Feedback plays a crucial role in the process of assessment. An effectively implemented feedback system in an organization will serve as a guide to assist people to know how they and other perceive their performance. Feedback is collected from relevant parties to get their views on various aspects related to college, teachers, infrastructure, etc.

## Students Feedback

Feedback from students provides a guidance on how to improve teaching-learning process as well as communicate their views and suggestions regarding various parameters related to college, teachers, such as, regularity of teachers, coverage of syllabus, use of teaching aids, cocurricular activities, problem solving mechanism, financial incentives, etc. The feedback obtained from 271 students in the year 2018-19 is analyzed with the help of various tools and techniques and arranged in the form of table 1 . The responses of the students were taken on a four-point scale i.e. 1 to 4 . The rating provided to various parameters is based on their mean scores and categorizes as follows: Very Good ( $3 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 4$ ), Good ( $2 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 3$ ), Satisfactory ( $1.5 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 2$ ) and Unsatisfactory (M.S. $<1.5$ ).
Table 1shows that all the parameters i.e. 20 upon which the students' feedback is obtained are rated as 'Very Good' which clearly signifies that students are satisfied with all aspects related to college and teachers. The highest mean score i.e. 3.99 is obtained by parameter "Camps organized for sports preparation" with which 99.60 per cent students were satisfied, followed by parameters "Coaching and Training of sports" with the satisfaction of 98.81 per cent students and "Financial incentives provided by institute for players" with the satisfaction of 98.41 per cent students with same mean score i.e. 3.98.
It can be examined from the results that the mean score of rest of the parameters is above 3 which are as follows in the descending order of their mean score: "Facility to improve fitness" with mean score of 3.97, "Modern Infrastructure for grounds/courts" with mean score of 3.96, "Regularity of Teacher" and "Recommend same teacher for next session" with same mean score of 3.95, "Clarity of teachers' voice" and "Behavior of Teacher" with same mean score of 3.94, "Coverage of Syllabus" with mean score of 3.91, "Problem Solution" with mean score of 3.89, "Punctuality" with mean score of 3.86, "Providing notes and reference books" with mean score of 3.85 , "Performance Discussion" with mean score of 3.84 , "Periodical Test" and "Group Discussions and Debate" with same mean score of 3.83 , "Tutorials by teachers" with mean score of 3.76, "Leaving class before time" with mean score of 3.69, "Use of Teaching Aids" with mean score of 3.62 and "Permitting students coming late to class" with mean score of 3.38 .

Table: 1
Students Feedback Analysis

| $\begin{gathered} \text { S. } \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ | Parameters | Percentage of Students |  |  |  | Aver age Score out of 4 | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unsatisfa ctory (1) | Satisfacto ry (2) | Good <br> (3) | Very Good(4) |  |  |
| 1 | Regularity of Teacher |  | 0.74 | 2.58 | 96.68 | 3.95 | Very Good |
| 2 | Coverage of Syllabus | 0.37 | 0.74 | 6.27 | 92.62 | 3.91 | Very Good |
| 3 | Periodical Test |  | 0.74 | 15.13 | 84.13 | 3.83 | Very Good |
| 4 | Group Discussions and Debate |  | 0.37 | 16.24 | 83.39 | 3.83 | Very Good |
| 5 | Use of Teaching Aids | 0.37 | 2.59 | 32.10 | 64.94 | 3.62 | Very Good |
| 6 | Problem Solution |  | 0.74 | 9.59 | 89.67 | 3.89 | Very Good |
| 7 | Performance Discussion |  |  | 15.87 | 84.13 | 3.84 | Very Good |
| 8 | Punctuality |  | 1.48 | 11.07 | 87.45 | 3.86 | Very Good |
| 9 | Permitting students coming late to class |  | 12.92 | 30.63 | 56.45 | 3.38 | Very Good |
| 10 | Leaving class before time |  | 3.69 | 23.62 | 72.69 | 3.69 | Very Good |
| 11 | Providing notes and reference books |  | 0.74 | 14.02 | 85.24 | 3.85 | Very Good |
| 12 | Clarity of teachers' voice |  |  | 5.54 | 94.46 | 3.94 | Very Good |
| 13 | Behavior of Teacher |  |  | 5.54 | 94.46 | 3.94 | Very Good |
| 14 | Tutorials by teachers |  | 1.85 | 19.92 | 78.23 | 3.76 | Very Good |
| 15 | Recommend same teacher for next session |  | 1.11 | 2.21 | 96.68 | 3.95 | Very Good |
| 16 | Coaching and Training of Sports | 0.79 | 0.40 |  | 98.81 | 3.98 | Very Good |
| 17 | Modern Infrastructure for grounds/courts |  | 0.79 | 1.59 | 97.62 | 3.96 | Very Good |
| 18 | Camps Organized for sports preparation |  |  | 0.40 | 99.60 | 3.99 | Very Good |
| 19 | Financial Incentives provided by institute for players |  | 0.40 | 1.19 | 98.41 | 3.98 | Very Good |
| 20 | Facility to improve fitness |  | 0.79 | 0.40 | 98.81 | 3.97 | Very Good |



