

# Students' Feedback on Teachers' Classroom Delivery vis-a-vis Quality of Teaching and Internal Evaluation System

Dr. Sukanta Chandra swain  
Asst. Dean of Faculty of Management Studies  
ICFAI University Jharkhand  
Grand Emerald Building  
Ashok Nagar, Ranchi-834002  
E-mail: [sukanta\\_swain@yahoo.com](mailto:sukanta_swain@yahoo.com)

**Abstract-** *In normative sense, feedback of students improves teachers' skills. In fact, qualified teachers won't take in students' comments as critical, but as useful propositions on how to better dole out their requirements. Using students as an avenue for professional development is a swift and unproblematic way to craft adjustments in teaching on daily basis. However, the pre-requisites for the realization of this sense of students' feedback, i.e., professionalism in both the parties with high level of honesty in giving and taking, have been turned to be the points of concern leading to distortions in quality of teaching and evaluation system. Alternatively, negative interpretation of students' feedback has been proved to be fatal in many cases diluting the very objective of the concept, i.e., quality teaching and due recognition to merit. On the backdrop of the negative interpretation of students' feedback, this paper tries to uncover the brutal consequences that have been experienced or likely to be experienced in our periphery damaging the sanctity of higher education system, particularly in Programmes of Management Education in India.*

**Keywords:** *Students' Feedback on lectures; Quality of Teaching; Internal Evaluation System*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A NASSCOM report reveals that over 3 million graduates and post-graduates get added to the Indian workforce each year, amongst which only 10-15 percent of regular graduates and 25 percent of technical graduates are considered employable by the industry. The situation of MBAs in India is no more different from this trend. As per a recent study conducted by MeriTrac on behalf of recruiting companies, out of 2264 MBAs drawn from over 100 B-Schools beyond the top 25 who sat for tests by recruiting companies, only 21% of them could make the grade and thus had the employability skill. Some of the reasons mentioned for this lopsided figure are lack of focus and definite career path among graduates, gratuitous emphasis on academic excellence, lack of industry-relevant curriculum, lack of quality faculty and the like. The reasons cited for the employability of graduates and post-graduates are nothing new and have been known for quite some time. The lack of 'Job Ready' skills in the course curriculum in majority of higher education institutes (HEIs) and the assessment system with high weight age on theoretical competencies instead of practical know-how is definitely a cause of concern. In short, from the fact mentioned above it's clear that quality of Indian higher education is at crossroad and the punch of it has been felt by every academic experts and planners. Accordingly the focus has now been shifted to introspect

and devise strategies to improve the employability of the students through disseminating quality education.

As a measure of maintaining quality and inculcating the employability skill among the students, almost all HEIs in India have started focusing on students' feedback on class delivery of teachers in order to make the classroom lectures useful for the students by way of accretion of students' interest in attending classes to learn something new and innovative from the classes that will be helpful in their future professional career. Like-wise, in order to continuously keep the students in touch with the studies and to develop a sense of self-grooming, which are very important to make them employable, the HEIs in India have introduced internal assessment system, other-wise known as continual evaluation system, along with the terminal examination system. The three concepts; students' feedback, quality of teaching and internal evaluation system are inter-woven. In normative sense, while quality of teaching is the end, the other two concepts – students' feedback and internal evaluation system are the means to achieve that end. But in many exceptional cases, students' feedback plays the role of demon and thereby dilutes the quality of teaching, and undermines the recognition to merit through distortion in internal evaluation structure.

The objective of this paper is bit different from the normative sense of interpreting students' feedback in the context of quality teaching and internal assessment system. In fact, this paper focuses on the extraordinary situations pertaining to students' feedback and resultant effect on

quality of teaching and internal assessment of students, particularly in HEIs India that offer post-graduate Business Administration courses, i.e., MBA/PGDM/PGPM. The purpose of highlighting this issue is just to make everybody aware of the problem and take steps accordingly so that the very objective of students' feedback will be fulfilled. By highlighting the negative aspects of students' feedback we don't mean to denounce the system, rather we strongly advocate for the system and whole-heartedly intend to implement the system in more rigorous way so that holes if any in the system could be plugged and every stakeholder involved will reap the benefit of the system.

