

2.7.1 STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

DEPARTMENT WISE REPORT OF FEEDBACK OF FINAL 3rd YEAR STUDENTS WHO HAVE PASSED OUT DURING THE YEAR - 2019-20

Parameters: A-Very Good (60% & above), B-Good (55% & above), C-Satisfactory (50% & above) & D-Unsatisfactory (Below 50%)

DEPARTMENT OF English

The survey is based on 38 final semester English Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value interns of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%
2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%
3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

Having said the above, it should be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be designed in such a way which has real life applicability and which generates knowledge and skills so that the students have no difficulty to compete with the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of English in the year 2020-21 was five and their names were Prof. Asis Pan, ex-Head of the Department, Prof. Prabir Kanti Basu, present Head of the Department, Prof. Sunandita Sarker, Prof. Saptaparna Saha, & Prof. Abir Sen.

The analysis of the students' feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Prof. Asis Kumar Pan

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest Generated: 65%

7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Prabir Kanti Basu

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest Generated: 65%

7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Sunandita Sarker

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest Generated: 65%

7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Saptaparna Saha

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Abir Sen

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

From the above it could be assessed that the overall performance of the teachers of the department is good but there is no room for complacency and the department will be striving hard to do even better.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus - 60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus - 60%
3. Quality of Library Books: 60%
4. Internet Facility: 60%
5. Browsing Facility in the library: 60%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%
8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests: 60%

9. Internal Assessment: 60%

10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students: 60%

11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects): Not Applicable

12. Availability of books from the Departmental Library: 60%

From the above students' evaluation on course & teaching, the curriculum & the facilities available to the students seem to be satisfactory but there is scope for improvement and has to be coped up with the progress of time.

Format IV OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%

b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%

c. Response of college authorities: 60%

d. Response from college office: 60%

e. Library Services: 60%

f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 60%

g. Co-curricular activities: 60%

h. Sports facilities: 60%

i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%

j. Discipline: 60%

k. Cleanliness: 60%

l. Canteen facilities: 60%

m. NSS activities: 60%

The college and its staff have been striving hard to meet the interests of the students so that they can make a mark for themselves as well as for the college in the long run.

DEPARTMENT OF BENGALI

The survey is based on 36 final semester Bengali Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value interns of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%
2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%
3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

Having said the above, it should be noted that to grow interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be designed in a way so that it has real life applicability and knowledge and skills so that the students have no difficulty to compete with the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Bengali in the year 2020-21 was five and their names were Dr. Tanusree Mondal, Head of the Department, Prof. Nagen Murmu, Prof. Sukanta Mukhopadhyay, Prof. Piyali Chakraborty, Prof. Arpita Dey.

The analysis of the students' feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Dr. Tanusree Mondal

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Nagen Murmu

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Piyali Chakraborty

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Arpita Dey

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 65%

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%
2. Teaching Ability: 60%
3. Sincerity: 60%
4. Punctuality: 60%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 60%
6. Interest Generated: 60%
7. Quality of the preparation of the class: 60%

From the above it could be assessed that the overall performance of the teachers of the department is good but there is no room for complacency and the department will be striving hard to do even better.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus - 60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus - 60%
3. Quality of Library Books: 60%
4. Internet Facility: 60%
5. Browsing Facility in the library: 60%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%
8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests: 60%
9. Internal Assessment: 60%
10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students: 60%
11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects): Not Applicable
12. Availability of books from the Departmental Library: 60%

From the above students' evaluation on course & teaching, the curriculum & the facilities available to the students seem to be satisfactory but there is scope for improvement and has to be coped up with the progress of time.

Format IV OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

- a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%
- b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%
- c. Response of college authorities: 60%
- d. Response from college office: 55%
- e. Library Services: 60%
- f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 55%
- g. Co-curricular activities: 55%
- h. Sports facilities: 60%
- i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%
- j. Discipline: 60%
- k. Cleanliness: 60%
- l. Canteen facilities: 55%
- m. NSS activities: 60%

Overall, the college and its staff have strived to the best of their abilities to serve the interests of the students so that they can make a mark for themselves as well as for the college in the long run.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The survey is based on 15 final semester Political Science Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

However, a point to remember is that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be designed in such a way which has real life applicability and which generates knowledge and skills so that the students have no difficulty to compete in the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Political Science in the year 2019-20 was three and their names were Prof. Debdas Dey, Head of the Department, Prof. Debtanu Majhi, Prof. Prashant Kumar Sharma, Prof. Kamal Roy & Prof. Anindita Mitra

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Prof. Debdas Dey:

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Debtanu Majhi:

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

-9-

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Prashant Kumar Sharma

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Kamal Roy

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%

2. Teaching Ability: 60%

3. Sincerity: 60%

4. Punctuality: 60%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 60%

6. Interest generated: 60%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 60%

Prof. Anindita Mitra

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%

2. Teaching Ability: 60%

3. Sincerity: 60%

4.Punctuality:60%

-10-

5.Accessibilityinandoutofthe class: 60%

6.Interestgenerated:60%

7.Qualityofpreparationofthe class: 60%

From

theabovepointsitisveryclearthattheteachersarecapableenoughtodealwiththestudentsandtheytrytheirbesttocatertotheneedsofthestudentsthoughsometimestheyarefacedwithproblemsthat are beyondtheircontrol.Butinthatcasetheteachersarealways eagertomakeupforthedelay.

