

LOGO

**POLICY ON FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS
ON CURRICULUM, SYLLABUS, TEACHING-
LEARNING & ASSESSMENT**

XYZ UNIVERSITY

01	01/01/2026	Issued for Implementation
Rev.	Date	Description
POLICY No.		

POLICY ON FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS ON CURRICULUM, SYLLABUS, TEACHING-LEARNING & ASSESSMENT

1. PRELIMINARY

Short Title, Applicability and Commencement

- (a) This Policy may be called, *"XYZ UNIVERSITY POLICY ON FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS ON CURRICULUM AND SYLLABUS"*.
- (b) The Policy shall apply to all the constituent schools, departments and other academic units of the XYZ University
- (c) The Policy shall come into force from the date of approval by the Board of Management
- (d) The Scope of this Policy doesn't include Students feedback on Teachers, Admin, Sports & Clubs, Learning Resources, Supporting Infrastructure and Students Exit Feedback a yet another requirement (to be dealt with separately).

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Feedback on curriculum and syllabus from the stakeholders and professionals provides a useful input to review, redesign, and redevelop the same so as to make it increasingly relevant to the students' learning and in meeting the attributes required from a given program of study. It further helps in analyzing and arriving at the impact assessment of its efficacy. This policy is annexed with feedback questionnaire, analytic report and action-taken report. It also sets a standard mechanism of feedback protocol. The mechanism works best when feedback, particularly from the students is sought on online mode (preferably anonymous) to allow for free expression of views. Class-wise feedback obtained by each program should be analyzed at the Department level and Analytical Report thus prepared would require definite action at various levels. Action-taken Report prepared by the Department shall have two components namely (a) Action at the Department/School level (b) Action flagged for the decision by the concerned officers of the university/ AC/BOM/ GB. When feedback warrants an urgent action or resolution by the Head of the Institution, the same be put up to the Head of Institution. A decision or resolution so obtained, if requires ratification by the AC/BOM/GB the same maybe placed before such committee/s, subsequently.

2.2. The policy is an outcome of deliberations done at various levels involving the stakeholders and is approved by the AC and BOM with input for quality by the IQAC.

3. OBJECTIVES

- To establish a mechanism of feedback and protocols with a view to address students' issues and provide solution.
- To provide clarity to all faculty and staff of academic units of this university on what would be expected from them with regards to obtaining feedback on curriculum and syllabus on regular basis.

- To review strengths and weaknesses in the design, development and relevance of curriculum and syllabus and effectiveness of delivery with a view to improve outcomes of program and courses and their delivery and assessment tools.
- To provide students of XYZ university an opportunity to project their recommendations for improving the curriculum and syllabus and be a part of university's governance system.
- To create adequate input for the BOS/ Curriculum and Syllabus revision committees at various levels in carrying out needed reforms from time to time.

4. STAKEHOLDERS: STUDENTS, TEACHERS, EMPLOYERS, PROFESSIONALS' FEEDBACK

4.1 Students

4.1.1. Students' feedback on the syllabus/curriculum shall be obtained during: -

- Mid Semester
- Semester End.

4.1.1.1. Mid-Semester Feedback:

Students' Mid-Semester feedback is aimed at providing resolutions to students' urgent academic concerns, while the students are half-way through their courses. On the other hand, Semester-end feedback, enables a structured, detailed and deep-down review of a program curriculum, course syllabus, teaching-learning and assessments aimed at benefiting students of the subsequent batch. Hence, the mid-semester feedback is extremely relevant and highly productive to the current batch of students. When designing a questionnaire, it should be kept in mind that the Mid-semester feedback should deal with only the urgent and compelling needs of the ongoing semester-courses. Accordingly, Dean Schools/HODs should not stay away from providing genuine redressal to students, course-correcting, where needed even without formal approval of BOS/AC. The decisions so taken if deemed necessary, maybe subsequently put up before the relevant bodies for ratification of the same. It therefore goes without saying that the questionnaire of the Mid-semester will accordingly have relevant questions of immediate critical changes such as :