## 2. EVALUATION SYSTEM IN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

As our present study is around the HEIs in India that offers Business Administration courses, before going to the evaluation system in such HEIs, we have to have concrete idea about different types of such HEIs which offer post-graduate Business Administration courses. Broadly we are having two categories of HEIs that offer post-graduate Business Administration courses; i) the University system that offers Master of Business Administration (MBA) and ii) Autonomous system with affiliation to AICTE that offers Post Graduate Diploma in Management (PGDM). In University system, the Universities themselves have their own departments of Business Administration and/or the colleges/institutes affiliated to the Universities offer the MBA programmes. In both the cases, the examination system is controlled by the concerned Universities. But in autonomous system, the institutes/colleges, which offer PGDM programme, get affiliation from the AICTE and the examination system of theirs get completely controlled by themselves. Besides these two categories, there is one more type of organizations in India that offers so called courses in business administration, i.e., Post-Graduate Programme in Management, which do not come under either any University or AICTE. In fact, these organizations don't have any legal status in Indian higher education system. But we cannot ignore them as such because of their achievements in students' preference and corporate acceptability. Like the institutes providing PGDM programme, these institutes' examination system is also controlled by themselves.

### 2.1. Comprehensive and Continual Evaluation

Unlike conventional evaluation system of universities, HEIs offering post-graduate programme in business administration now have either Semester system or Trimester system in which broadly two types of evaluation takes place; i) comprehensive examinations, i.e., terminal or semester end examinations, which is written type and ii) Internal examinations, i.e., continual examinations, which may be in the form of written class test, home assignments, presentation, class participation, case discussion, group discussion, role play, skit, quiz, etc. Besides, such HEIs also have mid-semester or mid-term examination which is

also written type like comprehensive examinations. In University system, the comprehensive and mid-semester or mid-term examinations are controlled by the concerned University's central examination department. So the concerned HEIs don't have any direct involvement either in question setting or evaluation. In fact, the question setters are appointed by the University and for developing one set of questions, a group of question setters get involved along with the moderators. Thus, nobody even the appointed question setters know about the exact question which will come in the question paper. But in case of institutes either offering PGDM or PGPM, the teaching faculty of the course sets the question papers and also evaluates the answer sheets. In case of internal examinations, be it University system or PGDM/PGPM system, the concerned teaching faculty does have considerable autonomy in selecting the components for evaluation and assessing the students with much personal prejudice. Thus, while in case of University system, the teaching faculty has control over only the internal part, in case of institutes offering PGDM or PGPM; the faculty members do have full control over both comprehensive and continual tests. Since the paper focuses on internal evaluation, we have to ignore the comprehensive examinations of University system of HEIs, which are no more internal. Other than this, all other examinations; internal examinations of University system of HEIs and comprehensive along with internal examinations of institutes offering PGDM and PGPM come under the purview of internal in the sense that in all these examinations, the teaching faculty members do have full control from setting of question papers to evaluating the answer sheets. However, in case of comprehensive examinations and mid-semester or mid-term examinations, the teaching faculty cannot to very much unfair as in today's RTI era, every student has the right to check his/her evaluated papers for his satisfaction in evaluation pattern. So in this case, the scope for manipulation is very less for any faculty member. But in internal evaluation, as most of the components bear some sort of subjectivity, manipulating in favour of or against anybody is not that difficult. That's why; it seems that this part of evaluation remains in the hands of the teaching faculty to control over the students.

### 2.2. The Weight age of Marks in Different Evaluations

The weight age of marks to internal and comprehensive examinations varies from HEI to HEI. Some of the commonly practiced weight age of marks to these groups of examinations is given below.

