## Feedback Analysis and Action Taken Report 2020-21

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. Ten variables are used to measure the teaching quality and overall teaching quality is calculated using mean percentage score (MPS)

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

Teaching Quality of College

| Criteria for Evaluation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regularity of teacher in Class | 4.61 | .647 |
| Preparation of teacher for the Class | 4.55 | .706 |
| Subject Knowledge of the teacher | 4.64 | .662 |
| Presentation and communication Skill of <br> the teacher | 4.49 | .779 |
| Usage of ICT (information and <br> Communication technology | 4.36 | .808 |
| Time allotted by the teacher for <br> interaction | 4.41 | .784 |
| Process of Internal Assessment by the <br> teacher | 4.45 | .739 |
| Availability of teacher outside the class <br> room | 4.40 | .804 |
| Class guidance and monitoring by the <br> teacher | 4.49 | .741 |
| Overall effectiveness of teacher in the <br> college] | 4.54 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 0 6 2 2 0}$ |
| Overall Teaching Quality | $\mathbf{8 9 . 8 7 8 3}$ |  |

Department wise Teaching Quality

| Criteria for Evaluation | Commerce |  | Management |  | Economics |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation |
| Regularity of teacher in Class | 4.59 | . 613 | 4.64 | . 697 | 4.63 | . 688 |
| Preparation of teacher for the Class | 4.54 | . 683 | 4.57 | . 738 | 4.53 | . 742 |
| Subject Knowledge of the teacher | 4.62 | . 658 | 4.67 | . 641 | 4.63 | . 732 |
| Presentation and communication Skill of the teacher | 4.48 | . 770 | 4.50 | . 812 | 4.53 | . 742 |
| Usage of ICT (information and Communication technology | 4.31 | . 832 | 4.44 | . 765 | 4.39 | . 783 |
| Time allotted by the teacher for interaction | 4.37 | . 802 | 4.49 | . 735 | 4.43 | . 797 |
| Process of Internal Assessment by the teacher | 4.40 | . 730 | 4.54 | . 723 | 4.48 | . 799 |
| Availability of teacher outside the class room | 4.34 | . 821 | 4.52 | . 758 | 4.44 | . 805 |
| Class guidance and monitoring by the teacher | 4.44 | . 740 | 4.56 | . 732 | 4.52 | . 759 |
| Overall effectiveness of teacher in the college | 4.51 | . 711 | 4.61 | . 702 | 4.55 | . 732 |
| Overall Teaching Quality | 89.1985 | 11.74231 | 91.0846 | 12.22311 | 90.2484 | 13.01875 |