- (a) specific difficulty if any in learning a specific course or a part thereof (specify course and its part).
- (b) whether course content delivered thus far was relevant to building foundational knowledge, employability and skilling. If not, which all courses required this focus
- (c) whether there was a need to review and re-design a specific course's credits and Lecture-Tutorial-Practical scheme (specify the course and extent of change required)
- (d) whether a specific course faculty is unable to impart instructions and meet course learning outcomes requiring a change (specify the course)
- (e) adequacy of supporting labs, software and learning resources (library books and databases) to attain course outcomes
- (f) whether a mentor/remedial classes/mentor-mentee scheme (whichever introduced by the department) was effective and useful in resolving day-to-day classroom academic learning

deficiencies. The Mid-term feedback proforma would require descriptive responses to understand students' issues without any ambiguity and language barrier.

4.1.1.2. Semester-End Feedback:

While a full-fledge exercise on review and revision of curriculum and courses may be undertaken once in two/three years, critical issues warranting additions, deletions, corrections as part of sustained and continuous improvements including incorporating regulatory norms and frameworks issued by the regulatory bodies from time to time must always be addressed once annually by the regular BOS/AC. Semester-end feedback of current batch therefore provides a very useful input for incorporating changes in curriculum, courses and related academic infrastructure for the batches of the subsequent year. The End-Semester feedback so obtained by the Departments in respect of their programs should be analyzed and analysis report prepared. The Analysis and Action-taken report (ATR) so prepared should be presented in the BOS/AC meetings and thereafter, placed before the BOM/GB after additional input by the IQAC on the quality of process followed by the departments, Analysis and the ATR. The feedback after its due perusal by the BOM/GB should be uploaded on the ERP for the information of faculty and students.

Let this policy provide for a step-wise clarity of the process as under:

4.1.1.3 Mid-Semester Feedback - Stepwise Explanation

Step 1: Feedback on a descriptive proforma for the Mid-Semester (Suggested in **Annexure-1**) shall be administered to students of a specific program centrally by the IT Head (one questionnaire for all courses of an ongoing Semester) online and anonymous, immediately after the second minor (assuming two minor examinations before the end-semester examination). It can be administered through Google Forms/Microsoft 365/ LMS requiring submission of response by a given date.

Step 2: The feedback so obtained may be collated and analyzed by the Program Coordinator, question-wise and Analysis Report prepared. Mid-Semester Feedback Analysis sample at **Annexure-II**

Step 3: Program Coordinator shall develop a draft ATR based on the Analytical Report and put up to the HOD for value-addition. ATR would be finalized with decisions arrived at by the Dean School/HOD and the same recorded in the minutes of a faculty council meeting. Such decisions as may be essential to be referred to the VC/Director/Principal may be suitably flagged and put up to the concerned officers. ATR sample at **Annexure-III**

Step 4: The decisions so taken by the Dean School/HOD would be intimated to students through the ERP/LMS/Message (as per institute practice). ATR of mid-semester must be made public within 30 days of the date stipulated for receiving the feedback.

4.1.1.4 Students' Semester-end feedback

Step 1: Semester-end feedback shall be similarly administered to students as stated above. The proforma for the 'End-Semester Feedback' is placed at **Annexure-IV**.

Step 2: Similarly, the Program Head/ HOD shall prepare a Semester Analysis Report. Sample of 'End-Semester Feedback Analysis' is at **Annexure-V**

Step 3: ATR report should be prepared inclusive of major points in the mid semester and end semester feedback and their analysis. The 'End-Semester Action Taken Report' is placed at **Annexure-VI**. Hence a Department with more than one program shall have exclusive annexures of each program feedback analysis and ATR reports. Duly approved by the BOS these would be placed before the IQAC for the sole purpose of quality audit of the entire process which includes but not limited to relevance of questionnaire, quality of analysis and ATR prepared co-relating it with the action taken in improvement of curriculum, syllabus, teaching-learning and assessment. Each School/Department would forward ATR to the AC for approval.