Weight age to Comprehensive	Weight age to Internal/Continual
80%	20%
70%	30%
75%	25%

60%	40%
50%	50%

The logic behind such a high level of concentration on internal/continual evaluation system is to go beyond traditional way of written examinations to add value to the personality of the students and develop the skill of employability. In fact, it has been observed that the components of continual evaluation like presentation, case discussion, role play, group discussion, skit, simulation, etc. make the students confident to speak before the audience and develop the skill of being critical and analytical. But it becomes counter-productive when the evaluator misuses his/her authority of assessing the students on parameters which involve great level of subjectivity. In fact, if the evaluator becomes vindictive for any student/s, s/he can damage a lot by way of awarding very less marks. The subsequent section of this paper deals with this type of vindictive reaction from the evaluator.

Again on segregating weight age to different components of continual/internal evaluation, there are differences among different HEIs and among faculty members of same HEI. In fact, in some HEIs, they give limited autonomy to the faculty members by fixing the components and their weight age. But in some case, the institution gives full autonomy to the faculty members to determine the components and their weight age. In some cases, the institute gives a broad guideline regarding minimum and maximum number of components with weight age cap. It has been observed that faculty members get a considerable extent of autonomy in determination of components and their weight age. For easy administration, some of the faculty members prefer written components like class test or home assignment in continual evaluation much. But for betterment of the students, as there has already been provision of either one or two written examination; terminal and mid-semester/term, the components of continual evaluation should be in non-written form.

### 3. STUDENTS' FEEDBACK SYSTEM

In order to make the classroom teaching interesting and beneficial for the students to fuller extent, all the HEIs in India have been shifted their importance towards the students' feedback on classroom delivery of the teachers so that the class works to be driven in students' way. Moreover, the regulatory bodies of Indian education system like UGC and AICTE have also mandated the same for all HEIs coming under their purview. In fact, owing to regulatory bodies' imposition or for the sake of converting teaching to learning processes, all the HEIs have adopted the practice of taking, analyzing and interpreting students' feedback on classroom delivery of the teachers. That is the reason why now a days in faculty recruitment processes, students also play a crucial role, i.e., the candidates for faculty position give presentation before a class of students and students' feedback on that demo lecture also matters for the selection of any faculty member. However, to make

the students' feedback system effective there should be proper mind set of both the students and faculty members.

#### 3.1. Format for Collecting Students' Feedback

There is no doubt that everybody thinking for betterment of higher education in India particularly Management education has felt the urge of having students' feedback system on classroom delivery and accordingly it has been very common practice for all HEIs in India. However, on the grounds of the way of taking students' feedback, developing the format for the purpose and the way of interpreting the outcome, HEIs vary a lot. But for the sake of having some idea of the exact parameters that are being used by the HEIs to collect the students' feedback, we have produced (in Annexure-I) the commonly used format by most of the HEIs offering programmes in business administration.

If we speak on quality of the format developed for the purpose of gathering students' feedback as presented in Annexure-I, unanimously all will agree that the format is exceptionally exhaustive and well-structured fitted to the objective of strategising how to improve quality in teaching learning process. In fact, we can infer that if the execution and interpretation of a format like this set be done properly, a far-reaching outcome will be achieved. Then where is the problem? The problem lies with how we make use of this format to collect information and there after how we deal with the information so collected.

Most of the HEIs use this set of formats exactly in as it is form while some of them are using the format tampering a little bit. However, the base of the format, by and large remains the same.

#### 3.2. Timing of Collecting Feedback

For extraction of exact feedback one has to be careful for the time of collecting the feed back. In this respect, there is high degree of deviations among different HEIs. While in one Semester/Term, some of the HEIs collect the feedback once just before the Terminal/Comprehensive examinations and some other HEIs collect twice; once just before the mid-semester/term examinations and another just before the terminal/comprehensive examinations. On the other hand, some HEIs collect it at the end of everyday. However, some institutes which are bit advanced in implementation of ICT in their system also have the provision of collecting it online after end of every session so that the concerned faculty members can do the correction in their delivery mode in very next session of their.