Class wise Teaching Quality of Department of Commerce

| Criteria for <br> Evaluation | Class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eg } \\ & \text { Un } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 年 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\Xi}{5} \\ & \stackrel{y}{x} \end{aligned}$ | क |  | \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{5} \\ & \stackrel{y}{x} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{F}{5!} \\ & \stackrel{y}{x} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 淢 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | क | 溉 | \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 淢 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | क | 部 | क |  | क |
| Regularity of teacher in Class | $\ddagger$ | 暏 | $\stackrel{8}{4}$ | Eิ | $\stackrel{6}{8}$ | 寺 | 㞧 | $\stackrel{\text { b }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{+}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\square}$ | $\overline{\text { F }}$ | $\bar{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | 预 | $\stackrel{8}{+}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{F}{\text { f }}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{6}{+}$ | \％ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \text { Preparation of } \\ \text { teacher for the Class } \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{o}{子}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ | 合 | $\stackrel{9}{7}$ | 筞 | ¢̆ | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | \％ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | 声 | ¢ | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{6}$ | 㞧 |  |
| Subject Knowledge of the teacher | $\stackrel{\stackrel{6}{+}}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\text { d }}{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{8}{4}$ | 管 | $\stackrel{\infty}{6}$ | İ | $\stackrel{+}{\square}$ | 姦 | $\stackrel{\text { F }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\bar{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\text { a }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 6 \\ \dot{f} \end{gathered}\right.$ | \％ | $\stackrel{8}{+}$ | 合 | $\stackrel{\infty}{8}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Presentation and } \\ \text { communication Skill } \\ \text { of the teacher } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ | $\stackrel{6}{6}$ |  | ふু | $\overline{5}$ | \％ | $\underset{+}{\text { 寺 }}$ | 骨 | $\stackrel{\text { g }}{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{0}{1}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} n \\ f \end{array}\right\|$ | 気 |  | ƠO | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | ¢ | \％ |
| Usage of ICT （information and Communication technology | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{6}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ | $\overline{\bar{\omega}}$ | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ | 寺 | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\sim}{c}$ | \％ | 捛 | $\stackrel{\substack{\text { a } \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\underset{寸}{q}$ | $\widehat{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\%}{\dot{q}}$ | 荌 | ¢ | 会 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ |
| Time allotted by the teacher for interaction | $\stackrel{\text { n }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6}$ | $\stackrel{7}{f}$ | ま | 等 | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7}$ | ¢ֻٌ | $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ | 管 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | ¢ ¢̧ | $\overline{\text { w }}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { a }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |
| Process of Internal Assessment by the teacher | － | $\stackrel{n}{n}$ | ¢ ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ | \％ | ¢ ¢ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}}{\stackrel{\text { c }}{\sim}}$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{+}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{+}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\substack{\infty \\ 寸}}$ | 合 | ¢ิ | ¢冖 | 等 | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\substack{+\\}}$ | $\infty_{\infty}^{\infty}$ |
| Availability of teacher outside the class room | İ | \％ | 尔 | E． |  | \％ | $\stackrel{n}{f}$ | ¢ | $\pm$ | \％ | 尔 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{+}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | \％ | 尔 | 筞 | ¢ ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ | 年 |
| Class guidance and monitoring by the teacher | $\stackrel{\sim}{7}$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢̧ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{-}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ | $\stackrel{*}{2}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | in | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{ \pm}{*}$ | 咢 | ढ़． | $\stackrel{\text { ¢̧ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\%}{8}$ | ลั | 午 |  |
| Overall effectiveness of teacher in the college |  | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{8}{7}$ | 号 | $\stackrel{7}{+}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{¢}$ | F | ¢ิ． | テु | 寺 | $\stackrel{8}{+}$ | ف⿳⺈⿴囗十大冖． | $\cdots$ | 鱼 | 予 | 鱼 | $\stackrel{\stackrel{8}{+}}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | 号 | 夺 | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ |

## Class wise Overall Teaching Quality of Commerce Department

| Class | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I M.Com | 88.5581 | 7.94482 |
| I B.Com Finance | 89.5767 | 13.08852 |
| II B.Com Finance | 87.3220 | 11.07722 |
| III B.Com Finance | 83.4483 | 8.74882 |
| I B.Com Cooperation | 91.8710 | 13.06162 |
| II B.Com Cooperation | 91.0095 | 9.67600 |
| III B.Com Cooperation | 87.4000 | 11.07580 |
| I B.Com Computer Application | 91.0928 | 12.64259 |
| II B.Com Computer Application | 89.0526 | 12.30624 |
| III B.Com Computer Application | 87.4545 | 10.80003 |
| Overall Teaching Quality |  |  |
| $\mathbf{8 9 . 8 7 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0 6 2 2 0}$ |  |

Class wise Teaching Quality of Department of Management

| Criteria for Evaluation | Class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I BBA Finance |  | II BBA <br> Finance |  | III BBA <br> Finance |  | I BBA HRM |  |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Regularity of teacher in Class | 4.57 | .800 | 4.54 | .652 | 5.00 | .000 | 4.73 | .614 |
| Preparation of teacher for the <br> Class | 4.50 | .871 | 4.47 | .751 | 4.80 | .447 | 4.62 | .655 |
| Subject Knowledge of the <br> teacher | 4.54 | .865 | 4.56 | .623 | 4.80 | .447 | 4.76 | .528 |
| Presentation and <br> communication Skill of the <br> teacher | 4.51 | .871 | 4.15 | .925 | 4.20 | 1.304 | 4.56 | .732 |
| Usage of ICT (information and <br> Communication technology | 4.36 | .967 | 4.19 | .754 | 4.20 | .837 | 4.54 | .628 |
| Time allotted by the teacher for <br> interaction | 4.47 | .826 | 4.39 | .766 | 4.00 | .707 | 4.55 | .699 |
| Process of Internal Assessment <br> by the teacher | 4.47 | .854 | 4.32 | .776 | 4.60 | .548 | 4.63 | .605 |
| Availability of teacher outside <br> the class room | 4.49 | .849 | 4.39 | .766 | 4.80 | .447 | 4.60 | .630 |
| Class guidance and monitoring <br> by the teacher | 4.53 | .865 | 4.41 | .673 | 4.80 | .447 | 4.61 | .666 |
| Overall effectiveness of teacher <br> in the college | 4.57 | .862 | 4.49 | .626 | 4.80 | .447 | 4.68 | .582 |
| Overall Teaching Quality | $\mathbf{9 0 . 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 4 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 . 8 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 1 5}$ |