Step 4: Registrar shall place Annual ATR of all Schools/Departments to the BOM's regular meetings for approval and after approval, publish it in the ERP/digital channel for students' information.

Step 5: Dean (A) shall prepare "Annual impact Assessment" of feedback of various stakeholders and present it to the BOM and GB.

4.2. Faculty Feedback

4.2.1. Faculty Course Exit Feedback will be obtained as under:

4.2.1.1. Faculty Course Exit Feedback is to be obtained from the course faculty after the end of every semester with a view to give an opportunity to the faculty to bring out various short-comings in the syllabus and recommend improvements/ changes for an overall improvement which may include but not limited to a change of course scheme, syllabus, course content, introducing new case studies, experiments, field projects, innovate teaching tools to improve course outcomes, inducing new skills, ability enhancement, course learning assessment and evaluation techniques etc. The feedback will aim at providing essential input to the Board of Studies in reviewing and revising course syllabus. It provides an opportunity to a faculty to self-evaluate his/her performance and identify training need for self-development and improvement of skill/s necessary to deliver the same course to the next batch of students. The feedback shall further induce a need in faculty to introduce new and enabling features in the LMS for asynchronous teaching-learning and contemporary digital tools for synchronous mode of teaching learning to give valuable experience to his/her students. The feedback provides faculty output in students learning outcomes, results, placements etc. This feedback is a sum total of demonstrated teaching-learning experience and is a full-fledged report on the Course.

Similar to students' feedback, respective coordinators of the programs shall prepare "Faculty Feedback Analysis Report prior to the start of the next semester and after due approve of HODs, the Department Coordinator shall place the Report before the BOS along with a proposal of actions required to be taken during the ensuring year. The online feedback Report duly analyzed and with recommendations for actions to be forwarded by each college/department to the IQAC for quality value addition and thereafter placed before AC and Board of Management/GB by the Registrar before the beginning of the next semester classes. The Format for 'Faculty Feedback on Curriculum /Syllabus' is attached as **Annexure-VII**.

4.3. Employers Feedback

4.3.1. The feedback on curriculum and syllabus will be obtained from the Employers through online mode, once annually. The university shall break-down the list of employers in two and more groups in such a way that each group of employers is requested to submit feedback on the curriculum and syllabus only once in three years. The objective is to involve employers into value-addition and to carryout due changes in the course syllabus and program curriculum periodically so as to meet employers' expectations from the university and the students. It provides a basic industry perspective necessary for the Curriculum Design and Development Committee/BOS to take the inputs forward, after due deliberations. The feedback also serves to provide useful input to the departments to hone-in the required skills in their students so as to render them decidedly better employable. The feedback of employers so obtained by the Placement Officer shall be similarly analyzed, and Action-taken Report prepared for onward submission to the Dir IQAC for quality value-addition who after due approval during quarterly IQAC meeting and subsequently placed by the Registrar before AC/BOM shall forward the same to the concerned schools and departments for action. This shall also be uploaded on the ERP. The format of 'Employers' Feedback on the Program Curriculum' is attached as **Annexure-VIII**.

4.4. Alumni Feedback

4.4.1. The Alumni network of this university comprises of eminent leaders, managers and entrepreneurship working at high places. Their feedback is important to the curriculum improvement more so when digital advances are evolving very rapidly. It is important for XYZ university to obtain industry input of skills needed by our students as also evaluate the impact of the current curriculum in our young alumni as a barometer of their effectiveness and demonstrated performance as leaders in the first 3 to 5 years of their service. Alumni would preferably be approached for online feedback by the Dean Alumni annually, analyze feedback, prepare Action-taken report and present the same in the IQAC meeting for quality check. The Report would be placed by the Registrar before AC BOM/GB and after due approval, will disseminate to all concerned schools and departments as also upload on the website. The format for 'Alumni Feedback on Curriculum' is at **Annexure-IX**.

