CURRICULUM FEEDBACK ANALYSIS REPORT 2017-18

Parent 2017-18

1. Methodology

This survey report is descriptive and analytical in nature. For the data collection, the sample survey method was used. The respective departments did the sample selection and data collection from the respective parent list.   The samples were selected by the systematic random sampling method. The data were collected by the 5-point scale questionnaire prepared by IQAC.   For the analysis of data – the descriptive statistics like average, percentage and tabular and diagrammatic tools were used. The data were analyzed with the statistical software SPSS (Trial Version). The report is prepared by IQAC. A copy of the report will submit to the concerned departments and also place before the academic council body of the college for necessary actions.

1.1. Overview

In the curriculum feedback survey 2017-18 of the category parent, 95parents representing various departments were participated. Table.1 gives the department wise breakup of participants.

Table 1: No of Parents representing departments

Course of the Student	No. of Parents	Percent
Economics	11	11.6
English	10	10.5
BBA	10	10.5
Commerce	11	11.6
Computer Science	9	9.5
Microbiology	17	17.9
Biotechnology	8	8.4
Biochemistry	9	9.5
History and WAS	10	10.5
Total	95	100.0

Source: Sample survey data 2018

Out of the total samples, 74.7% are from Muslim community, 6.3% are General, 15.8% are SC and 3.2% are OBC. The education status of parents are given in table.2

Table.2. Education Qualification of Parents

Education	Number of Parents	Percent
Below SSLC	24	25.3
SSLC	36	37.9
Plus two	20	21.1
Degree	13	13.7
Post Graduation	2	2.1
Total	95	100.0

Source: Sample Survey Data 2018

2. Department wise Analysis

2.1.Objective and goal of Curriculum:

Out of the 95 parents of students representing various departments, 45.26% opined that the objective and goal of the curriculum is very clear while 51.57% opined that the objective and goal of the curriculum is clear. The observation of parents on objective and goal of curriculum of all departments can be seen from the following table.3.

Table.3. Objective and Goal of the Curriculum

Parents Representing Departments	Objective and Goal of the Curriculum			Total
	Very Clear	Clear	Somewhat Clear	
Economics	2	9	0	11
English	5	4	1	10
BBA	3	7	0	10
Commerce	2	8	1	11
Computer Science	8	1	0	9
Microbiology	13	4	0	17
Biotechnology	3	5	0	8
Biochemistry	2	7	0	9
History and WAS	5	4	1	10
Total	43	49	3	95

Source: Sample survey data 2018

2.2. Academic Flexibility

On the variable academic flexibility (choices to choose courses other than department) 27.27% of parents opined that the curriculum is not flexible in that sense.

Table.4. Academic Flexibility (Choices to choose courses from other departments)

Course of the Student	Academic flexibility				Total
	Very flexible	Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Not flexible	
Economics	4	4	3	0	11
English	5	3	2	0	10
BBA	6	4	0	0	10
Commerce	2	3	3	3	11
Computer Science	2	4	3	0	9
Microbiology	7	9	1	0	17
Biotechnology	5	3	0	0	8
Biochemistry	2	4	3	0	9
History and WAS	4	5	1	0	10
Total	37	39	16	3	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018

2.3. Capacity of the Curriculum to Develop Attitude and Skills for a Democratic Life

Table.5. Capacity of the curriculum to develop attitude and skills for a democratic life

Course of the Student	Capacity of the curriculum to develop attitude and skills for a democratic life					Total
	Very Strong	Strong	Somewhat Strong	Not Strong	6.00	
Economics	5	3	3	0	0	11
English	5	4	1	0	0	10
BBA	3	7	0	0	0	10
Commerce	1	6	4	0	0	11
Computer Science	1	6	2	0	0	9
Microbiology	5	10	1	0	1	17
Biotechnology	3	4	1	0	0	8
Biochemistry	2	4	2	1	0	9
History and WAS	2	5	3	0	0	10
Total	27	49	17	1	1	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018

2.4. The Proportion of Scientific Content

Table.6: The Proportion of Scientific Content

Course of the Student	The Proportion of Scientific Content					Total
	Sufficient Enough	Sufficient	Somewhat Sufficient	Not Sufficient	Can't Say	
Economics	1	9	1	0	0	11
English	2	8	0	0	0	10
BBA	3	7	0	0	0	10
Commerce	1	4	4	1	1	11
Computer Science	2	7	0	0	0	9
Microbiology	3	10	3	1	0	17
Biotechnology	3	4	1	0	0	8
Biochemistry	3	5	0	1	0	9
History and WAS	4	6	0	0	0	10
Total	22	60	9	3	1	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018

2.5. Use of Learner Centered Methodology

Table.7: Use of Learner Centered Methodology

Count

Course of Student	Use of Learner Centred Methodology				Total
	Excellent	Good	Somewhat Good	Mot Good	
Economics	7	2	2	0	11
English	3	5	2	0	10
BBA	4	6	0	0	10
Commerce	2	7	2	0	11
Computer Science	2	7	0	0	9
Microbiology	7	3	7	0	17
Biotechnology	4	4	0	0	8
Biochemistry	1	7	0	1	9
History and WAS	3	4	3	0	10
Total	33	45	16	1	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018