The genuine point in the context of timing of collecting feedback is - 'which is the best time of collecting feedback?' Different times of collecting feedback have their own advantages and disadvantages. If we go by analyzing relatively then we can find that collecting feedback just before the examination is not appropriate as students' concentration was there in examinations and they don't take the feedback so seriously. In that case, without spending much time on filling the feedback form, they give some figures even without reading the parameters

properly. In such case what is the advantage of collecting information of that type. One more disadvantage of this is if we take the feedback at the end of the Semester, then there will be no scope for the faculty members to change their way of delivery in the class room. Looking into all these we may suggest to collect feedback at the end of everyday. Then question comes, why not at the end of every session? Yes, if we collect feedback at the end of every session, that will be much better but the problem will be there in administration and time management. For this, there should be sophisticated software developed for the purpose and the classroom should be accordingly ready so that at the end of every session, the students will be given 5 minutes to give their feedback online. If it happens, we may have to sacrifice minimum half an hour of productive class time for feedback. Anyway, for some long term benefit, we should be ready to sacrifice something negligible in short run.

### 3.3. Processing of filled-in Feedback forms

The next important activity after collecting the feedback from the students is to process the same appropriately and quickly so that the same can be reached to the destination, i.e., the concerned faculty members on time. Who should do it? Should it be any administrative staff or teaching staff or the academic coordinator? In our opinion, it should not be any administrative faculty as it is not proper to let the administrative staff know about the weak points of any faculty member. At the same time, it should not be any teaching faculty because there will some sort of temptation to do some manipulations favouring the person concerned or his/her friend faculty members. Similarly, if the academic coordinator does it and it happens to be taken everyday or session-wise, then the coordinator's fulltime job will be only processing of the feedback. But that is not possible. So the solution is technology. That means there should be software for collection and processing of the feedback online and the concerned faculty members will given with their username and password to check the feedback they have received from the students. In fact, the software should be so designed that the processing will automatically be done without delay after 10 minutes of the session completed and the concerned faculty member has to check that before log out his system. If it happens then there will be a full proof transparent feedback system which can be made use of enhancing quality and employability of the students. However, this system of processing feedback is yet to be practiced in common platform.

## 4. INTERPRETATION OF STUDENTS' FEEDBACK FIGURES

After collecting the feedback from the students, most of the HEIs process the same manually and convey the outcome to the faculty members separately with full confidentiality. The problem here is relating to the usefulness of this type of feedback. If the faculty members receive the feedback at the end of the Semester/Term, they

will have nothing to do for the Semester/Term gone by. If at all feedback gets collected twice, may be, the outcome of the mid-Semester/mid-Term feedback will help the faculty members to work on the areas where students show their concern. But if it is collected on daily basis or session-basis and the job is not being through software, then expecting any result out of this is simply foolishness. So only thing that we advocate that there should be online feedback system for every session and the processing of the same is to be done online by the software and will be made available to the faculty members at the end of the day. Although it seems very interesting and transparent that collects accurate feedback, it may also have serious repercussions which have been presented in subsequent section. However, in this section we will focus on how we use the outcome of students' feedback.

Most of the HEIs after collecting the feedback from the students, process it to arrive at the performance of the faculty as per students' views and convey the same to the concerned faculty members. Some of the B-schools have their own way of communicating the same to the faculty members through a certain format.

The inception of the concept of students' feedback has been on the backdrop of improving the quality of teaching and converting teaching into learning processes. But the outcome of the students' feedback has been used in many purposes like in appraising the performance of the faculty members by the institutions and showing that to the prospective employers by the faculty members for better prospects in job. The original objective of students' feedback was to know the students' reaction on teachers' class room delivery so that the teachers can adjust themselves with the wavelength of the students and accordingly the learning process will be effective. In fact, an honest faculty always wants to know the students' expectation from him/her. So students' feedback is the way to convey students' feelings on teachers' delivery to the teachers. But because of multiple use of the outcome of the students' feedback, the concept has lost its sanctity and the faculty members who should be anxious to know the students' perception on their teaching are having fear for knowing that. It's because, if at all, students' feedback on any teacher's class delivery goes wrong, there will be threat of losing the job or getting demoted or holding up the normal increment.