FormatIIISTUDENTS'EVALUATIONONCOURSE&TEACHING

1.Syllabus-

Thestudentsofthedepartmentfindthesyllabusveryattractiveandthisattractivenesshastobemaintained.

2.Coverageofthesyllabus- 60%

3.QualityofLibraryBooks: 60%

4.InternetFacility: 60%

5.BrowsingFacilityinthelibrary: 60%

6.AccessibilitytotheLibraryBooks: 60%

7.Participationofthestudentsintheinteractivesession: 60%

8.HelpfulnessoftheClassTests: 60%

9.InternalAssessment: 60%

10.Aretheteachersreadytolistentotheproblemsofthestudents: 60%

11.Arethelaboratoriesproperlyequippedandmaintained(forlabbasedsubjects):

12.AvailabilityofbooksfromtheDepartmentalLibrary: 60%

The college is always eager to help the students to the best of its ability in order to make them capable of competing with outside world.

Format I OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%

-11-

b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%

c. Response of college authorities: 60%

d. Response from college office: 60%

e. Library Services: 60%

f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 60%

g. Co-curricular activities: 60%

h. Sports facilities: 60%

i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%

j. Discipline: 60%

k. Cleanliness: 60%

l. Canteen facilities: 60%

m. NSS activities: 60%

Therefore, from the above every member of the college is dedicating themselves not only for the betterment of the students but of the institute as well so that the students can talk of it and help the institute to achieve a distinction in the long run.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The survey is based on 06 final semester Education Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

Having said the above, it should be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be restructured to have real life applicability,

-12-

generating knowledge and skills so that the students have no difficulty to compete with the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Education in the year 2019-20 was four and their names were Prof. Sanjay Sarkar, Head of the Department, Prof. Sunita Shaw, Prof. Gargi Gangopadhyay & Prof. Sima Nandy.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Prof. Sanjay Sarkar:

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Sunita Shaw:

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 605%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Gargi Gangopadhyay

-13-

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%
2. Teaching Ability: 60%
3. Sincerity: 60%
4. Punctuality: 60%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 60%
6. Interest generated: 60%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 60%

Prof. Sima Nandy

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 55%
2. Teaching Ability: 55%
3. Sincerity: 55%
4. Punctuality: 55%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 55%
6. Interest generated: 55%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 55%

From the above points it is very clear that the teachers are capable enough to deal with the students and they try their best to cater to the needs of the students though sometimes they are faced with problems that are beyond their control. But in that case the teachers are always eager to make up for the delay.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus- 60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus- 60%
3. Quality of Library books: 55%

4. Internet Facilities 60%

-14-

5. Browsing Facility in the library: 60%

6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%

7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%

8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests: 60%

9. Internal Assessment: 60%

10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students: 60%

11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects):

12. Availability of books from the departmental library: 60%

From the above it could be determined that the college along with its staff have been rendering services to the students for their betterment but still some areas need to be stressed more that is responses from the office, internet availability etc. need improvement.

Format I OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%

b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%

c. Response of college authorities: 60%

d. Response from college office: 60%

e. Library Services: 60%

f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 60%

g. Co-curricular activities: 60%.

h. Sports facilities: 60%

i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%

j. Discipline: 60%

k. Cleanliness: 60%

l. Canteen facilities: 55%

m. NSS activities: 60%

Overall, the college as well as the staff members are giving every effort to attract the students and make the environment more conducive for healthy and advanced education in order to make the institute stand apart from others.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

The survey is based on 01 final semester Philosophy Hons. Student who has passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

Moreover,

it should be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be designed in such a way which has real life applicability and which generates knowledge and skills so that the students have no difficulty to compete with the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Philosophy in the year 2019-20 was four and their names were Prof. Chaitali Ghosh, Head of the Department, Prof. Madhusree Chatterjee, Prof. Mita Chatterjee & Prof. Manisha Dey.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Prof. Chaitali Ghosh

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Madhusree Chatterjee:

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65 %

Prof. Mita Chatterjee

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Manisha Dey

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

From the above points it is very clear that the teachers are capable enough to deal with the students and they try their best to cater to the needs of the students though sometimes they are faced with problems that are beyond their control. But in that case the teachers are always eager to make up for the delay.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus- 60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus- 60%
3. Quality of Library Books: 60%
4. Internet Facility: 60%
5. Browsing Facility in the library: 60%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%
8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests: 60%
9. Internal Assessment: 60%
10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students: 60%
11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects):
12. Availability of books from the Departmental Library: 60%

The institution with its staff have been striving for the betterment of education among the students as well as the institution itself and in order to do so have to keep up and keep on improving the initiatives taken by the college.