4.5 Professionals Feedback

4.5.1. XYZ university will rely on the feedback of Professionals who are the members from industry, academia and research bodies in India and abroad, preferably those in various statutory and non-statutory bodies in their respective areas of the discipline. These will be identified by the Director IQAC in consultation with the schools and departments. IQAC may include some experts from well-established professional bodies and institutes of eminence, and seek their feedback as well. The Director, IQAC is responsible for the feedback and shall administer the same online, once in two years and prepare the report as also develop Action-taken Report on the same. In addition to approval by the BOM/GB, the feedback shall also be shared with all BOS as input for the review and revision of the curriculum. The format of 'Professionals' Feedback on Curriculum and Syllabus' is attached **Annexure-X**.

5. PROTOCOLS FOR THE FEEDBACK

5.1 The protocols attached with the policy are highly effective mechanism to fix various responsibilities for obtaining timely feedback, analyzing, approval and dissemination of feedback. The same is attached as **Annexure-XI**.

6. REMOVING OF DIFFICULTY

XYZ reserves the right to amend the policy as many times as it feels essential. The issues involved in designing policy are dynamic in nature and will require this policy to be reviewed and revised periodically.

Annexure-I

Mid-Semester Student Feedback Questionnaire (BTech CSE 2025-29 – Semester III)

Enrollment No. of the Student Class

Program Course Name & Code

UG / PG - Year & Semester

Q No	Question (Descriptive, Course-Specific)	Response Type (write your concerns/recommendations)
A1	Is the Semester III CSE curriculum manageable in terms of difficulty and workload?	
A2	In Data Structures, are stacks, queues, and linked lists explained clearly with examples?	
A3	In OOP using Java, are concepts like class, object, inheritance clearly understood?	
A4	In Discrete Mathematics, are logic, relations, and functions explained step-by-step?	
A5	In Computer Organization & Architecture, are number systems and memory concepts understandable?	
A6	Are Data Structures and OOP lab sessions helping you apply theory concepts?	
A7	Is the pace of teaching suitable across all core CSE courses this semester?	
A8	Are internal assessments aligned with what is taught in class and lab?	
A9	Of all the courses which course/ according to you not being taught by competent faculty? (Mention course/s only)	
A10	Any feedback you wish to share that was not covered above.	

Annexure-II

Mid-Semester Feedback Analysis (BTech CSE 2025-29 – Semester III)

Course	Key Student Feedback	Analysis
Data Structures	Fast pace; difficulty in linked lists	Needs slower coverage and more practice
OOP using Java	Syntax clear; OOP concepts confusing	More examples and coding demos required
Discrete Mathematics	Highly abstract and difficult	More solved problems needed
COA	Theory heavy; terminology confusing	Simplify explanations with diagrams
Labs	Useful but limited time	Increase guided practice
Faculty	Course faculty on discrete Mathematics unable to teach with applied knowledge	Needs urgent replacement
Additional points	Industry project requested	Requires a quick tie up.

Annexure-III

Mid-Semester Action Taken Report (BTech CSE 2025-29 – Semester III)

Issue Identified	Course	Action Taken	Responsibility	Timeline
Fast teaching pace	Data Structures	Added extra tutorial and recap sessions	Course Faculty	Immediate
Weak OOP concepts	OOP using Java	Introduced live coding demonstrations	Faculty	Immediate
Abstract concepts difficult	Discrete Mathematics	Additional solved examples in class	Faculty	Immediate
COA complexity	COA	Use simplified diagrams and hardware examples	Faculty	Ongoing
Limited lab time	Labs	Scheduled additional practice slots	Lab In-charge	Ongoing
Faculty	Discrete Math	Faculty replaced	-	-
Additional points	A project on coding	Internal project would suffice in Semester-III	Faculty	Industry project may be undertaken in Semester IV

Annexure-IV

Enrollment No. of the Student **Class**
Program **Course Name & Code**
UG / PG - Year & Semester

End-Semester Student Feedback Questionnaire (BTech CSE 2025-26 Semester-(III))