The concern of this issue is instead of using students' feedback in constructive way we are converting it as an instrument to punish. Many instances are there in some HEIs where there is no reward for any faculty if s/he gets excellent students' feedback but there will definitely punishment in one way or other for the faculty members whose feedback is low. In our opinion, instead of punishing the faculty whose students' feedback is low, s/he should be counselled properly and may be for such faculty members, the institution should conduct workshops to train them properly. In some cases, the institution should sponsor the faculty to attend the faculty development programme or refresher/orientation courses in reputed

organizations. Yes, for promoting somebody, this can be one among many parameters.

If the wrong interpretation of students' feedback keeps on moving there will be unbearable consequences on the quality of teaching and internal evaluation system.

## 5. IMPACT OF STUDENTS' FEEDBACK FIGURE

The impact of students' feedback, if it is appropriately interpreted, would definitely be far reaching. It gives the faculty members great scope to improve and transform him/her into a great faculty and makes the students to appropriate benefit out of that transformation. But many a times we find the negative interpretation of the same as mentioned below.

Faculty members who receive excellent feedback from the students on their classroom delivery, they should feel motivated to put extra efforts in order to keep that trend up and get closer to the students expectation day by day. In fact, some of the honest faculty members from that basket do the same and try their best to perform better in the classroom in every semester as compared to the outgoing semester. At the same time, some faculty members from the same basket, instead of keeping that up in true sense, get overwhelmed and complacent. In fact, they take things for granted and neglect their prime job of teaching. However, the negative consequence of those who get excellent feedback from the students is very limited and controllable. But the repercussions of bad students' feedback have been proved in some cases to be more damaging devastating.

As we have already mentioned in the previous sections, there has been multiple use of students' feedback even by the employer. In that case, teachers anticipating substantially low students' feedback become apprehensive to the extent of losing the job or getting demoted or at least to forego the normal increment. To avoid all such unbearable consequences, some of the faculty members from that basket prefer to follow dishonest ways of having excellent feedback. Some of such ways are mentioned below.

In such situation, some of the faculty members keep on developing rapport with the students to make them happy in one way or other going out of the way. Even at times some faculty members use internal evaluation components as tools for their saviour. In fact, they forget to assess the students properly rather they award marks in different components simply seeing the faces and without having any clear demarcation between a good student and average student. In some cases, faculty members use the internal evaluation components as give and take device. Sometimes they go for tacit agreement between the students and themselves for exchange of good marks in internal components and students' feedback forms. In this way, all students get almost marks in the same basket. It discourages the well performers as their merit does not get properly recognized and refrains the average performers to

put hard work as they get marks at par with the toppers of the class doing nothing. By doing all this, the faculty members not only spoil the internal evaluation system of the institution but also distort the nobility of the profession.

If the institution is AICTE affiliated autonomous one or one with no legal status so far as education system of India is concerned, the gravity of distorting of dignity of teaching becomes unexpectedly high. It's because, in this type of institutions, the faculty members have full control over everything of academics – starting from teaching to setting question papers and evaluating answer sheets even in terminal and mid-semester/term examinations. In such cases, some faculty members drive the students' feedback in their way. It's because;

Being the regulator of everything of academics, they may gratify the students doing as per their requirements or threatening them to spoil their career. In either of the way, they may succeed to get good feedback from the students. Threatening may not be everybody's cup of tea but the former one can be accepted by anyone desirous to do so. In some cases, faculty members don't go into the depth of the subject and teach just from the exterior covering the elementary things ignoring the syllabus prescribed so as to create the impression among the students that his teaching is excellent. In that case students may not lose marks in the examinations since as the question setter s/he may set the question just from the portions covered by him/her in the classrooms. If at all s/he is obliged to the students to award good marks for the sake of his/her good feedback but s/he could not convince the students either in the classroom or in the question paper, in that case, s/he awards marks to them for even nothing in the answer sheet because s/he only evaluates.