2.6. Use of ICT in Teaching Learning

Table 8: Use of ICT in Teaching Learning

Course of Students	Use of ICT in Teaching Learning				Total
	Excellent	Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good	
Economics	4	6	1	0	11
English	4	4	2	0	10
BBA	2	5	3	0	10
Commerce	3	4	4	0	11
Computer Science	3	6	0	0	9
Microbiology	9	3	5	0	17
Biotechnology	4	4	0	0	8
Biochemistry	1	5	2	1	9
History and WAS	3	4	3	0	10
Total	33	41	20	1	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018

2.7. Content of Core Courses

Table: 9 Content of core Courses

Course of the Student	Content of core Courses				Total
	Sufficient Enough	Sufficient	Somewhat Sufficient	Not sufficient	
Economics	5	6	0	0	11
English	3	4	2	1	10
BBA	2	7	1	0	10
Commerce	2	8	0	1	11
Computer Science	2	4	2	1	9
Microbiology	7	5	5	0	17
Biotechnology	5	3	0	0	8
Biochemistry	6	3	0	0	9
History and WAS	2	6	2	0	10
Total	34	46	12	3	95

Source: Sample Survey Data 2018

2.8.   Content of Common Courses

Table.10. Content of common Courses

Course of the Student	Content of common Courses					Total
	Sufficient Enough	Sufficient	Somewhat Sufficient	Not Sufficient	Can't Say	
Economics	3	7	1	0	0	11
English	0	5	4	1	0	10
BBA	3	7	0	0	0	10
Commerce	3	6	1	1	0	11
Computer Science	2	6	1	0	0	9
Microbiology	3	3	1	4	6	17
Biotechnology	3	5	0	0	0	8
Biochemistry	6	3	0	0	0	9
History and WAS	4	4	2	0	0	10
Total	27	46	10	6	6	95

Course: Sample Survey Data 2018

2.9.   Content of Open Courses

Table 11: Content of Open Courses

Course of the Student	Content of Open Courses					Total
	Sufficient Enough	Sufficient	Somewhat Sufficient	Not sufficient	Can't Say	
Economics	4	6	1	0	0	11
English	3	3	2	1	1	10
BBA	4	6	0	0	0	10
Commerce	2	7	1	1	0	11
Computer Science	1	7	0	1	0	9
Microbiology	2	3	2	3	7	17
Biotechnology	4	4	0	0	0	8
Biochemistry	3	3	3	0	0	9
History and WAS	4	3	2	1	0	10
Total	27	42	11	7	8	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018

2.10. Content of Complimentary Courses

Table.12: Content of Complimentary Courses

Course of the Student	Content of Complimentary Courses					Total
	Sufficient Enough	Sufficient	Somewhat Sufficient	Not Sufficient	Can't Say	
Economics	3	6	2	0	0	11
English	2	5	2	1	0	10
BBA	3	7	0	0	0	10
Commerce	2	7	2	0	0	11
Computer Science	6	3	0	0	0	9
Microbiology	2	2	2	2	9	17
Biotechnology	4	4	0	0	0	8
Biochemistry	7	0	2	0	0	9
History and WAS	4	4	2	0	0	10
Total	33	38	12	3	9	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018

2.11. Capacity of the Curriculum to Ensure all Round Growth of the Learner

Table 13. The capacity of the Curriculum to Ensure all round growth of the learner

Course of the Student	The capacity of the Curriculum to Ensure all round growth of the learner					Total
	Very Strong	Strong	Somewhat Strong	Not Strong	Can't Say	
Economics	2	7	1	1	0	11
English	1	6	3	0	0	10
BBA	3	7	0	0	0	10
Commerce	3	3	5	0	0	11
Computer Science	2	6	1	0	0	9
Microbiology	7	4	3	2	1	17
Biotechnology	5	3	0	0	0	8
Biochemistry	0	6	2	1	0	9
History and WAS	1	5	4	0	0	10
Total	24	47	19	4	1	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018

2.12. The Suitability of the Curriculum to teaching Learning Situation

Table.14: The Suitability of the Curriculum to Teaching Learning Situation

Course of the Student	The Suitability of the Curriculum to Teaching Learning Situation				Total
	Very Suitable	Suitable	Somewhat Suitable	Not Suitable	
Economics	7	3	1	0	11
English	4	3	2	1	10
BBA	2	7	1	0	10
Commerce	3	6	1	1	11
Computer Science	2	5	1	1	9
Microbiology	8	4	3	2	17
Biotechnology	7	1	0	0	8
Biochemistry	1	4	4	0	9
History and WAS	2	6	2	0	10
Total	36	39	15	5	95

Source: Sample Survey data 2018