Q No	Question (Descriptive, Outcome-Oriented)	Response Type (Concerns/Recommendations)
B1	Did Semester III CSE courses strengthen your computer science foundation?	
B2	Which course contributed most to your learning and why?	
B3	Which course was most difficult by the end of semester and why?	
B4	Has Data Structures improved your problem-solving ability?	
B5	Has OOP using Java improved your coding confidence?	
B6	Are you confident to take advanced CSE courses in the next semester?	
B7	Were labs effective in reinforcing theory learning?	
B8	Were assessments fair and aligned with teaching?	
B9	Does any course require syllabus improvement or redesign?	
B10	Were mid semester feedback if given by you/other students on some critical concern/s acted upon and that improved the outcomes ?	
B11	Is any faculty ineffective in teaching affecting learning outcomes? (Mention course only)	
B12	Any feedback not covered in the above questions.	

Annexure-V

End-Semester Feedback Analysis (BTech CSE 2025-26 – Semester III)

Focus Area	Key Findings	Implication
Curriculum	Strong core CS foundation	Curriculum direction appropriate
Data Structures	Good learning but needs more practice	Increase lab/tutorial exposure
OOP using Java	Improved confidence	Scale up competency with industry-linked project.
Discrete Mathematics	Remains challenging despite a faculty change on mid-semester feedback	Add bridge/support modules
Teaching Effectiveness	One course flagged.	Faculty development needed.
Action-taken on Mid-semester feedback	Outcomes were improved and yet it continued to be an area requiring students to take extra mentoring classes.	Mentor-mentees initiatives.

Annexure-VI

End-Semester Action Taken Report (BTech CSE 2025-26 – Semester III)

Issue	Action to be taken before the next Academic session	Key competencies development and ownership
Need more DS practice	Increase Data Structures lab hours	BOS to address course scheme with improved L-T-P giving more emphasis on Practical.
Math abstraction issue	Introduce Discrete Math bridge module	BOS to develop Bridge course modules and plan the same in the Time table. Develop Mentor-Mentee scheme in this area.
Computer Organization and Architectural complexity	Revise teaching plan with higher Bloom's taxonomy level requiring students to analyze, evaluate and design architecture. Add more contact hours. Let faculty use visual pipeline diagrams and animation and simulators as tools of teaching.	Faculty concerned to develop competency with focus on multi-layered abstraction, concurrency and parallelism, quantitative performance analysis. Recommended a Certification MOOC course.
Teaching concern	Faculty development in key concern areas where course outcomes were of level 1 and 2 in courses having threshold of 40%.	Department to organize faculty development in domain area as also introduce contemporary simulation and teaching tools.
Student readiness	Strengthen mentoring system	Student support and off the classroom hours guidance. Labs to be opened on extended timings.

Annexure-VII

(Refers to paragraph 4.2.1.1)

Faculty Feedback on Curriculum /Syllabus

Name of the Faculty

Class

Program

Course Name and code

UG - Year and Semester

PG Year and Semester

SI No.	Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unable to Comment
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The curriculum adequately covers Major, Minor, Multi-disciplinary, vocational, value-added courses, skill and ability enhancement courses including internships and research project as required by the Credit and Curriculum design framework.					
2	The course syllabus converted to course outcomes was further aligned to program outcomes, blooms taxonomy levels, teaching and assessment tools.					
3	The course content was contemporary and skill competencies included in the syllabus were essentially relevant to the industry and for self-employment of students.					
4	The course assessment (question-papers, projects, internships and assignments etc.) were aligned to course learning outcomes and accordingly measured towards course attainments. The course attainment level of my course in the ensuing semester was level 3					
5	The course syllabus was within the scope of my existing teaching competencies and expertise and was effectively delivered leveraging contemporary teaching methodologies and tools.					
6	The evaluation process was in keeping with the examination reforms using examination software.					
7	The syllabus was within the easy grasp of students and was fully covered and revised. Where required, additional remedial classes were organized.					
8	The students found the syllabus quite exciting to learn and reflect upon					

Q. 9 Suggestions for improvement of self and the course (not exceeding 250 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

Annexure-VIII

(Refers to paragraph 4.3.1)

Employers' Feedback on the Program Curriculum

Name of the Employer: **Program:**

Designation: **Date of feedback**

We appreciate you for your structured feedback to improve our Program curriculum.

