## Feedback Analysis and Action Taken Report 2018-19

The academic council has gone through the analysis of teachers, Students, alumni and employer feedback and necessary steps have been taken to implement the suggestions
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## Methodology

Feed back of students on teaching process is evaluated and presented in this report. Data for the evaluation of teaching is collected from students using structured questionnaire. Google form is used for data collection and the link is shared among whatsapp groups of all classes. All students can participate in this survey since the link is circulated in whatsapp group. Data collected were analysed using arithmetic mean. Five variables are used to measure the teaching quality and overall teaching quality is calculated using mean percentage score (MPS)

MPS $=($ Mean Score $/$ Maximum possible Score $) \times 100$

Teaching Quality of College

| Variables | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Subject Knowledge of the Teacher | 4.6507 | .55299 |
| Sincerity and Commitment of the <br> Teacher | 4.5612 | .56467 |
| Ability to Integrate Course Material with <br> Environment | 4.4478 | .65395 |
| Accessibility \& Approachability of the |  |  |
| Teacher | 4.4985 | .63281 |
| Overall Performance of Teacher | 4.5284 |  |
| Overall Teaching Quality | $\mathbf{9 0 . 7 4 6 3}$ |  |
| 10.035 |  |  |

Teaching Quality of Departments

|  | Department |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Commerce |  | Economics |  | Management |  |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviatio n | Mean | Std. <br> Deviati <br> on | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation |
| Subject Knowledge of the Teacher | 4.6343 | . 56014 | 4.6835 | . 54407 | 4.6543 | . 55137 |
| Sincerity and Commitment of the Teacher | 4.5486 | . 57404 | 4.5696 | . 54734 | 4.5802 | . 56710 |
| Ability to Integrate Course Material with Environment | 4.3829 | . 66673 | 4.4810 | . 69542 | 4.5556 | . 57009 |
| Accessibility \& Approachability of the Teacher | 4.5029 | . 63313 | 4.4051 | . 68909 | 4.5802 | . 56710 |
| Overall Performance of Teacher | 4.5029 | . 65103 | 4.5190 | . 65752 | 4.5926 | . 49441 |
| Overall Teaching Quality | 90.2857 | 10.052 | 90.63 | 10.848 | 91.85 | 9.174 |

Class wise Teaching Quality of Department of Commerce

|  | Class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | II Year <br> B．Com Co－ operation |  | III Year <br> B．Com Co－ operation |  | II Year B．Com Finance |  | III Year B．Com Finance |  | II Year <br> B．Com <br> Computer <br> Application |  | III Year <br> B．Com <br> Computer <br> Application |  |
|  |  |  | $\sum_{i}^{\text {E/ }}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EVIN } \\ & \sum_{0}^{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\sum_{\text {E/ }}^{\text {E/ }}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E/ } \\ & \sum_{0}^{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | E． | 呂 |
| Subject Knowledge of the Teacher | $\stackrel{\infty}{+}$ | $\stackrel{t}{i}$ | $\stackrel{\bar{r}}{7}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{子}{\underset{\gamma}{\mathrm{O}}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\underset{\text { ® }}{\underset{\text { F }}{ }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{i n}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\underset{o}{0}}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{n}$ |
| Sincerity and Commitment of the Teacher | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{n}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{+}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ | n | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\text { ¢ }}$ | ñ |
|  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7}$ | $\stackrel{i}{0}$ | $\underset{\dot{J}}{\stackrel{O}{j}}$ | $\hat{0}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{+}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{+}$ | $\stackrel{n}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{7}$ | to | $\stackrel{\sim}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N}}{\substack{0}}$ |
|  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{+}}$ | $\stackrel{N}{0}$ | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\underset{\sim}{*}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{+}{+}$ | $\underset{O}{\mathcal{F}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{O}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { to } \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{8}{+}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\stackrel{0}{0}}$ | $\stackrel{i n}{\sim}$ | $\cdots$ |
| Overall Performance of Teacher | $\stackrel{\ominus}{+}$ | n | $\underset{\forall}{\underset{子}{~}}$ | to | $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \underset{寸}{+} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{O}{F}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\circ}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { O. } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{i}{\square}$ | － | $\stackrel{\sim}{i}$ | $\stackrel{4}{\sim}$ |
| Overall Teaching Quality | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\alpha}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\underset{\infty}{4}}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{7}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\theta}{\hat{0}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\alpha}{\circ}}$ | $$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}$ |

