Officer/Instructor.	PARAGE AGNIT	ione i philippi	hul Date of Jan/2	
				Principal, TSR (Name & Signature)	

26th Sep-2019

Rev- 02



ectu	re Time, From 1550	To: 1650		on (Date) 09 01 2020
		Nautical science	JAY	Valid till 08/01/2021
		- work, energy		in a circuit
iclus	(New appointment- at in e scale of 1 of 5, please in le comments in the column	PAR terview / initial evaluation- wi	T I thin probation e person me nal comments	n period / regular faculty evaluation) ets the teaching criteria listed below. Plea s as necessary.
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	well clear objective
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.		5	well prepared
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.		5	YES
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.		5	well 'Clear
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.		4	YES
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.		2	465
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.		5	Good
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills		5	YES
9.	Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully.		4	YEI
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.		4	YEI
	e event the performance is ne & Sig. of Evaluator 1:	below average or poor the		
Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mr. Shashan				
Nar	me & Sig. of Officer.	Ms. manish		
For	new appointment & Proba	ation Period Evaluation Rem	arks by	1
	NA			1 also

WPIF-7.1-01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems 26th Sep 2019

Rev- 02 1

	PART II: For Regular Faculty						
1	<ul> <li>Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'.</li> <li>a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance &amp; Mgmt' section)</li> </ul>						
	47.52/50 Mgmt.' section						
	b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:						
	Shonghi - Francescal						
	ben decent weakness - HIL						
	Strengths - Experienced heavener - MIL						
2.	how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluation statement about						
	Taking physics for B.sc. (ou) & DNS						
3.	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty.						
	No -						
3.	Training programme suggested by CIC/D-In-1-15						
	Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).						
	None						
4.	Name of training course, in-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration:						
	None: I day soft skill training by TSR						
	0 0						
5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)						
	NA						
	1.112						
6.	Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement,						
	☐ Needs further improvement, ☐ Any other remarks (state clearly):						
	NA NA						
Man							
	& Sig. of Evaluator 1: Capt. Biay Kumar & Date: 09/01/2020						
Name	& Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mr. Shashank Phonde Date: 09 101/2020						
Name	& Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Me has add						
	1 3. Mantha Sonawane : Ng Date: 09/91/202						

Principal, TSR (Name & Signature)



uu.	re Time, From 1040 To: 1140 se Name: R. Sc. (Nauti Cal Science	e) (4	valid till 24/01/2020
ubje	ct/Topic: Nautical physics beleut	ronice -	of Army as a differentiation
	PAR	TI	Marin Company
	(New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- wi	thin probatio	
cluc	e scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the comments in the column on the right. Attach addition	nai commen	is as necessary.
_	cellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Avera	age, 1- Poor	
SI.	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	well clear
2.	Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials.	4	well prepared
3.	Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction.	5	YES
4.	Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly.	4	yes and
5.	Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught.	4	YES
6.	Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required.	5	YES
7.	Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations.	4	yes
8.	Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills	5	well managed.
9.	Respect. The faculty treated all students respectfully.	5	YES
10.	Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner.	4	well summanised.
n th	e event the performance is below average or poor the	evaluators s	should specify reason.
Na	me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: CAPT . Bay I me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Ms . Manisha	cumar	02-34-
Na	me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Ms. Manisha	Cona	wane My
Na	me & Sig. of Officer: Tyr. Shashank	phone	less
For	new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Rem	arks by	A 1
	NA-		( ) el

(Name & Signature)

WPIF-7.1-01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems 26h Sep 2019

	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).					
	49-62/50					
	b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:					
	Strengton - Experienced. Leakners -NIL					
	-sincere.					
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 teaching:					
	Taking physic Lelectronics for BSC(NS)/DNS					
3.	Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty.					
	NO.					
3.	Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).					
4.	Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration:					
	1101					
5.	Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)					
	NIA					
6.	Remark: (Tick appropriately) :  Significant Improvement,  Satisfactory Improvement,  Needs further improvement,  Any other remarks (state clearly):					
	NIA					
Nam	e & Sig of Evaluator 1: CAPT. A) ay kumar D Date: 25/01/2020					
Nom	e & Sig of Evaluator 2:					

CMS. Mamisha Sonaware. Y

Date:

Principal, †SR (Name & Signature)

AU

WPIF-7.1-01-02 Prepared by: Head Management Systems

Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor:

26th Sep 2019

Rev- 02