Format I OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

- a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%
- b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%
- c. Response of college authorities: 60%
- d. Response from college office: 60%
- e. Library Services: 60%
- f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 55%
- g. Co-curricular activities: 55%
- h. Sports facilities: 60%
- i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%
- j. Discipline: 60%
- k. Cleanliness: 60%
- l. Canteen facilities: 60%
- m. NSS activities: 60%

From the above assessments, one thing is clear that the college with its staff are trying hard to earn reputation through the betterment of the students and giving out something extra which would make it a world apart.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

The feedback analysis has been made on the basis of response of twenty-three honours students who have passed out in the session 2020-21. It is to be noted that there are four teachers in the Department of History, two whole timers, Dr. Samindra Mohan Biswas, Head of the Department, Dr. Mitali Dey, and two SACTS - Prof. Haimanti Banerjee and Prof. Epsita Khan:

1. Dr. Samindra Mohan Biswas:

- a) Knowledge: 60% b) Teaching Ability: 60% c) Sincerity: 60% d) Punctuality: 60%

-19-

- e) Accessibility: 60% f) Interest Generated: 60% g) Quality of Preparation: 60% h)

Syllabus Attractiveness: 60% i) Syllabus Covered: 60%

2. Dr. Mitali Dey:

a) Knowledge: 60% b) Teaching Ability: 60% c) Sincerity: 60% d) Punctuality: 60%
e) Accessibility: 60% f) Interest Generated: 60% g) Quality of Preparation: 60% h) Syllabus
Attractiveness: 60% i) Syllabus Covered: 60%

3. Prof. Haimanti Banerjee:

a) Knowledge: 60% b) Teaching Ability: 60% c) Sincerity 60% d) Punctuality: 60%
e) Accessibility: 60% f) Interest Generated: 60% g) Quality of Preparation: 60% h)
Syllabus Attractiveness: 60% i) Syllabus Covered: 60%

4. Prof. Epsita Khan:

a) Knowledge: 60% b) Teaching Ability: 60% c) Sincerity 60% d) Punctuality: 60%
e) Accessibility: 60% f) Interest Generated: 60% g) Quality of Preparation: 60% h)
Syllabus Attractiveness: 60% i) Syllabus Covered: 60%

The overall assessment can be termed as good despite managing the department with two staff members with one of them being guest faculty. The target should have been much better and in the future the department with its limited resources would be trying to overcome the shortcomings especially regarding teaching ability, interest generation, quality of preparation, punctuality, covering of syllabus, sincerity, punctuality, knowledge and accessibility.

Now, the analysis of the performance of the library and the office:

1. Library:

a) Accessibility of books: 60% b) Library Internet Facility: 60% c) Library Browsing Facility:
60% d) Availability of books: 60%

Overall facility of the library is good but the internet accessibility and availability of

-20-

books have to be improved along with the collection of books.

2. a) Teacher-Student Interaction: 60%, b) Usefulness of class tests: 60% c) Impartiality of Internal Assessment: 60% d) Help of the teachers: 60% e) Availability of Departmental Books: 60%

So the overall performance vis-a-vis students could be termed as satisfactory but more efforts are needed to improve as there are rooms for improvement.

3. Response of the College:

a) Infrastructural facilities: 60% b) Response of the College Authority: 60% c) Response of the Office: 60% d) Library Services: 60% e) Computer/Wifi Facility: 60% f) Co-curricular activities; 60% g) Sports Facility: 60% h) Social Atmosphere: 60% i) Discipline: 60% j) Cleanliness: 60% k) Canteen facilities: 60% l) NSS Activities: 60%

The overall performance of the College is good. But there are rooms of improvement in the fields of social atmosphere, discipline, infrastructure, office, cleanliness and canteen facilities which we hope to do so in the time ahead.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

The survey is based on 11 final semester Computer Science Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 55%.

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

It should be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be designed in such a way which has real life applicability and which generates knowledge and skills so that the students have no difficulty to compete with the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Computer Science in the year 2019-20

was four and their names were Prof. Unmesh Mandal, Head of the Department, Prof. Sovan Kumar Ponda, Prof. Rimpi Saha, Prof. Gautam Das & Prof. Apurba Jyoti Roy.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Prof. Unmesh Mandal:

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 60%

Prof. Sovan Kumar Ponda

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%
2. Teaching Ability: 60%
3. Sincerity: 60%
4. Punctuality: 60%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 60%
6. Interest generated: 60%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 60%

Prof. Rimpi Saha

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%
2. Teaching Ability: 60%
3. Sincerity: 60%

4. Punctuality: 60%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 60%
6. Interest generated: 60%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 60%

Prof. Apurba Jyoti Roy

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%
2. Teaching Ability: 60%
3. Sincerity: 60%
4. Punctuality: 60%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 60%
6. Interest generated: 60%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 60%

From the above, it is proved that the teachers are more than capable enough to impart better education to the students and they try their best to cater to the needs of the students though sometimes they are faced with problems that are beyond their means. In that case the teachers are always eager to make up for the delay.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus- 60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus- 60%
3. Quality of Library Books: 60%
4. Internet Facility: 60%
5. Browsing Facility in the library: 60%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%

8.HelpfulnessoftheClassTests: 60%

9.InternalAssessment: 60%

10.Aretheteachersreadytolistentotheproblemsofthestudents: 60%

11.Arethelaboratoriesproperlyequippedandmaintained(forlabbasedsubjects):

12.AvailabilityofbooksfromtheDepartmentalLibrary: 60%

The services rendered by the college are for the benefit of the students and more the services the better the benefits for the students and there is always scope for improvement.