Class wise Teaching Quality of Department of Economics

|  | Class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I Year BA <br> Economics |  | II Year BA Economics |  | III Year BA Economics |  |
|  | Mean | Std. Dev | Mean | Std. Dev | Mean | Std. Dev |
| Subject Knowledge of the Teacher | 4.6129 | . 49514 | 4.6944 | . 62425 | 4.8333 | . 38925 |
| Sincerity and Commitment of the Teacher | 4.4839 | . 50800 | 4.5833 | . 60356 | 4.7500 | . 45227 |
| Ability to Integrate Course <br> Material with <br> Environment | 4.3871 | . 71542 | 4.5556 | . 69465 | 4.5000 | . 67420 |
| Accessibility \& Approachability of the Teacher | 4.1935 | . 70329 | 4.5278 | . 65405 | 4.5833 | . 66856 |
| Overall Performance of Teacher | 4.4194 | . 67202 | 4.5833 | . 64918 | 4.5833 | . 66856 |
| Overall Teaching Quality | 88.3871 | 9.81725 | 91.7778 | 11.78646 | 93.0000 | 10.25139 |

## Class wise Teaching Quality of Department of Management

|  | Class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I Year BBA Finance |  | II Year BBA <br> Finance |  | III Year BBA <br> Finance |  |
|  | Mean | Std. Dev | Mean | Std. Dev | Mean | Std. Dev |
| Subject Knowledge of the Teacher | 4.5385 | . 64262 | 5.0000 | . 00000 | 4.6296 | . 49210 |
| Sincerity and <br> Commitment of the <br> Teacher | 4.4872 | . 60139 | 4.9333 | . 25820 | 4.5185 | . 57981 |
| Ability to Integrate Course Material with Environment | 4.5128 | . 64367 | 4.9333 | . 25820 | 4.4074 | . 50071 |
|  <br> Approachability of the Teacher | 4.5385 | . 60027 | 4.8667 | . 35187 | 4.4815 | . 57981 |
| Overall Performance of Teacher | 4.6154 | . 49286 | 4.8667 | . 35187 | 4.4074 | . 50071 |
| Overall Teaching Quality | 90.7692 | 10.46916 | 98.4000 | 3.64104 | 89.7778 | 7.79217 |

# STUDENTS FEEDBACK ON TEACHING QUALITY ACTION TAKEN REPORT 2018-19 

After taking feedback from students' certain points were discussed and solutions were provided by academic council

- Students are happy with the pedagogy adopted by faculties but their examination performance is not up to their ability to score. Hence exam writing tips provided to students.
- Students use library very less, hence compulsory visit to library once in a week implemented.
- Peer teaching methods to be introduced in coming years.


## Analysis of teacher's feedback of 2018-19

- Department of Management

| questions | satisfied | Neutral | dissatisfied | Total SCORE | AVERAGE <br> SCORE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Learning <br> resources | 5 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 2.66 |
| Encouragement <br> for research <br> related <br> activities | 4 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 2.5 |
| Internal <br> assessment <br> practices | 4 | 1 | 15 | 2.5 |  |

## OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE = 2.55

## INTERPRETATION

The teachers are having a dissatisfiedn stand regarding all the criterias analyzed .The teachers need more encouragement in doing articles in research journals and need few more reference books in the department.