The above graph reveals the Students Feedback related to Teachers and Syllabus in terms of mean scores of various statements. It can be examined through the graph that the mean scores of S.6, S. 9 and S. 14 are lower as compared to rest of the Statements.

## Parents/Guardians Feedback

Parents who take part in surveys are more likely to understand and support approaches that are being used by the college. Therefore, Parents feedback is important for the college as we get their thoughts on various parameters such as: Admission Procedure, Infrastructure facility, Cafeteria facility, Library Sports and cultural activities, students counseling, use of ICT, etc.
The feedback of 102 Parents/Guardians were obtained for the year 2018-19 and analyzed with the help of various statistical tools which is presented in a tabulated form i.e. Table 2 The responses of Parents/Guardians were taken on a five-point likert scale i.e. 1 to 5 where, 1 represents Not Satisfied, 2 represents Slightly Satisfied, 3 represents Moderately Satisfied, 4 represents Very Satisfied and 5 represents Extremely Satisfied.
The parameters were rated on the basis of their mean scores so calculated and the criteria is as follows: Extremely Satisfied ( $4 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 5$ ), Very Satisfied ( $3 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 4$ ), Moderately Satisfied ( $2 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 3$ ), Slightly Satisfied ( $1.5 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 2$ ) and Not Satisfied (M.S. $<1.5$ ).
It is evident from the table below that Parents/Guardians were extremely satisfied with all the parameters i.e. 11included in Parents/Guardians Feedback form as the mean score of all these parameters are above 4.
The highest mean score i.e. 4.71 is obtained by parameter "Admission Procedure" with shows that 74.51 per cent parents found admission procedure easy.

Table: 2

## Parents Feedback Analysis

2018-19

| $\begin{gathered} \text { S. } \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ | Parameters | Percentage of Parents |  |  |  | Extre mely Satisfi ed (5) | Aver age Score out of 5 | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Not Satisf ied (1) | Slight <br> ly Satisf ied (2) | Modera tely Satisfie d (3) | very Satisfie d(4) |  |  |  |
| 1 | Admission Procedure |  |  | 3.92 | 21.57 | 74.51 | 4.71 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 2 | Infrastructure Facility |  | 1.96 | 7.84 | 29.42 | 60.78 | 4.49 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 3 | Cafeteria Facility | 3.92 | 3.92 | 22.55 | 22.55 | 47.06 | 4.07 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 4 | Library |  | 2.94 | 6.86 | 24.51 | 65.69 | 4.53 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 5 | Sports and Cultural Activities |  | 0.98 | 4.90 | 26.47 | 67.65 | 4.61 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 6 | Students Counseling Activities |  |  | 9.80 | 27.45 | 62.75 | 4.53 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 7 | Use of ICT |  | 3.92 | 9.80 | 33.34 | 52.94 | 4.35 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 8 | Academic Discipline |  |  | 5.88 | 27.45 | 66.67 | 4.61 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 9 | Improvement in wards' Personality |  | 1.96 | 3.92 | 28.43 | 65.69 | 4.60 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 10 | Teaching method |  |  | 3.92 | 22.55 | 73.53 | 4.70 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 11 | Evaluation and Feedback Mechanism |  | 0.98 | 4.90 | 24.51 | 69.61 | 4.63 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |

It can be disclosed from the results that the mean score of rest of the parameters is above 4 which are as follows in the descending order of their mean score: "Teaching method" with mean score of 4.70, "Evaluation and Feedback Mechanism" with mean score of 4.63, "Academic Discipline" with mean score of 4.61, "Improvement in wards' Personality" with mean score of 4.60, "Students Counseling Activities" with mean score of 4.53, "Infrastructure Facility" with mean score of 4.49, "Use of ICT" with mean score of 4.35, and "Cafeteria Facility" with mean score of 4.07.


The above graph displays the mean scores of Parents/Guardians satisfaction toward various aspects related to the college. It shows that the mean score of S. 5 (related to cultural activities) is highest i.e. 4.02, whereas the mean score of S. 3 (related to Cafeteria facility) is lowest i.e. 3.47

## Students Satisfaction Survey

Students Satisfaction is the ultimate goal of an organization. The result of survey so conducted reveals the efforts made by the college for the satisfaction of students. Students Satisfaction Survey was conducted in the year 2018-19 and got responses from 128 respondents on various aspects such as: Time-table, Language lab, Computer labs, Guest lectures, Cafeteria/Tuck shop, Co-curricular activities, Academic celebrations, etc. The feedback so obtained is analyzed with the help of various tools and techniques and arranged in the form of table 3. The responses of the students were taken on a four-point scale i.e. 1 to 4 . The rating provided to various parameters is based on their mean scores and categorizes as follows: Very Good ( $3 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 4$ ), Good ( $2 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 3$ ), Satisfactory ( $1.5 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 2$ ) and Unsatisfactory (M.S. $<1.5$ ).
It can be examined through the table 3 that students were satisfied with all the parameters i.e. 11 included in the Students satisfaction survey form as their mean score is greater than 3. The highest mean score was obtained by parameter 'Time-Table' i.e. 3.77 which indicates that most of the students were satisfied with the time-table followed in the college during the year 2018-19 whereas the lowest score was obtained by the parameter 'Cafeteria/Tuck shop' i.e. 3.23 which depicts that most of the students were unsatisfied with the Cafeteria of the college.

Table: 3
Students Satisfaction Survey Analysis
(2018-19)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { S. } \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ | Parameters | Percentage of Students |  |  |  | Average Score out of 4 | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unsatisfacto ry (1) | Satisfactor $y(2)$ | Good <br> (3) | Very <br> Good(4) |  |  |
| 1 | Gain from <br> Classes  | 0.78 | 3.91 | 21.09 | 74.22 | 3.69 | Very Good |
| 2 | Time-Table |  | 3.91 | 17.96 | 78.13 | 3.77 | Very Good |
| 3 | Language Lab | 1.56 | 11.72 | 24.22 | 62.5 | 3.48 | Very Good |
| 4 | Classes of Computers | 4.69 | 7.03 | 25.78 | 62.5 | 3.46 | Very Good |
| 5 | Computer Labs | 2.34 | 12.5 | 24.22 | 60.94 | 3.44 | Very Good |
| 6 | Guest Lectures | 3.91 | 9.38 | 22.66 | 64.05 | 3.47 | Very Good |
| 7 | Cafeteria/Tuck Shop | 6.25 | 19.53 | 19.53 | 54.69 | 3.23 | Very Good |
| 8 | Mentoring System | 3.13 | 10.15 | 20.31 | 66.41 | 3.50 | Very Good |
| 9 | Co-curricular <br> Activities | 2.34 | 10.16 | 25.00 | 62.50 | 3.48 | Very Good |
| 10 | Academic Celebrations | 0.78 | 7.03 | 22.66 | 69.53 | 3.61 | Very Good |
| 11 | Cultural Activities | 0.78 | 4.69 | 12.50 | 82.03 | 3.76 | Very Good |



