**Sharda University** 

School: School of Engineering and Technology Department of Civil Engineering

Academic Year: 2021 Feedback Analysis

(This format is placed before the Departmental Academic Committee & the Board of Studies)

| Stakeholders      |             | Fee  | dbac   | k Que | estion | s Ave | erage |    | Suggestions by Stakeholders in Feedback   |
|-------------------|-------------|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|----|---|
|                   |             | Q1   | Q2     | Q3    | Q4     | Q5    |       | Q7 |   |
| Faculty (No. 7)   | Excellent   | 100% | 100%   | 100%  | 100%   | 100%  | 83%   |    | No comments or suggestions  |
|                   | V.Good      |      | -      |       | -      |       | -     |    |   |
|                   | Good        |      |        |       |        |       |       |    |   |
|                   | Fair        |      |        |       |        |       | 17%   |    |   |
|                   | Poor        |      |        |       |        |       |       |    |   |
| Students (No. 41) | Excellent   | 40%  | 40%    |       |        |       |       |    | Advanced Topics in construction, materials, design included in curriculum  More focus on PERT/CPM and their practical Application through live projects included in curriculum (Through RSPL)  more assignments to engage students Need practical Example |
|                   | Very Good   | 40%  | 40%    |       |        |       |       |    |   |
|                   | Good        | 20%  | 20%    |       |        |       |       |    |   |
|                   | Satisfactor | 0%   | 0%     |       |        |       |       |    |   |
|                   | Not         |      | 0%     |       |        |       |       |    |   |
| Alumni (No. 12)   | Excellent   |      | - 1000 | 17%   | 33%    | 25%   | 42%   |    |   |
|                   | V.Good      |      |        | 50%   |        | 3-2-  |       |    | More industry visits should be included.<br>Hands on training on softwares.   |
|                   | Good        |      | 25%    | 17%   | 33%    | 17%   | 17%   |    |   |
|                   | Fair        | 17%  |        | 17%   |        |       |       |    |   |
|                   | Poor        |      |        |       |        | 17%   |       |    |   |

|                   | Excellent | 57% | 29% | 29% | 57% | 43% | 57% | 43% | ayllabas more specific towards a field of structi |
|-------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
|                   | V.Good    | 29% | 29% | 43% | 29% | 29% | 14% | 29% | engg.<br>synchronise with school education        |
| Employers (No. 7) | Good      |     | 29% | 14% |     | 14% | 14% | 14% |   |
|                   | Fair      | 14% |     | 14% | 14% |     |     |     | Same Feedback for MTEch                           |
|                   | Poor      |     | 14% |     |     | 14% | 14% | 14% |   |
| Vhere.            |           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | software specific rather than just designing mar  |

Where,

Q1: Relevance of the curriculum to the Programme (industry) (Alumni)

Relevance of the syllabus to the Course (Faculty)

Is the syllabus appropriate to the course (Student)

Q2: Applicability of curricula to industry/practical needs (industry) (Alumni)

Degree of Alignment of Course outcomes with syllabus (Student)

Q3: Addressal of curricula to current needs-local/regional/national/global (industry) (Alumni) (faculty)

Q4: Applicability to life-long learning (industry) (Alumni) (faculty)

Q5: Appropriateness of technical tools/software integrated in curricula (industry) (Alumni) (Faculty)

Q6: Appropriate blend of theory and hands on/practical learning (industry)

Q7: Suggestions for improvement of curricula (industry) (Alumni) (Student) (Faculty)

Signature

Name: Dr Gaurav Saini HoD: Civil Engineering