S No.	Feedback of Curriculum/Syllabus	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unable to Comment
		5	4	3	2	1
01	How satisfied are you with the knowledge, skills and competencies of our students hired by you and agree that the curriculum of our program/s is impactful?					
02	Does our overall curriculum design meet the industry needs?					
03	How have our students performed in your industry in respect of values, ethics, attitude, sensitivity towards gender, diversity, co-existence, reflection in patriotism, care for the disadvantaged society and decent behaviour? How satisfied are you with our students hired by you in the past?					
04	Did you find usefulness of electives offered in our curriculum that prepare students for the multi-disciplinary streams, wide choice for careers as well as entrepreneurs and as life-long learners?					
05	Do our programmes prepare students as effective communicators, leaders and managers?					
06	Did you find out students aware of their responsibilities towards the climate, protection of natural resources, sustainability and circular economy?					
07	Did you find a spark in our students in thinking out of box, disrupting status-quo and innovating?					
08	Whether our students working in your organization have demonstrated professional skills, evolved a new idea or process and added value and wealth to the organization?					
09	Rate the practical and applied knowledge of students in terms of their relevance to the real-life application?					
10	Rate our students learning from the value-added courses and internships which form essential part of our curriculum.					

Q.11 Please write any 5 competencies you would like us to build in our students and include in our curriculum.

.....

.....

.....

.....

Annexure-IX

(Refers to paragraph 4.4.1)

Alumni Feedback on Curriculum

Name of Alumnus **Batch**

Company serving with designation **Program of study**

We thank you and appreciate for your structured feedback to improve our program curriculum

SI No.	Description	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unable to Comment
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The program outcomes and course outcomes are clearly stated and outcomes accordingly evaluated and continuously improved upon.					
2	There is an enhanced emphasis on high order learning, practical knowledge, work projects and labs.					
3	The skill-development, innovation and entrepreneurship receive the highest focus to make students increasingly employable.					
4	The curriculum is forwarding-looking and caters for multi-disciplinary learning through electives and provides for flexible options					
5	There is adequate emphasis on human values, ethics, behaviour, attitude, service for the community and life transferable skill-development.					
6	Appropriate and innovative teaching-learning methods are used to provide facility for continuous learning in the curriculum					
7	Assessment and evaluation are robust and program outcomes are well documented. These are designed in sync with the program and course outcomes.					
8	The curriculum provides a lot of experiential learning and minimum of two internships. This makes students increasingly employable.					
9	The curriculum is periodically revised to adopt to ever evolving external businesses challenges and technology advancements.					
10	I found that the program curriculum and course syllabi at the university delivered on building students competent and as well-rounded personalities ready for the future challenges.					

Q.11 Any additional suggestion (approximately 250 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

Annexure-X

(Refers to paragraph 4.5.1)

Professionals' Feedback on Curriculum and Syllabus

Name Designation

Organization Program

We thank you and appreciate for your structured feedback on the curriculum improvement

SI No.	Questions	Responses	
		Yes	No
1	Curriculum is adequately designed and periodically updated with special emphasis on the spirit and essential aspects as enshrined in the NEP 2020.		
2	It receives highest importance in the higher order learning, building new knowledge, building research and making students the global leaders and managers as also responsible citizens of the society.		
3	The curriculum is easily comparable with the best in the world in the given discipline.		
4	The curriculum has within it well thought-out courses which enable meet students' outcomes of a program in sync with students' attributes.		
5	The assessment and evaluation well mapped with the course and program outcomes.		
6	The curriculum meets the individual, societal, local, regional national and global needs and aspirations.		