Format IVOVERALLRATINGBYTHESTUDENTS

a.Infrastructurefacilities: 60%

b.Student-teacherrelationship: 60%

c.Responseofcollegeauthorities: 60%

d.Responsefromcollegeoffice: 60%

e.LibraryServices: 60%

f.Computer/Wififacilities: 60%

g.Co-curricularactivities: 60%

h.Sportsfacilities: 60%

i.Socialatmosphere/relation: 60%%

j. Discipline: 60%

k.Cleanliness: 60%

l.Canteenfacilities: 60%

m.NSSactivities: 60%

Intheoverallassessment,theperformanceofthecollegeanditsstaffisquiteencouragingasfarasimpartingeducationtothestudentsareconcernedbutthetargetforbettermentsshouldbemuchhigheriftheinstituteistomakeanameforitself.

DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT

The survey is based on 05 final semester Mathematics Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value interns of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives:60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%.

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

Having said the above, it should be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be designed in such a way which has real life applicability and which generates knowledge and skills so that the students have no difficulty to compete with the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Sanskrit in the year 2020-21 is three and their names were Dr. Chinmoy Mishra, Head of the Department, Prof. Amit Mahato and Prof. Arpita Singha Roy.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Dr. Chinmoy Mishra

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest Generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Amit Mahato

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Arpita Singha Roy

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

From the above, it is proven that the teachers are more than capable enough to impart better education to the students and they try their best to cater to the needs of the students though sometimes they are faced with problems that are beyond their means. In that case the teachers are always eager to make up for the delay.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus - 60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus - 60%
3. Quality of Library Books: 60%

4. Internet Facility: 60%
5. Browsing Facility in the library: 60%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%
8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests: 60%
9. Internal Assessment: 60%
10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students: 60%
11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects):
12. Availability of books from the Departmental Library: 60%

The services rendered by the college are for the benefit of the students and more the services the better the benefits for the students and there is always scope for improvement.

Format IV OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

- a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%
- b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%
- c. Response of college authorities: 60%
- d. Response from college office: 60%
- e. Library Services: 60%
- f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 60%
- g. Co-curricular activities: 60%
- h. Sports facilities: 60%
- i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%
- j. Discipline: 60%
- k. Cleanliness: 60%

k. Canteen facilities: 60%

m. NSS activities: 60%

In the overall assessment, the performance of the college and its staff is quite encouraging as far as imparting education to the students are concerned but the target for betterment should be much higher if the institute is to make a mark in the world of competition.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

The survey is based on 08 final semester Mathematics Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%.

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

Having said the above, it should be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be designed in such a way which has real life applicability and which generates knowledge and skills so that the students have no difficulty to compete with the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Mathematics in the year 2019-20 is three and their names were Dr. Ramesh Kar, Vice Principal & Head of the Department, Prof. Sharmistha Roy and Prof. Rimpi Saha.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Dr. Ramesh Kar

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse:65%

6.InterestGenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse:65%

Prof. Sharmistha Roy

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse:65%

Prof. Rimpi Saha

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse:65%

Fromtheabove,itisproventhattheteachersaremorethancapableenoughtoimpartbettereducationtothestudentsandtheytrytheirbesttocatertotheneedsofthestudentsthoughsometimestheyarefacedwithproblemsthatarebeyondtheirmeans.Inthatcasetheteachersarealwayseagertomakeupforthe delay.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus-60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus-60%
3. Quality of Library Books:60%
4. Internet Facility:60%
5. Browsing Facility in the library:60%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books:60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session:60%
8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests:60%
9. Internal Assessment:60%
10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students:60%
11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects):
12. Availability of books from the Departmental Library:60%

These services rendered by the college are for the benefit of the students and more the services the better they benefit for the students and there is always scope for improvement.

Format IV OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

- a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%
- b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%
- c. Response of college authorities: 60%
- d. Response from college office: 60%
- e. Library Services: 60%
- f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 60%
- g. Co-curricular activities: 60%

h.Sportsfacilities: 60%

i.Socialatmosphere/relation: 60%

j. Discipline: 60%

k.Cleanliness: 60%

l.Canteenfacilities: 60%

m. NSSactivities:60%

Intheoverallassessment,theperformanceofthecollegeanditsstaffisquiteencouragingasfarasimpar
tingeducationtothestudentsareconcernedbutthetargetforbettermentsshouldbemuchhigherifthei
nstituteistomakeanameforitself.

