FEEDBACK ANALYSIS REPORT

1.4.2 Feedback process of the Institution

The procedures adopted for the monitoring and evaluation of policies include:

Feedback collected and analysed


- Feedback collected: The institute has various channels to collect and document responses on curriculum from different stakeholders, such as students, parents, industry and faculty.
- II. Feedback Analysis: After collecting feedback from these meetings, the data is
 - a. Receiving feedback regarding the policies from various stakeholders.
 - b. Evaluation of policy based on Feedback received.
 - c. Continuation of the policy in case of positive feedback.
 - d. Carry out improvements in Policy/ Plan till improvement in quality is noticed.

All teaching departments and the student support services plan quality objectives for a given year. The fulfillment of the quality objectives are monitored by Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) through the Academic and Administrative Audits. Policies and plans are revised and are approved by Management Representative (MR).

FEEDBACK

1026 RESPONSES

Respondent	No. of Respondent
Students	523
Parents	275
Alumni	162
Faculty	54
Employer	12




Director

Feedback On Curriculum / Syllabus


i) Academic Content

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	171
Good	273
Average	51
Poor	16
Very Poor	12




ii) Coverage of the Syllabus

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	140
Good	288
Average	86
Poor	06
Very Poor	03




iii) Coverage of modern/advanced topics

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	133
Good	
Average	279
Poor	90
	09
Very Poor	12



iv) Sequence of the Subjects


No. of Respondents
116
267
119
11
10



gamn

v) Relevance of units in syllabus relevant to course

Response Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	94
Average	283
Poor	131
Very Poor	11
0.7 1 001	04




vi) Size of syllabus in terms of the load on the student

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	116
Good	248
Average	140
Poor	15
Very Poor	04




vii) Evaluation scheme design & conduction

Response Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	139
Average	230
Poor	131
Very Poor	17
tery roof	06



viii) Applicability of course in real life


Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	115
Good	248
Average	134
Poor	23
Very Poor	03



gamne


ix) Opinion regarding Industrial visits

Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	116
Average	232
Poor	115
Very Poor	17
V - 501	03



x) Outcomes of the course

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	99
Good	208
Average	184
Poor	32
Very Poor	00




gamne'

Director

Parent Feedback


Occupation of Parents

Occupation Farmer	No. of Respondents
Business	171
Government Servant	28
Service	02
Other	47
Other	03




i) Parental pride & Respect for the college

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	207
Good	67
Average	00
Poor	00
Very Poor	00




ii) College Campus Cleanliness

Response Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	158
Average	114
Poor	0
Very Poor	00
. 61 9 1 00	00




iii) Faculty Connect

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	143
Good	115
Average	16
Poor	00
Very Poor	00




iv) Library Facility

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	134
Good	130
Average	10
Poor	00
Very Poor	00




v) Canteen Facility

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	00
Good	03
Average	17
Poor	239
Very Poor	16




vi) Support from administration and office staff

Response Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	112
Average	139
Poor	22
	00
Very Poor	00




vii) Hostel Facility

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	00
Good	00
Average	00
Poor	13
Very Poor	262




viii) Timely intimation about development of your ward

Response Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	112
Average	139
Poor	22
	00
Very Poor	00




ix) Disciplinary practices

Distribution of Francisco	
Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	159
Good	110
Average	06
Poor	00
Very Poor	00
Very 1 doi	



x) Transportation Facility


Response	
Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	219
Average	52
Poor	04
Very Poor	00
, cry roor	00



Alumni Feedback


Batch wise

Batch	
2010-12	No. of Respondent
2011-13	21
2012-14	06
2013-15	00
2014-16	21
2015-17	21
2016-18	22
	29
2017-19	42




1. College Campus

Response	
Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	66
Average	94
Poor	02
Very Poor	00
very root	00




2. College Campus Cleanliness

D-manea	No. of Respondents
Response	57
Very Good	27
Good	88
	17
Average	00
Poor	00
Very Poor	00




3. Faculty Connect

Response	
Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	26
Average	87
Poor	49
Very Poor	00
,	00




4. Library Facility

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	31
Good	75
	56
Average	00
Poor	00
Very Poor	




5. Canteen Facility

Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	00
Average	00
Poor	02
Very Poor	157
-	00




6. Hostel Facility

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	00
Good	00
Average	02
Poor	00
Very Poor	157




7. Computing Facility

Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	31
Average	110
Poor	20
Very Poor	00
	00




8. Sports Facility

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	41
Good	64
Average	55
Poor	02
Very Poor	00




9. Classroom Facility

Response	
Very Good	No. of Respondents
Good	40
Average	73
Poor	46
Very Poor	03
Control of the Contro	00




10. Seminar Hall Facility

Response	No. of Respondents
Very Good	48
Good	71
Average	40
Poor	02
Very Poor	00



11. Common Room Facility

Average 62 Poor 49	Very Good Good	No. of Respondents
Poor 62		1.47
40		62
Vom. D		49
Very Poor	very Poor	



12. Sick/ Frist Aid Room Facility

Response	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
Very Good	No. of Respondents
	45
Good	62
Average	0.5
	49
Poor	05
Very Poor	00