Class wise Teaching Quality of Department of Economics

| Criteria for Evaluation | Class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I BA Economics |  | II BA Economics |  | III BA <br> Economics |  |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Regularity of teacher in Class | 4.68 | . 477 | 4.63 | . 613 | 4.65 | . 588 |
| Preparation of teacher for the Class | 4.68 | . 477 | 4.53 | . 689 | 4.51 | . 692 |
| Subject Knowledge of the teacher | 4.68 | . 477 | 4.68 | . 664 | 4.57 | . 689 |
| Presentation and communication Skill of the teacher | 4.59 | . 590 | 4.53 | . 709 | 4.51 | . 692 |
| Usage of ICT (information and Communication technology | 4.73 | . 456 | 4.29 | . 790 | 4.41 | . 686 |
| Time allotted by the teacher for interaction | 4.59 | . 503 | 4.32 | . 864 | 4.49 | . 692 |
| Process of Internal Assessment by the teacher | 4.77 | . 429 | 4.44 | . 781 | 4.46 | . 691 |
| Availability of teacher outside the class room | 4.68 | . 477 | 4.47 | . 747 | 4.27 | . 804 |
| Class guidance and monitoring by the teacher | 4.64 | . 581 | 4.49 | . 710 | 4.54 | . 650 |
| Overall effectiveness of teacher in the college | 4.68 | . 477 | 4.56 | . 645 | 4.49 | . 692 |
| Overall Teaching Quality | 93.4545 | 8.42178 | 89.8904 | 11.298 | 89.783 | 11.291 |

## ACTION TAKEN REPORT- 2020-21

After taking feedback and reading the analysis, the academic council has chalked out the following actions and solutions,

- Student engagement has improved through online learning.
- As per the feedback the online class timing reduced to 3hrs 30 minutes
- Teachers have engaged the students through live videos and ppts
- Pdf were circulated through class groups.
- Internal exams were conducted effectively through Team's platform.
- Webinars helped the students to interact with industry experts and subject experts.
- All the faculties have shown good teaching quality and council appreciates the effort
- Teachers to be more expert in using technology in teaching method

DEPT TO WHICH YOU BELONG
31 responses


- PG DEPT OF COMMERCE

DEPT OF MANAGEMENT

- DEPT OF ECONOMICS

The pattern of curriculum delivery is in accordance with University guidelines and syllabus 31 responses


The learning resources available in college is adequate for effective teaching (Including Library and ICT tools)
31 responses


Satisfied with the internal assessment practices adopted by the college for measuring student performance
31 responses

strongly agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

The college provides enough opportunities for personal and professional growth 31 responses

strongly agree

- Agree
- Neutral

Disagree
Strongly Disagree

Academic and administrative staff is cordial and provides all necessary information well in advance 31 responses


The college provides enough opportunities and encouragement for pursuing research related activities

31 responses


## ACTION TAKEN REPORT

1. Teacher-student engagement has improved through online learning.
2. Webinars helped the students to interact with industry experts and subject experts
3. As per the feedback the online class timing reduced to 3 hrs 30 minutes
4. Teachers have engaged the students through live videos and ppts
5. Pdf were circulated through class groups.
6. Internal exams were conducted effectively through Team's platform.

## ANALYSIS OF ALUMINI FEEDBACK 2020-2021.

Majority of the alumni students belongs to b.com computer application and majority were female respondents. More than $60 \%$ of respondents agree that the programs are highly helpful in job market. Around 47 percentage agreed that the project was very constructive and challenging. Almost 69 percentage respondents like the learning environment and campus.