DEPARTMENTOF GEOGRAPHY

**The survey is based on 26 final semester Geography
Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:**

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%.

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

It should be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be targeted to having real life applicability generating knowledge and skills so that the students face no difficulty to compete in the real world.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Geography in the year 2020-21 is three and their names were Dr. Laxman Chandra Pal, Head of the Department, Prof. Argha Saha, & Prof. Pabitra Bhattacharya.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Prof. Laxman Chandra Pal

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers: 65%
- 2.TeachingAbility: 65%
- 3.Sincerity: 65%
- 4.Punctuality: 65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass: 65%
- 6.InterestGenerated: 65%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass: 65%

Prof. Argha Saha

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers: 65%
- 2.TeachingAbility: 65%
- 3.Sincerity: 65%
- 4.Punctuality: 65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass: 65%
- 6.Interestgenerated: 65%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass: 65%

Prof. Pabitra Bhattacharya

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers: 60%
- 2.TeachingAbility: 60%
- 3.Sincerity: 60%
- 4.Punctuality: 60%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass: 60%
- 6.Interestgenerated: 60%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass: 60%

From the above, it is proved that the teachers are quite capable to deliver better education to the students and they try their best to cater to the needs of the students though some times they are faced with problems that are beyond their means. In that situation, the teachers are always eager to make up.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus - 60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus - 60%
3. Quality of Library Books: 60%
4. Internet Facility: 60%
5. Browsing Facility in the library: 60%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%
8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests: 60%
9. Internal Assessment: 60%
10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students: 60%
11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects):
12. Availability of books from the Departmental Library: 60%

The services rendered by the college are for the benefit of the students and more the services the better the benefits for the students and there is always scope for improvement. So from the above, the services and the facilities provided to the students in this case though seem to be satisfactory but also it should strive for the best.

Format IV OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

- a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%
- b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%
- c. Response of college authorities: 60%

d. Response from college office: 60%

e. Library Services: 60%

f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 60%

g. Co-curricular activities: 60%

h. Sports facilities: 60%

i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%

j. Discipline: 60%

k. Cleanliness: 60%

l. Canteen facilities: 60%

m. NSS activities: 60%

In the overall assessment, the performance of the college and its staff is satisfactory as far as imparting education and facilities to the students are concerned but simple satisfaction is not enough and the institution should set much higher target if it is to make a name for itself.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (B. Com Honours)

The survey is based on 42 final semester Commerce Hons. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%.

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

It is to be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be prepared to deal in a way that has applicability in real life that helps to generate knowledge and skills enabling the students to compete in the real world irrespective of the circumstances.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Commerce in the year 2019-20 is nine and their names are Dr. Subhajit Ghosh, Head of the Department (Day), Prof. Radhakanta Sarkar, Prof. Pinaki Dutta, Prof. Mahadeb Dey, Prof. Debabrata Mukherjee, Prof. Sadhunath Kundu, Head of the Department (Eve.), Prof. Nityalal Sen, Prof. Partho Manna & Prof. Krishna Sarkar.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers areas follows:

Dr. Subhajit Ghosh

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Radhakanta Sarkar

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 60%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Pinaki Dutta

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality: 65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse: 65%

6.Interestgenerated: 65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse: 65%

Prof. Mahadheb Dey

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers: 65%

2.TeachingAbility: 65%

3.Sincerity: 65%

4.Punctuality: 65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse: 65%

6.Interestgenerated: 65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse: 65%

Prof. Debabrata Mukherjee

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility: 60%

3.Sincerity: 55%

4.Punctuality: 50%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse:60%

6.Interestgenerated:60%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse: 60%

Prof. Sadhunath Kundu

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof. Nityalal Sen

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof. Partho Manna

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof. Krishna Sarkar

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%
- 2.TeachingAbility:65%
- 3.Sincerity:65%
- 4.Punctuality:65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%
- 6.Interestgenerated:65%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Fromtheabove,itisproventhattheteachersarequitecapabletodeliverbettereducationtothestudentstheytrytheirbesttocatertotheneedsofthestudentsthoughsometimestheyarefacedwithproblemsatareeyondtheirmeans.Inthatsituation,theteachersarealwayseagertomakeup.

FormatIIISTUDENTS'EVALUATIONONCOURSE&TEACHING

- 1.Syllabus- 60%
- 2.Coverageofthesyllabus- 60%
- 3.QualityofLibraryBooks: 60%
- 4.InternetFacility: 55%
- 5.BrowsingFacilityinthelibrary: 55%
- 6.AccessibilitytotheLibraryBooks:55%
- 7.Participationofthestudentsintheinteractivesession:50%
- 8.HelpfulnessoftheClassTests: 60%
- 9.InternalAssessment: 60%
- 10.Aretheteachersreadytolistentotheproblemsofthestudents: 55%
- 11.Arethelaboratoriesproperlyequippedandmaintained(forlabbasedsubjects):
- 12.AvailabilityofbooksfromtheDepartmentalLibrary:55%

Theservicesrenderedbythecollegeareforthebenefitofthestudentsandmoretheservicethebetterthebenefitsforthestudentsandthereisalwaysscopeforimprovement.Sofromtheabove,theservicesandthefacilitiesprovidedtothestudentsinthiscaseneedtobeseriouslylookedintothoughthecollegedespitemalldodshasbeencontinuouslytryingtomitigatetheproblemsfacedbythestudents.