Q 7 Any other suggestion that you may offer

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Annexure-XI

(Refers to Feedback Policy Para 4.1)

FEEDBACK PROTOCOLS

1. STUDENTS MID AND END SEMESTER FEEDBACK PROTOCOL

- Type of feedback: Curriculum, Syllabus, Teaching-Learning & Assessment
- Constituency: Individual students for each course.
- Methodology of Data Gathering: Preferably online- A representative sample, at least 50% students of the class.
- Data collection frequency: Mid and End Semester
- Data collection responsibility: Department Course Coordinator
- Statistical Analysis: Descriptive and Inferential
- Frequency of Analysis, Interpretation and Action Taken Report: End Semester
- Faculty Responsible to forward complete report to HoD
- HoD to forward consolidated report to Director, IQAC
- Assessment Goal: At least 50% students participated for at least 75% responses.

2. FACULTY'S COURSE EXIT FEEDBACK PROTOCOL

- Type of feedback: Course Exit feedback.
- Constituency: Individual faculty for each course delivered in every Semester.
- Methodology of Data Gathering: A representative sample (at least 75%) of the faculty data.
- Data collection frequency: Every Course exit
- Data collection responsibility: Department Course Coordinator
- Statistical Analysis: Descriptive and Inferential
- Frequency of Analysis, Interpretation, Action Taken Report: At the end of every course delivered
- Faculty Responsible to forward complete report to HoD
- HoD to forward consolidated report to Director, IQAC
- Assessment Goal: At least 50% faculty participated for at least 75% responses on the given metrics with 3/4 satisfaction level.

3. ALUMNI FEEDBACK PROTOCOL

- Type of feedback: Curriculum and courses syllabus.
- Constituency: Alumni
- Methodology of Data Gathering: Online feedback Form and Alumni Meet
- Data collection frequency: Once in a year (no repeat alumni)
- Data collection responsibility: Dean Alumni
- Statistical Analysis: Descriptive and Inferential
- Frequency of Analysis and Interpretation: Annual

- Responsibility for Analysis, Interpretation and Action Taken Report – Dean Alumni
- Faculty Responsible for the entire process: Director IQAC
- Assessment Goal: 35% of the alumni to answer at least 75% of feedback questions and meet 3/4 satisfaction level

4. EMPLOYERS' FEEDBACK PROTOCOL

- Type of feedback: Curriculum Feedback of program/s
- Constituency: Employers
- Methodology of Data Gathering: Online through mailing and offline while visiting campus for hiring.
- Data collection frequency: Annual (no repeat employer)
- Data collection responsibility: Placement Officer
- Statistical Analysis: Descriptive and Inferential
- Frequency of Analysis and Interpretation: Annual
- Responsibility for Analysis, Interpretation and Action Taken Report: Dean of the respective college/faculty.
- Faculty Responsible for this assessment tool: Placement Officer and Dir IQAC
- Assessment Goal: 60% of the received surveys will convey an average of 2.5/4 satisfaction level.

5. PROFESSIONALS FEEDBACK AS PART OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE PROTOCOL

- Type of feedback: Curriculum of a program
- Constituency: Advisory committee
- Methodology of Data Gathering: Online survey and input from the Minutes of the Meetings
- Data collection frequency: Once in two years (Odd years)
- Data collection responsibility: Coordinator IQAC
- Statistical Analysis: Descriptive and Inferential
- Frequency of Analysis, Interpretation and Action Taken Report: Once in two years (odd years)
- Responsibility for Analysis, Interpretation and Action Taken Report: Director IQAC
- Faculty Responsible: Director IQAC
- Assessment Goal: 60% of received survey should meet 3/4 satisfaction level.

6. FEEDBACK APPROVAL IN VARIOUS STATUTORY BODIES

- Students and Faculty Feedback would be put-up to Board of Studies and Academic Council
- Feedback of all Stakeholders (comprehensive) duly analysed at the level of BOS, AC and IQAC would be put-up by the Registrar to the Board of Management/Governing Body, twice annually for perusal and directions, if any. Analytic Report and ATR should be uploaded on the ERP for students' information. Action taken in the case of Mid Semester feedback would be uploaded on the ERP for student information without any delay/statutory bodies approval.