## 1.PROGRAMME COMPLETED FROM THIS COLLEGE

| COURSE | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| B.COM FINANCE | $20.2 \%$ |
| B.COM COMPUTER APPLICATION | $38.3 \%$ |
| B.COM COOPERATION | $26.2 \%$ |
| BBA FINANCE | $10.8 \%$ |
| BA ECONOMICS | $4.5 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

## 2. GENDER

| GENDER | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| MALE | $48.2 \%$ |
| FEMALE | $51.8 \%$ |

## 3. YEAR OF COMPLETION

| YEAR | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2016-17$ | $33.3 \%$ |
| $2017-18$ | $40.6 \%$ |
| $2018-19$ | $18.1 \%$ |
| $2019-20$ | $8 \%$ |

## 4.QUALIFICATION

| QUALIFICATION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| DEGREE | $73.5 \%$ |
| P.G. | $26.5 \%$ |
| MPHIL,PHD | 0 |
| OTHERS | 0 |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $32.1 \%$ |
| AGREE | $43.4 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $11.8 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $8.8 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $3.9 \%$ |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $28.2 \%$ |
| AGREE | $62.1 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | 0 |
| DISAGREE | $3.7 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | 0 |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $33.8 \%$ |
| AGREE | $48.5 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $15.6 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $1.2 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $0.9 \%$ |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $30.8 \%$ |
| AGREE | $42.2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $20.2 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $3.8 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $3 \%$ |

9. PROJECT WAS VERY CHALLENGING CONSTRUCTIVE

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $33.5 \%$ |
| AGREE | $46.8 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $8.2 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $7.2 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $4.3 \%$ |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $83.52 \%$ |
| AGREE | $15.2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | 0 |
| DISAGREE | $0.28 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $1 \%$ |

11. OPEN COURSES OFFERED UNDER CBCSS WERE DIVERSE AND RESOURCEFUL

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $33.4 \%$ |
| AGREE | $38.2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $11.9 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $9.2 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $7.3 \%$ |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $30.5 \%$ |
| AGREE | $48.4 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $18.3 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $2.8 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | 0 |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $56.8 \%$ |
| AGREE | $39.2 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $2.5 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $1.2 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $0.3 \%$ |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $36.2 \%$ |
| AGREE | $45.6 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $12.2 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $4.2 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | $1.8 \%$ |

## 15. OVERALL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT OFFERED IN THE CAMPUS WAS EXCELLENT

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY AGREE | $68.5 \%$ |
| AGREE | $27.9 \%$ |
| NEUTRAL | $1.3 \%$ |
| DISAGREE | $2.3 \%$ |
| HIGHLY DISAGREE | 0 |

## ACTION TAKEN REPORT

1. Convocation ceremony to be initiated after corona pandemic.
2. Alumni to be encouraged to do webinars with current students and entertain them to overcome the stress during lockdown.
3. Alumni in good positions should give placement consultancy to existing students.

## DATA ANALYSIS REPORT OF EMPLOYER FEEDBACK 2019-20

MAJORITY OF THE EMPLOYERS ARE HIGHLY APPRECIABLE WITH THE WORKING SKILL OF EMPLOYEE. THEY MAINTAIN GOOD EMPLOYER EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIP. THE EMPLOYYES HAVE GOOD TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE AND COMMUNICATION SKILL. CURRICULAR AND NON-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY THE COLLEGE MAKE THEM FIT TO THE JOB.

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| HIGHLY APPRECIABLE | 45.6 |
| APPRECIABLE | 39.9 |
| AVERAGE | 10.7 |
| POOR | 3.8 |

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 | 52.6 |
| AVERAGE | 33.4 |
| NOT AT ALL | 0 |
| VERY GOOD | 14 |

3. HOW DO YOU RATE HIS OR HER COMMUNICATION SKILL?

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| EXCELLENT | 34.2 |
| GOOD | 5.9 |
| FAIR | 9.8 |
| POOR | 1.2 |
| VERY GOOD | 48.9 |

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

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| YES | 98.3 |
| NO | 1.7 |

4. ARE YOU HAPPY WITH THE EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIP?

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| YES | 99 |
| NO | 1 |

5. DOES THE EMPLOYEE POSSES THE TECHNOLOGICAL SKILL REQUIRED FOR THE JOB?

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| YES | 83.4 |
| NO | 16.6 |

6. HOW DO YOU RATE HIS OR HER EMOTIONAL STABILITY?

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| VERY GOOD | 25.6 |
| GOOD | 66.2 |
| AVERAGE | 6.9 |
| POOR | 1.3 |

7. HOW DO YOU RATE HIS OR HER RELATIONSHIP WITH YOU?

| OPINION | PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| VERY GOOD | 73.2 |
| GOOD | 18.6 |
| AVERAGE | 7.4 |
| POOR | 0.8 |

## FEEDBACK TAKEN REPORT

1. Holistic development of the students should be improved.
2. Creativity and outdoor activities will help to improve the confidence of freshers.