## - Department of commerce

| questions | Satisfied | Neutral | dissatisfied | Total SCORE | AVERAGE <br> SCORE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Learning <br> resources | 9 | 4 | 0 | 35 | 2.69 |
| Encouragement <br> for research <br> related <br> activities | 8 | 4 | 1 | 33 | 2.53 |
| Internal <br> assessment <br> practices | 11 | 2 | 0 | 27 |  |

The workload is in comfortable zone.
Overall average score= 2.68

- Dept of Economics

| questions | Satisfied | Neutral | dissatisfied | Total SCORE | AVERAGE <br> SCORE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Learning <br> resources | 6 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3 |
| Encouragement <br> for research <br> related <br> activities | 5 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 2.83 |
| Internal <br> assessment <br> practices | 5 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 2.83 |

The workload is normal
Overall average score $=\mathbf{2 . 8 8}$

Overall average score of the college $=\mathbf{2 . 6 5}$
ANALYSIS OF FEED BACK OF LANGUAGE TEACHERS

| questions | Satisfied | Neutral | dissatisfied | Total SCORE | AVERAGE <br> SCORE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Learning <br> resources | 7 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3 |
| Encouragement <br> for research <br> related <br> activities | 6 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 2.85 |
| Internal <br> assessment <br> practices | 5 | 2 | 19 | 2.71 |  |

Overall average score of the college=2.65

## Suggestions recommendations and action taken report 2018-19

1 Internal evaluation system has to be strengthened, Referred to centralized exam team under academic council. steps were taken to address the concern 2. Library resource needed to increased, Referred to Library subcommitteeand Stock increased with off line resources.
3. Better coverage of the syllabus by the faculty- Academic council took note of the concern - 100perct of the syllabus is getting covered by the faculty

## ANALYSIS OF ALUMNI FEEDBACK 2018-2019

Majority of the alumni students belongs to b.com finance and majority were male respondents. Around 48 percent agreed that the CBCSS syllabus is in tune with international and national trends. Majority agreed that the program offered by the college was help them to attain job. Around 58 percentage agreed that the program have well structured. Majority highly agreed that the project work was very challenging and guide help them until final stage. Around $53 \%$ like the learning environment of this campus.

## 1.PROGRAM COMPLETED FROM THIS COLLEGE

| COURSE | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| B.COM FINANCE | $40.5 \%$ |
| B.COM COMPUTER APPLICATION | $15.5 \%$ |
| B.COM COOPERATION | $6.8 \%$ |
| BBA FINANCE | $28.2 \%$ |
| BA ECONOMICS | $9.1 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

## 2. GENDER

| GENDER | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| MALE | $63.3 \%$ |
| FEMALE | $36.7 \%$ |

## 3. YEAR OF COMPLETION

| YEAR | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2016-17$ | $36 \%$ |
| $2017-18$ | $43 \%$ |
| $2018-19$ | $21 \%$ |

## 4.QUALIFICATION

| QUALIFICATION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| DEGREE | $70 \%$ |
| P.G. | $30 \%$ |
| MPHIL,PHD | $0 \%$ |
| OTHERS | $0 \%$ |

## 5. THE SYLLABUS WAS IN TUNE WITH NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL TRENDS. (CBCSS,CUCBCSS)

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $29.3 \%$ |
| AGREE | $48.4 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $15.8 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $2.3 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $4.2 \%$ |

## 6. PROGRAMME OFFERED TO ME WAS DEMANDING IN JOB MARKET

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $35.9 \%$ |
| AGREE | $58.1 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $4.3 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $1.7 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | 0 |

## 7. THE PROGRAMME HAD A WELL STRUCTURED AND ORGANISED SYLLABUS

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $23.8 \%$ |
| AGREE | $58.9 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $10.7 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $5.2 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $1.4 \%$ |

## 8. THE INNER CONTENT IN EACH SUBJECT WAS RELEVENT AND UP TO DATE

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $30.8 \%$ |
| AGREE | $53.2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $12.2 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $3.8 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | 0 |

## 9. PROJECT WAS VERY CHALLENGING CONSTRUCTIVE

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $60.3 \%$ |
| AGREE | $29.8 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $3.2 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $6 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $0.7 \%$ |

10. MY INTERNAL GUIDE WAS GOOD SUPPORT TILL ITS FINAL STAGE

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $88.9 \%$ |
| AGREE | $10.2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $0.9 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | 0 |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | 0 |