Format I OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

- a. Infrastructural facilities: 55%
- b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%
- c. Response of college authorities: 60%
- d. Response from college office: 60%
- e. Library Services: 55%
- f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 55%
- g. Co-curricular activities: 55%
- h. Sports facilities: 55%
- i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%
- j. Discipline: 60%
- k. Cleanliness: 60%
- l. Canteen facilities: 50%
- m. NSS activities: 55%

In the overall assessment, the performance of the college and its staff is quite inspiring as far as imparting education and facilities to the students are concerned but the target should be set much higher if the institute is to make a name for itself.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (GEN.)

The survey is based on **78** final semester Commerce Gen. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value intern of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 55%.

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

It is to be noted that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should be prepared to deal in a way that has applicability in real life that help to generate knowledge and skills enabling the students to compete in the real world irrespective of the circumstances.

Format I I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Commerce in the year 2019-20 _____ is nine and their names were Dr. Subhajit Ghosh, Head of the Department (Day), Prof. Radhakanta Sarkar, Prof. Pinaki Dutta, Prof. Mahadeb Dey, Prof. Debabrata Mukherjee,

Prof. Sadhunath Kundu, Head of the Department (Eve.),

Prof. Nityalal Sen, Prof. Partho Manna & Prof. Krishna Sarkar.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Dr. Subhajit Ghosh

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest Generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Radhakanta Sarkar

-42-

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof.PinakiDutta

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof.MahadhebDey

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof. Debabrata Mukherjee

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:60%
- 2.TeachingAbility:60%
- 3.Sincerity:60%
- 4.Punctuality: 50%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:60%
- 6.Interestgenerated:60%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass: 60%

Prof.SadhunathKundu

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%
- 2.TeachingAbility:65%
- 3.Sincerity:65%
- 4.Punctuality:65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%
- 6.Interestgenerated:65%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof.NityalalSen

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%
- 2.TeachingAbility:65%
- 3.Sincerity:65%
- 4.Punctuality:65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%
- 6.Interestgenerated:65%

- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof.ParthoManna

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%
- 2.TeachingAbility:65%
- 3.Sincerity:65%
- 4.Punctuality:65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse:65%
- 6.Interestgenerated:65%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse:65%

Prof.KrishnaSarkar

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%
- 2.TeachingAbility:65%
- 3.Sincerity:65%
- 4.Punctuality:65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse:65%
- 6.Interestgenerated:65%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse:65%

Fromtheabove,itisproventhattheteachersarequitecapabletodeliverbettereducationtothestudentsandtheytrytheirbesttocater totheneedsofthestudents thoughsometimes they arefacedwithproblems thatarebeyondtheirmeans.Inthat situation,theteachersarealwayseagertomakeup.

FormatIIISTUDENTS'EVALUATIONONCOURSE&TEACHING

- 1.Syllabus- 60%
- 2.Coverageofthesyllabus- 60%
- 3.QualityofLibraryBooks: 60%
- 4.InternetFacility: 55%

5. Browsing Facility in the library: 55%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%
8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests: 60%
9. Internal Assessment: 60%
10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students: 60%
11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects): N.A.
12. Availability of books from the Departmental Library: 55%

The services rendered by the college are for the benefit of the students and more the services the better the benefits for the students and there is always scope for improvement. So from the above, the services and the facilities provided to the students in this case need to be seriously looked into though the college despite all odds has been continuously trying to mitigate the problems faced by the students.

Format I OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

- a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%
- b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%
- c. Response of college authorities: 60%
- d. Response from college office: 60%
- e. Library Services: 60%
- f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 55%
- g. Co-curricular activities: 55%
- h. Sports facilities: 55%
- i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%
- j. Discipline: 60%
- k. Cleanliness: 60%

l.Canteenfacilities:50%

m.NSSactivities:55%

Intheoverallassessment,theperformanceofthecollegeanditsstaffisquiteinspiringasfarasimparting educationandfacilitiestothestudentsareconcernedbutthetargetshouldbesetmuchhigheriftheinsti tuteistomakeanameforitself.