The above graph depicts the mean scores of various parameters related to Students satisfaction. It clearly shows that the mean score of S. 7 (related to Cafeteria/Tuck shop) is lowest i.e. 3.23 among all the statements, followed by S.3, S.4, S.5, S.6, S. 8 and S.9, while the highest mean score belongs to S. 2

## Alumni Feedback

To the outside world, Alumni are the best ambassadors' of our college as their success and achievements represents concrete outcomes made by our college for them. The feedbacks of alumni were obtained for the year 2018-19 and analyzed with the help of various statistical tools which is presented in a tabulated form i.e. Table 4 The responses of alumni were taken on a fivepoint likert scale i.e. 1 to 5 where, 1 represents Not Satisfied, 2 represents Slightly Satisfied, 3 represents Moderately Satisfied, 4 represents Very Satisfied and 5 represents Extremely Satisfied. The parameters were rated on the basis of their mean scores so calculated and the criteria is as follows: Extremely Satisfied ( $4 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 5$ ), Very Satisfied ( $3 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 4$ ), Moderately Satisfied ( $2 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 3$ ), Slightly Satisfied ( $1.5 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 2$ ) and Not Satisfied (M.S. $<1.5$ ).
It can be determined from the from the table 4 that the alumni were extremely satisfied with 10 out of 13 parameters with the highest mean score i.e. 5 and those parameters are: Admission Procedure, Fee Structure, Environment, Infrastructure and Lab Facility, Faculty, Library, Cafeteria Facilities, Hostel, Alumni association and they were very satisfied with 2 parameters i.e. Quality of support material with mean score of 4.13 and Project guidance with mean score of 4. It is also evident from the table that alumni were moderately satisfied with the training and placement of the students in the college with the mean score of 2.38 .
We enjoy a consistent and quality relationship with our alumni and also get feedback from them on regular basis which helps us to know their thoughts related to various aspects such as:

Admission Procedure, Fee Structure, Infrastructure and Lab Facility, Cafeteria Facilities, Faculty, etc.

Table: 4
Alumni Feedback Analysis
(2018-19)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { S. } \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ | Parameters | Percentage of Parents |  |  |  | Extre mely Satisfi ed (5) | Average Score out of 5 | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Not Satisf ied (1) | Slight ly Satisf ied (2) | Modera tely Satisfie d (3) | very Satisfie d(4) |  |  |  |
| 1 | Admission Procedure |  |  |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extremely Satisfied |
| 2 | Fee Structure |  |  |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extremely Satisfied |
| 3 | Environment |  |  |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extremely Satisfied |
| 4 | Infrastructure and Lab Facility |  |  |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extremely Satisfied |
| 5 | Faculty |  |  |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 6 | Project Guidance |  |  |  | 100 |  | 4 | very Satisfied |
| 7 | Quality of Support Material |  |  |  | 87.5 | 12.5 | 4.13 | very Satisfied |
| 8 | Training and Placement |  | 87.5 |  |  | 12.5 | 2.38 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 9 | Library |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 10 | Cafeteria Facilities |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | Extremely Satisfied |
| 11 | Hostel Facilities |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | Extremely Satisfied |
| 12 | Overall rating of the College |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| 13 | Alumni Association |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | Extremely Satisfied |



## Faculty Feedback

We get views and suggestions of faculty members on various aspects through their feedback as well as during the meetings held in college. The feedbacks of faculty were obtained for the year 2018-19 and analyzed with the help of various statistical tools which is presented in a tabulated form i.e. Table 5 The responses of alumni were taken on a five-point likert scale i.e. 1 to 5 where, 1 represents Not Satisfied, 2 represents Slightly Satisfied, 3 represents Moderately Satisfied, 4 represents Very Satisfied and 5 represents Extremely Satisfied. The parameters were rated on the basis of their mean scores so calculated and the criteria is as follows: Extremely Satisfied ( $4 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 5$ ), Very Satisfied ( $3 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 4$ ), Moderately Satisfied ( $2 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 3$ ), Slightly Satisfied ( $1.5 \leq$ M.S. $\geq 2$ ) and Not Satisfied (M.S. <1.5).