By doing this, those faculty members help the undeserving students and undeserving faculty members like themselves but do great harm to the deserving students as they get improper dealing or ill-treatment from those faculty members.

At the same time, some wicked students may be there in class who give average feedback to the excellent teachers only because they don't like him. Sometimes, if faculty members become strict to maintain discipline, s/he may get less feedback from few of the students of the class. In that case, the average feedback of those faculty members becomes less as compared to what s/he should have got had it been a fair and honest feedback from the students' side. Sometimes students give bad feedback to the faculty if they don't like the subject the faculty handles. In that case, what is wrong with the faculty? Institutes where feedbacks taken at the end of the Semester/Term, it has been found that students those who don't attend the classes regularly also give the feedback to the faculty members. But that's not fair. There should be minimum criteria for the students to give feedback to the faculty members. As a measure of retaliation, sometimes when the faculty receives bad feedback from the students, s/he tries to take revenge on the concerned students and award them less

marks deliberately on the components those are under his/her control.

## 6. CONCLUSION

It is not that all the faculty members practice negative things that have been enumerated throughout this paper. But yes, it has been practiced by some of the faculty members for whom the entire teaching community get ashamed. If there is chance of misinterpretation of the students' feedback in all fronts; by the employers, by the faculty members and also by the students, should we denounce this system of students' feedback? The answer to this question is big 'no'. If the system is getting misinterpreted, at the same time, it has also lot many positive points that if handled properly could add a lot in the form of quality education and employability of students. Therefore, instead of denouncing the system, efforts should be there how to block the chance of interpreting negatively.

Instead of taking students' feedback at the end or middle of the Semester, it should be taken session-wise and the outcome of the same should be checked directly by the concerned faculty and the Head of the institution. HEIs should develop a system to nurture this students' feedback delicately. In order to give feedback to the faculty members, the students should have the required level of maturity and at the same time to take the students' feedback constructively, faculty members should be broad

and open-minded. The employers should make use of the students' feedback report constructively.

Students' feedback if administered and interpreted properly will definitely enrich all the stakeholders involved in the process.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Agarwal, Pawan. (2006). Higher Education in India. The Need for Change. New Delhi, India: Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations.
- [2] Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) Committee Report on Financing of Higher and Technical Education, June 2005.
- [3] Draft Report of Working Group on Higher Education for the XI Plan, Planning Commission, Government of India (2007)
- [4] Knight, J. & de Witt, H. (Eds.). (1999). Quality and Internationalization of Higher Education. OECD Publications.
- [5] NASSCOM-McKinsey Report
- [6] Tilak, J.B.G. (2004) Public Subsidies in the Education Sector in India. Economic and Political Weekly 39 (4) (24-30 January): 343-59
- [7] Valimaa, J. (2004a), .Nationalisation, Localization and Globalization in Finnish Higher Education., Higher Education, Vol. 48, pp. 27-54.
- [8] www.ugc.ac.in

## Annexure-I

### Sample Questionnaires Feedback from Universities Students

#### Questionnaire No. 1

#### University XYZ

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester/Term/Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Students are required to rate the courses on the following attributes using the 4 -point scale shown. The format given is for one course. Do the same for other courses on separate page.

#### Course-I

Parameters	A Very Good	B Good	C Satisfactory	D Unsatisfactory
1. Depth of the course content including project work if any				
2. Extent of coverage of course				
3. Applicability/relevance to real life situations				
4. Learning value (in terms of knowledge, concepts, manual skills, analytical abilities and broadening perspectives)				
5. Clarity and relevance of textual reading material				
6. Relevance of additional source material (Library)				
7. Extent of effort required by students				
8. Overall rating				

**Questionnaire No. 2**

**University XYZ**

**Student Feedback on Teachers (Separate for each Teacher)**

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester/Term/Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Please rate the teacher on the following attributes using the 4 -point scale shown