FACULTY OF SCIENCE (B.SC GEN. WITH MATHS)

The survey is based on 03 final semester Science Gen.Students (with Maths) who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1.Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2.Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%

3.Interest generated by the course: 60%

It is to be noted that for interest generation in the courses among the students the curriculum should be structured in a way so that it has real life values creating knowledge and skills, thus enabling the students to cope with the real world irrespective of the circumstances.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

The number of teachers in the Department of Science in the year 2019-20 is nine and their names are Dr. Ramesh Kar, Vice Principal & Head of the Department, Dr. Sovan Kumar Ponda, Dr. Abdul Khaleque, Prof. Soumya Saha, Prof. Unmesh Mandal, Prof. Apurba Jyoti Roy, Prof. Masood Karim Shah, Prof. Rimpi Saha, and Prof. Sharmistha Roy.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers are as follows:

Dr. Ramesh Kar

-47-

1.Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2.Teaching Ability: 65%

3.Sincerity: 65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%

6.InterestGenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Dr. Sovan Kumar Ponda

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof. Unmesh Mondal

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Dr. Abdul Khaleque

-48-

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Soumya Saha

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Masood Karim Shah

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%
2. Teaching Ability: 60%
3. Sincerity: 60%
4. Punctuality: 60%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 60%
6. Interest generated: 60%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 60%

Prof. Apurba Jyoti Roy

-49-

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Rimpi Saha

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Sharmistha Roy

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

From the above, it is proved that the teachers are very well equipped to deliver better

-50-

education to the students and they try their best to cater to their needs though
sometimes they are faced with problems that are beyond their means. In that
situation, the teachers are always eager to give their extras to help the students.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

- 1.Syllabus- 60%
- 2.Coverageofthesyllabus- 60%
- 3.QualityofLibraryBooks: 60%
- 4.InternetFacility: 60%
- 5.BrowsingFacilityinthelibrary: 60%
- 6.AccessibilitytotheLibraryBooks: 60%
- 7.Participationofthestudentsintheinteractivesession: 60%
- 8.HelpfulnessoftheClassTests: 60%
- 9.InternalAssessment: 60%
- 10.Aretheteachersreadytolistentotheproblemsofthestudents: 60%
- 11.Arethelaboratoriesproperlyequippedandmaintained(forlabbasedsubjects): 55%
- 12.AvailabilityofbooksfromtheDepartmentalLibrary: 60%

Theservicesrenderedbythecollegeareforthebenefitofthestudentsandmoretheservicethebetterthebenefitsforthestudentsandthereisalwaysscopeforimprovement.Sofromtheabove,theservicesandthefacilitiesprovidedtothestudentsinthiscaseneedtobeseriouslylookedintothoughthoughthecollegedespitemalloddsahasbeencontinuouslytryingtomitigatetheproblemsfacedbythestudents.

FormatIVOVERALLRATINGBYTHESTUDENTS

- a.Infrastructurefacilities: 60%
 - b.Student-teacherrelationship: 60%
 - c.Responseofcollegeauthorities: 60%
- 51-**
- d.Responsefromcollegeoffice: 60%
 - e.LibraryServices: 60%
 - f.Computer/Wififacilities:55%
 - g.Co-curricularactivities:55%

h.Sportsfacilities: 60%

i.Socialatmosphere/relation: 60%

j.Discipline: 60%

k.Cleanliness: 60%

l. Canteenfacilities: 55%

m. NSS activities: 60%

Intheoverallassessment,theperformanceofthecollegeanditsstaffis satisfactory as farasimpartingeducationandfacilitiestothestudentsareconcernedbut simple satisfaction is not enough and the institution should setmuchhigher target if it istomakeanameforitself.

FACULTY OF ARTS (B. A. & B. Sc. GEN. WITH& WITHOUT GEOGRAPHY)

The survey is based on 100 final semester B. A. Gen. Students who have passed out during the year 2020-21:

Format I STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON CONCERNED COURSE:

1. Learning Value in terms of skills, concepts, knowledge, analytical abilities, and broadening perspectives: 60%

2. Applicability/relevance to real life situations: 60%

3. Interest generated by the course: 60%

It is to be remembered that to generate interest in the courses among the students the curriculum should have applicability to real life that helps to acquire knowledge and skill, thus helping the students to compete in real life.

Format II STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON TEACHERS

-52-

The number of teachers in the Faculty of Arts (B. A. Gen. with Geo.) in the year 2020-21 is thirty five and their names are Prof. Debdas Dey (H.O.D. of Pol. Science), Prof. Debtanu Majhi, Prof. Prashant Kumar Sharma, Prof. Kamal Roy, Prof. Chaitali Ghosh (H.O.D. of Philosophy), Prof. Madhusree Chatterjee, Prof. Prabir Kanti Basu, Prof. Sunandita Sarker, Prof. Saptaparna Saha, Dr. Samindra Mohan Biswas, H. O. D. (History), Dr. Mitali Dey, Dr. Tanusree Mandal (H.O.D. of Bengali), Dr. Sukanta Mukhopadhyay, Prof. Nagen Murmu, Dr. Laxman Chandra Pal,

H.O.D.(Geo.), Prof. Shawli Basu Roy, Prof. Argha Saha, Prof. Sanjay Sarkar (H.O.D. of Education), Prof. Sunita Shaw, Dr. Chinmoy Mishra (H.O.D. of Sanskrit), Prof. Amit Mahato, Prof. Asis Kumar Pan, Prof. Tanisha Mitra, Prof. Mita Chatterjee, Prof. Prof. Manisha Dey, Prof. Arpita Dey, Prof. Piyali Chakraborty, Prof. Anindita Mitra, Prof. Gargi Gangopadhyay, Prof. Sima Nandy, Prof. Arpita Singha Roy, Prof. Abir Sen, Prof. Haimanti Banerjee, Prof. Epsita Khan & Prof. Pabitra Bhattacharya.

