



# **BIDHANNAGAR COLLEGE**

EB-2, Sector 1, Salt Lake City,  
Kolkata-700064, India

Under Graduate

&

Post Graduate

**STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ANALYSIS**

2022-23

## Analysis of UG & PG Student Feedback for the Academic Year 2022-2023

### Mechanism of the Feedback Analysis:


A mechanism of quantification based on the analysis of student feedback is adopted, using parameters related to a variety of items like the Course, the respective Department in general, and the Teachers in particular. In quest of some sort of objectivity, only the outgoing final year students of every UG & PG program are called upon to respond to the questionnaire, severally. Like the last year, this year's feedbacks are taken from students in completely **ONLINE** mode.

### A. Analysis of the College-level Infrastructural Facilities and Activities:

The 9-item questionnaire relates to the college level Infrastructural facilities and activities. Each question has 5 options - A, B, C, D, and E. A, as verbally demonstrated to the students, stands for Excellent, B for Very Good, C for Good, D for Fair, and E for Poor. The method quantification employed has several steps undertaken serially.

- **Step-1:** Difficult as the grades are to visualize, they are ordinal and this justifies the correspondence developed of the grades to the numerical data assigned. Grade A is thus quantified as 5; B as 4; C as 3; D as 2; E as 1.
- **Step-2:** For each of the 9 items, the 'score' of the college-level Infrastructural facilities and activities at first computed over all the 16 departments, therefore score for the college is prepared to make a visual representation based on the average over department-wise scores, in which the high value (towards 5) indicates good performance and the low value (towards 1), poor.
- **Step-4:** A Bar Diagram is prepared on the scores over 9 different items representing college-level Infrastructural facilities and activities.
- **Step-5:** To get a single index over 9 items for a specific year, we have taken the average of the 9 indices. Thus a single composite index for the college is obtained.
- **Step-6:** A scale adjustment to the department-wise indices and college-level index is made so that it takes values within the span of 0 (zero) and 1 (one), where 0 is indicative of the worst possible performance and 1 indicates the best possible. 0.5 denotes the average. The adjusted indices are presented in the following Table 1.

Following the above steps, we found the normalized score of the college on Infrastructural facilities and activities is **0.722**. Last year (session 2021-22) this figure was **0.734**.



1. Cleanliness of Toilets, 2. Cleanliness of Campus, 3. Administrative Help, 4. Environment for Co-curricular Activities, 5. Scope for Indoor Games, 6. Environment for Cultural Activities, 7. Central Library Books: Availability & Access, 8. Co-operation of Library Staff, 9. Access to Online Academic Resources.

### **B. Analysis of the Department-wise Infrastructural Facilities and Activities:**

The 5 item questionnaire (a set of two) relates to the Infrastructural facilities and activities owned by the Department. Each question has 5 options - A, B, C, D and E. A, as verbally demonstrated to the students, stands for Excellent, B for Very Good, C for Good, D for Fair and E for Poor. The questionnaire involves a multiplicity of items and issues like learning value of the course, its depth and applicability, the infrastructure of a department and its academic ambience.

The method quantification employed has a number of steps undertaken serially.

- **Step-1:** Difficult as the grades are to visualize, they are ordinal in nature and this justifies the correspondence developed of the grades to the numerical data assigned. Grade A is thus quantified as 5; B as 4; C as 3; D as 2; E as 1.
- **Step-2:** For each of the 5 items, the 'score' of is thus prepared to make a visual representation of the college on the basis of the average gradings over department-wise responses, in which the high value (towards 5) indicates good performance and the low value (towards 1), poor.
- **Step-3:** In order to get a single index over 5 items for a specific year for the college, we have taken the average of the indices. Thus a single composite index for the college is obtained.
- **Step-4:** A scale adjustment to the department-wise indices and college-level index are made in order that it takes values within the span of 0 (zero) and 1 (one), where 0 is indicative of the worst possible performance and 1 indicates the best possible. Obviously, 0.5 denotes the average.


## UG & PG Feedback Analysis for The Academic Session 2022-23

**Table 1:**  
**Total No. UG & PG students who responded to the feedback questions**

Department	No. of UG Respondents	No. of PG Respondents
Bengali	4	NA
Education	8	1
Philosophy	1	NA
English	9	NA
History	19	NA
Pol. Science	14	NA
Anthropology	8	14
Botany	14	11
Chemistry	13	27
Economics	9	NA
Geography	17	NA
Mathematics	9	NA
Microbiology	9	18
Physics	18	NA
Statistics	17	NA
Zoology	15	23
<b>College</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>94</b>

The normalized score (within a scale of 0 to 1) for the whole college based on the average response on Infrastructural Facilities and Activities is **0.732** based on in total of **278** students' responses, whereas the same score was **0.756** last year i.e. 2021-22 for 162 students.

**Before the Last year (i.e. session 2020-21), the overall college-level normalized index was 0.777 for 288 students.**



1. Availability of Career Counseling Assistance/Discussions, 2. Encouragement to Curricular and Co-curricular Activities by the Department, 3. Space Availability, 4. The Academic Infrastructure (Laboratory and/or Computer, Departmental Library, Equipments) of the Department, 5. Use of teaching aids/audio visual aids.

### C. Analysis of the Department-wise Feedback on Under Graduate Teaching:

A separate questionnaire is fashioned to get student feedback in respect of individual teachers of a Department in the context of three teaching attributes – (i) Quality and Effectiveness of Teaching, (ii) Sense of Responsibility in Teaching and (iii) Punctuality and Availability. Six different questions are set over the three attributes and the students are invited to mark their teachers on a 5-point scale.