Name of the Teacher \_\_\_\_\_

Parameters	A Very Good	B Good	C Satisfactory	D Unsatisfactory
1. Knowledge base of the teacher (as perceived by you)				
2. Communication Skills (in terms of articulation and comprehensibility)				
3. Sincerity / Commitment of the teacher				
4. Interest generated by the teacher				
5. Ability to integrate course material with environment/other issues, to provide a broader perspective				
6. Ability to integrate content with other courses				
7. Accessibility of the teacher in and out of the class (includes availability of the teacher to motivate further study and discussion outside class)				
8. Ability to design quizzes /Tests /assignments / examinations and projects to evaluate students understanding of the course				
9. Provision of sufficient time for feedback				
10. Overall rating				

**Questionnaire No. 3**

**University XYZ**

**Students' overall Evaluation of Programme and Teaching**

(To be filled only after Results are out)

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Course : \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher : \_\_\_\_\_

Year : \_\_\_\_\_

Your responses will be seen only after your course results have been finalised and recorded.

The information will be used only for the improvement of the course and teaching in the future.

**You need not disclose your name if you do not wish to.**

**You may tick off more than one answer to a question to the extent that it does not invalidate your response.**

- The syllabus was
 

a) challenging	b) dull
c) adequate	d) inadequate
- Your background for benefiting from the course was
 

a) more than adequate	b) just adequate
c) inadequate	d) cannot say
- Was the course conceptually difficult to understand?
 

a) easy	b) manageable
c) difficult	d) very difficult

4. How much of the syllabus was covered in class?
  - a) 85 to 100%
  - b) 70 to 85%
  - c) 55 to 70%
  - d) less than 55%
5. What is your opinion about the library materials for the course?
  - a) excellent
  - b) adequate
  - c) inadequate
  - d) very poor
6. Were you able to get the prescribed readings?
  - a) easily
  - b) with difficulty
  - c) not at all
  - d) with great difficulty
7. How well did the teacher prepare for class?
  - a) thoroughly
  - b) satisfactorily
  - c) poorly
  - d) indifferently
8. How well was the teacher able to communicate?
  - a) effectively
  - b) invariably
  - c) satisfactorily
  - d) badly
9. Did the teacher encourage student participation in class?
  - a) yes
  - b) attempted
  - c) not at all
  - d) sometimes
10. If yes, which of the following methods were used?
  - a) encouraged questions
  - b) discussion in class
  - c) discussion outside class
  - d) discussion individually
11. How helpful was the teacher in advising?
  - a) helpful
  - b) unhelpful
  - c) sometimes helpful
  - d) sometimes unhelpful
12. Was the teacher
  - a) courteous
  - b) rude
  - c) indifferent
  - d) strict
13. Did the internal assessment work?
  - a) fairly
  - b) regularly
  - c) helpfully
  - d) cannot say
14. What effect do you think the internal assessment will have on your course grade?
  - a) improve it
  - b) lower it
  - c) no effect
  - d) cannot say
15. How did the teacher provide feedback on your performance?
  - a) regularly/irregularly
  - b) in time/late
  - c) with helpful comments
  - d) without comments
16. Were your assignments discussed with you?
  - a) yes, fully
  - b) yes, partly
  - c) no
  - d) sometimes
17. Were you provided with a course and lecture outline at the beginning?
  - a) yes
  - b) no
18. Was it helpful?
  - a) yes
  - b) no



19. Was it followed?  
a) yes  
b) no
20. Was there any opportunity for personal interaction with teachers?  
a) Yes  
b) to some extent  
c) nil  
d) cannot say
21. Was there any opportunity for small group work?  
a) Yes  
b) to some external  
c) nil  
d) cannot say
22. Were outsider experts invited to address you?  
a) Yes  
b) rarely  
c) none  
d) frequently
23. Did you visit industries, laboratories, banks and outside Universities/  
a) Ye, frequently  
b) some times  
c) no  
d) yes, rarely
24. If you have other comments to offer on the course and the instructor you may do so below or on a separate sheet.