## 11. OPEN COURSES OFFERED UNDER CBCSS WERE DIVERSE AND RESOURCEFUL

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $28.3 \%$ |
| AGREE | $43.2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $17.9 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $6.4 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $4.2 \%$ |

12. CODUCT OF EXAMINATIONS AND PUBLICATIONOF RESULTS WERE STRICTLY ACCORDING TO THE PREDETERMINED SCHEDULE

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $48.9 \%$ |
| AGREE | $29.8 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $19.3 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $1.2 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $0.8 \%$ |

13. CURRICULUM HAS ENHANCED MY COMPETENCY IN COMMUNICATION , CRITICAL THINKING, PROBLEM SOLVING AND CREATIVITY

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $43.2 \%$ |
| AGREE | $33.4 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $10.5 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | 9.5 |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | 3.4 |

14. PROGRAMME WAS CAPABLE OF CATERING TO MY REQUIREMENT AT WORKPLACE.

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $38.9 \%$ |
| AGREE | $34.2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $9.8 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $11.2 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $5.9 \%$ |

15. OVERALL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT OFFERED IN THE CAMPUS WAS EXCELLENT

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $52.9 \%$ |
| AGREE | $28.3 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $4.2 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | 0.6 |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | 0 |

## ACTION TAKEN REPORT

1. Convocation ceremony to be initiated.
2. Alumni meet to be encouraged.
3. Alumni in good positions should be given time to interact with present students, especially with outgoing students.

## DATA ANALYSIS REPORT OF EMPLOYER FEEDBACK 2018-19

EMPLOYERS ARE APPRECIABLE WITH THE SKILL OF EMPLOYEES. THE CURRICULAR AND NON CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY THE CAMPUS ARE MAKES THE EMPLOYEES FITTO THE JOB.COMMUNICATION SKILL OF EMPLOYEES ARE ALSO EXCELLENT. THEY ALSO POSSESS TECHNOLOGICAL SKILL AND GOOD COMMUNICATION SKILL.

1. HOW DO YOU RATE THE WORKING SKILL FOR YOUR JOB

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY APPRECIABLE | 32.5 |
| APPRECIABLE | 43.8 |
| AVERAGE | 8.9 |
| POOR | 4.2 |
| VERY GOOD | 10.6 |

2. DO YOU THINK THAT THE CURRICULAR AND NON CURRICULAR EXPERIENCE FROM THIS COLLEGE MAKES THE EMPLOYEE FIT INTO THE JOB

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| YES OF COURSE | 43.8 |
| AVERAGE | 29.5 |
| NOT AT ALL | 6.8 |
| VERY GOOD | 19.9 |

3. HOW DO YOU RATE HIS OR HER COMMUNICATION SKILL

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| EXCELLENT | 43.8 |
| GOOD | 38.6 |
| FAIR | 10.5 |
| POOR | 0 |
| VERY GOOD | 7.1 |

## 4. DO YOU APPOINT A SIMILAR PERSON IF A VACANCY

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| YES | 99.8 |
| NO | 0.2 |

5. ARE YOU HAPPY WITH THE EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIP

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| YES | 99.5 |
| NO | 0.5 |

6. DOES THE EMPLOYEE POSSES THE TECHNOLOGICAL SKILL REQUIRED FOR THE JOB

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| YES | 78.3 |
| NO | 21.7 |

7. HOW DO YOU RATE HIS OR HER EMOTIONAL STABILITY

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| VERY GOOD | 18.2 |
| GOOD | 72.3 |
| AVERAGE | 8.9 |
| POOR | 0.6 |

8. HOW DO YOU RATE HIS OR HER RELATIONSHIP WITH YOU

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| VERY GOOD | 79.1 |
| GOOD | 19.7 |
| AVERAGE | 1.2 |
| POOR | 0 |

## ACTION TAKEN REPORT

1.Students to be taken to industrial visits and internship to be encouraged for getting more external exposure.
2.English language skill to be improved more by giving more soft skill training.
3. Computer skill of the students to be enhanced.