- **Step 1:** Quality, Responsibility and Punctuality/ Availability – these are the three distinct heads under which the questions set are merged, analyzed and visually projected department-wise through bar-diagram.
- **Step 2:** For each of the 3 attributes, the 'score' of a department is thus prepared to make a visual representation for the department on the basis of the average of the scores secured by respective department faculties from respective students' responses, in which the high value (towards 5) indicates good performance and the low value (towards 0), poor.
- **Step 3:** All the departments are put under the same process of quantification.
- **Step-4:** Bar Diagrams on the scores are prepared for each of the 3 attributes over all the 16 departments.
- **Step-5:** To assess the aggregative performance of a department over the 3 attributes, an index for each of the 16 departments for a specific year is formulated just by taking average over the 3 scores on the 3 attributes.
- **Step-6:** In order to get a single index for college over the 3 attributes for a specific year, we have taken the weighted average of the indices of all departments, the weights being the number of responses for every department. Thus a single composite index for the college is obtained.

## UG & PG Feedback Analysis for The Academic Session 2022-23



- **Step-7:** A scale adjustment to the department-wise indices and college-level index is made in order that it takes values within the span of 0 (zero) and 1 (one), where 0 is indicative of the worst possible performance and 1 indicates the best possible. 0.5 denotes the average. The adjusted indices are presented in the following Table 2.



**Table 2**  
**Indices of different UG faculties relating to Responsibility, Quality, and Availability/Punctuality**

Department	Normalized Index				No. of Respondents
	Quality	Responsibility	Punctuality/Availability	Aggregate	
Bengali	4.75	4.71	4.73	0.946	4
Education	4.21	4.22	4.22	0.843	8
Philosophy	4.53	4.80	4.70	0.935	1
English	4.52	4.44	4.43	0.893	9
History	4.78	4.77	4.78	0.955	19
Pol. Science	4.81	4.72	4.74	0.951	14
Anthropology	4.79	4.68	4.65	0.942	8
Botany	4.43	4.60	4.49	0.902	14
Chemistry	3.79	3.81	3.81	0.761	13
Economics	4.10	3.97	4.00	0.805	9
Geography	3.65	3.80	3.77	0.748	17
Mathematics	4.47	4.42	4.57	0.898	9
Microbiology	4.20	4.11	4.18	0.832	9
Physics	4.10	4.22	4.32	0.843	18
Statistics	4.21	4.27	4.38	0.857	17
Zoology	4.07	3.91	3.95	0.796	15
<b>College</b>	<b>4.305</b>	<b>4.306</b>	<b>4.328</b>	<b>0.862</b>	<b>184</b>

Last year (session 2021-22), overall college level aggregated score was **0.859** for **162** student responses.

## UG & PG Feedback Analysis for The Academic Session 2022-23







### **D. Analysis of the Department-wise Feedback on Post-Graduate Teaching:**

A separate questionnaire is fashioned to get student feedback concerning individual teachers of a Department in the context of three teaching attributes – (i) Quality and Effectiveness of Teaching, (ii) Responsibility, and (iii) Punctuality and Availability. Six different questions are set over the three attributes and the students are invited to mark their teachers on a 4-point scale.

- **Step 1:** Quality, Responsibility, and Punctuality/ Availability – these are the three distinct heads under which the questions set are merged, analyzed, and visually projected department-wise through a bar diagram.
- **Step 2:** For each of the 3 attributes, the 'score' of a department is thus prepared to make a visual representation for the department based on the average of the scores secured by respective department faculties from respective students' responses, in which the high value (towards 5) indicates extremely good performance and the low value (towards 1), poor.
- **Step 3:** All the 6 departments are put under the same process of quantification.
- **Step 4:** A scale adjustment to the department-wise indices is made so that it takes values within the span of 0 (zero) and 1 (one), where 0 is indicative of the worst possible performance and 1 indicates the best possible. 0.5 denotes the average. The adjusted indices are presented in the following Table 1.
- **Step-5:** Bar Diagrams on the scores are prepared for each of the 3 attributes over all the 6 PG departments.
- **Step-6:** To assess the aggregative performance of a department over the 3 attributes, an index for each of the 6 PG departments for a specific year is formulated just by taking the average over the 3 scores on the 3 attributes.
- **Step-7:** To get a single index for college over the 3 attributes for a specific year, we have taken the weighted average of the indices of all departments, the weights being the number of responses for every department. Thus, a single composite index for the college is obtained.

## UG & PG Feedback Analysis for The Academic Session 2022-23

**Table 3**

Indices of different departments relating to Teachers' Responsibility, Quality and Availability/Punctuality. Figures presented in ( ) correspond to the last analyzed year 2020-21 for 64 students

Department	Normalized Index				No. of Respondents
	Quality	Responsibility	Punctuality/ Availability	Aggregate	
Chemistry	3.996	4.063	4.176	4.078	27
Microbiology	4.335	4.305	4.295	4.312	18
Zoology	4.798	4.828	4.747	4.791	23
Anthropology	4.670	4.633	4.657	4.653	14
Botany	4.559	4.623	4.584	4.589	11
Education	3.083	3.000	2.875	2.986	1
<b>College</b>	<b>0.882 (0.88)</b>	<b>0.887(0.84)</b>	<b>0.889(0.83)</b>	<b>0.886(0.85)</b>	<b>94</b>

In the last year (i.e. session 2020-21), aggregated normalized indices for three departments Chemistry, Microbiology, Zoology, Anthropology, Botany and Education were **0.863, 0.859, 0.886, 0.891, 0.938 and 0.672 respectively**. Overall college level aggregated normalized index in teaching was **0.85 for total 64 PG students**. This year this figure is increased to **0.885**.