The analysis of the student's feedback on the teachers areas follows:

Prof. Asis Kumar Pan

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 60%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Chaitali Ghosh

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

-53-

6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Debdas Dey

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Prabir Kanti Basu

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Dr. Samindra Mohan Biswas

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

-54-

6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Shawli Roy Basu

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse:65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse:65%

Prof. Madhusree Chatterjee

1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%

2.TeachingAbility:65%

3.Sincerity:65%

4.Punctuality:65%

5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclasse: 65%

6.Interestgenerated:65%

7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclasse:65%

Dr. Tanusree Mondal

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

-55-

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Dr. Laxman Chandra Pal

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Argha Saha

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Chinmoy Mishra

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%

-56-

4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Sanjay Sarkar

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers:65%
- 2.TeachingAbility:65%
- 3.Sincerity:65%
- 4.Punctuality: 65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass: 65%
- 6.Interestgenerated: 65%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass:65%

Prof. Sunita Shaw

- 1.Knowledgebaseoftheteachers: 65%
- 2.TeachingAbility: 65%
- 3.Sincerity: 65%
- 4.Punctuality: 65%
- 5.Accessibilityinandoutoftheclass: 65%
- 6.Interestgenerated: 65%
- 7.Qualityofpreparationoftheclass: 65%

Prof. Debtanu Majhi

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%

-57-

3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Prashant Kumar Sharma

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Kamal Roy

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%
2. Teaching Ability: 65%
3. Sincerity: 65%
4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest Generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Sunandita Sarker

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

-58-

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest Generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Saptaparna Saha

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest Generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Nagen Murmu

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Mitali Dey

-59-

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Dr. Sukanta Mukhopadhyay

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Amit Mahato

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Anindita Mitra

-60-

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Mita Chatterjee

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Manisha Das

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Abir Sen

-60-

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Haimanti Banerjee

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Epsita Khan

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

-61-

Prof. Gargi Gangopadhyay

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Sima Nandy

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Arpita Singha Roy

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%

5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%

6. Interest generated: 65%

-62-

7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

Prof. Pabitra Bhattacharya

1. Knowledge base of the teachers: 65%

2. Teaching Ability: 65%

3. Sincerity: 65%

4. Punctuality: 65%
5. Accessibility in and out of the class: 65%
6. Interest generated: 65%
7. Quality of preparation of the class: 65%

So, from this it is established that the teachers are every much capable to deliver the goods to the students and they try their best to meet their demand though sometimes they are faced with problems that are beyond their control. In that case, the teachers are always eager to give their extra to help the students.

Format III STUDENTS' EVALUATION ON COURSE & TEACHING

1. Syllabus- 60%
2. Coverage of the syllabus- 60%
3. Quality of Library Books: 60%
4. Internet Facility: 60%
5. Browsing Facility in the library: 60%
6. Accessibility to the Library Books: 60%
7. Participation of the students in the interactive session: 60%
8. Helpfulness of the Class Tests: 60%
9. Internal Assessment: 60%
10. Are the teachers ready to listen to the problems of the students: 60%

-63-

11. Are the laboratories properly equipped and maintained (for lab based subjects):
12. Availability of books from the Departmental Library: 60%

These services rendered by the college are for the benefit of the students and more the services the better they benefit for the students and there is always scope for improvement. So from the above, the services and the facilities provided to the students in this case though seem to be satisfactory but also it should strive for the best.

Format I OVERALL RATING BY THE STUDENTS

- a. Infrastructural facilities: 60%
- b. Student-teacher relationship: 60%
- c. Response of college authorities: 60%
- d. Response from college office: 60%
- e. Library Services: 60%
- f. Computer/Wifi facilities: 60%
- g. Co-curricular activities: 60%
- h. Sports facilities: 60%
- i. Social atmosphere/relation: 60%
- j. Discipline: 60%
- k. Cleanliness: 60%
- l. Canteen facilities: 60%
- m. NSS activities: 60%

In the overall assessment, the performance of the college and its staff is satisfactory as far as imparting education and facilities to the students are concerned but simple satisfaction is not enough and the institution should set much higher target if it is to make a name for itself.

Conclusion:

On the basis of the feedback of 391 students it is inferred that the teachers to the best of their abilities have been catering to the needs of the students along with the office staff and the Library but it is also the duty of the University to make the syllabus more interesting and job

-64-

oriented as the students after all want to earn after graduating. Having said this the college should also see to the fact that the learners should easily access the web facilities and other modern amenities in order to cope up with the competition.