Table: 5
Employees Feedback Analysis
2018-19

|  | Parameters | Percentage of Employees |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { S. } \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ |  | Not Satisf ied (1) | Slight ly Satisf ied (2) | Moder ately Satisfie d (3) | very Satisfie d(4) | Extre mely Satisfi ed (5) | Aver age Scor e out of 5 | Rating |
| 1 | Teaching-Learning Strategy |  |  |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |


| 2 | Balance between theory and Application |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | Flexibility of Time-Table |  | 15.38 | 84.62 | 4.85 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 4 | Opportunities for upgrading skills and qualifications |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 5 | Tests and examination |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 6 | Encouraged to give suggestions |  | 15.38 | 84.62 | 4.85 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 7 | G.R. cell |  | 46.15 | 53.85 | 4.54 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 8 | Grievances Redressal |  | 61.54 | 38.46 | 4.38 | Extre mely Satisfi ed |
| 9 | Washrooms | 15.38 | 61.54 | 23.08 | 3.92 | very Satisfi ed |
| 10 | Adequacy of Infrastructure for IT |  | 30.77 | 69.23 | 4.69 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 11 | Opportunity to participate in Committees |  | 38.46 | 61.54 | 4.62 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 12 | Cooperation of members |  | 15.38 | 84.62 | 4.85 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 13 | Transparency in internal evaluation |  | 7.69 | 92.31 | 4.92 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |


| 14 | Usefulness of ICT Workshops |  |  | 7.69 | 92.31 | 4.92 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | Internet Facility |  |  | 7.69 | 92.31 | 4.92 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 16 | Separate space in Cafeteria |  | 23.08 | 38.46 | 38.46 | 4.15 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 17 | Opportunities for higher learning and research |  |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 18 | Language lab facility |  |  | 76.92 | 23.08 | 4.23 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 19 | Need of training for using smart boards | 23.08 | 23.08 | 23.08 | 30.77 | 3.62 | very Satisfi ed |
| 20 | Availability of books and reading materials |  |  |  | 100 | 5 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 21 | Cooperation of office staff |  |  | 53.85 | 46.15 | 4.46 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |
| 22 | Environment |  |  | 15.38 | 84.62 | 4.85 | Extre <br> mely <br> Satisfi <br> ed |

It can be observed from the results of the table that the faculty members were extremely satisfied with 20 out of 22 parameters with the mean score above 4 and those parameters are: TeachingLearning Strategy (mean score: 5), Balance between theory and Application (mean score: 5), Balance between theory and Application (mean score: 5), Tests and examination (mean score: 5), Opportunities for higher learning and research (mean score: 5), Availability of books and reading materials (mean score: 5), Transparency in internal evaluation (mean score: 4.85), Usefulness of ICT Workshops (mean score: 4.85), Internet Facility (mean score: 4.85), Flexibility of TimeTable (mean score: 4.85), Encouraged to give suggestions (mean score: 4.85), Cooperation of members (mean score: 4.85), Environment (mean score: 4.85), Adequacy of Infrastructure for IT (mean score: 4.69), Opportunity to participate in Committees (mean score: 4.62), G.R. cell
(mean score: 4.54), Cooperation of office staff (mean score: 4.46), Grievances Redressal (mean score: 4.38), Language lab facility (mean score: 4.23) and Separate space in Cafeteria (mean score: 4.15). They were very satisfied with washrooms with mean score of 3.92 and need for training for using smart boards with the mean score of 3.62.


