Minutes of CDMC Meeting

18-03-2017

The members of Curriculum Design and Monitoring Committee for B.Tech Mechanical Engineering program met on 18-03-2017 at AGF-04, 'U' block, of VFSTR. The following members attended the meeting.

S.No	Members	Designation	Signatures
1.	Dr. M Ramakrishna, Professor & HoD	Chairman	
2.	Mr. D Satyanarayana Rao, Associate Professor	Member	
3.	Mr. G Suresh, Assistant Professor	Member	
4.	Mr. Mihir Barman, Assistant Professor	Member	

Agenda of the meeting

1. Analysis of the feedback collected from various stakeholders such as Alumni, Employers, Faculty, Parents and Students during the academic year 2016-17.

The following are the important points of analysis obtained from various stakeholders:

1. Students requested to add more design courses material specific.
2. As last year students asked the relevant courses applicable to design of aerospace components.
3. Parents requested to add courses relevant to vibration analysis.
4. Alumni suggested to offer advance courses on vibration analysis
5. Alumni recommended to offer advance analysis softwares for the benefit of students.
6. Employers suggested that apart from improving in the communication skills it's also required to develop analytical skills in students
7. Employers suggested to offer courses related to NDT techniques and Reliability Engineering either as an elective or regular course.
8. Faculty felt that much more importance should be given towards training the students in more modeling softwares
9. Faculty suggested to offer subjects in the area of NDT techniques in coming regulation.
10. Faculty also suggested to check the feasibility in offering courses related advanced manufacturing technologies.

Detailed feedback analysis report is enclosed as Annexure-I

The outcomes of the meeting will be placed before the BoS for further discussion and recommendations.

Chairman, CDMC

Annexure-I

FEEDBACK ANALYSIS OF ALUMNI ON M. Tech-Machine Design Curriculum in AY: 2016 – 17

Feedback has been received from the Alumni on the following parameters:

Q1. Curriculum has paved a good foundation in understanding the concepts
Q2. Course Contents of Curriculum fulfilled the specified Program Outcomes
Q3. Curriculum imparted all the required Job Oriented Skills / prerequisite to pursue higher education
Q4. Electives of Curriculum served the technical advancements needed to serve in the industry
Q5. Tools and Methodologies followed during practical sessions has enriched the required practical knowledge to serve in Industry
Q6. Competency with your peers from other Institutions
Q7. Current curriculum meets the present industry demands

The categorization of rating is as follows: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Moderate (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1).

Feedback Analysis is carried based on Average Satisfaction Rating. Rating categorization is carried based on Excellent (≥4); Very Good (≥3.5&<4); Good (≥3&<3.5); Moderate (>2 &<3) and Unsatisfactory (<2)

Feedback from Alumni 2016-17 (Academic Year) - PG –M. Tech (MMD)

The result derived in terms of percentage of Alumni with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Analysis of feedback from Alumni 2016–17

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	20	80	0	0	0	4.2	Excellent
Q2	40	60	0	0	0	4.4	Excellent
Q3	80	20	0	0	0	4.8	Excellent
Q4	40	60	0	0	0	4.4	Excellent
Q5	60	40	0	0	0	4.6	Excellent
Q6	20	60	20	0	0	4	Excellent
Q7	20	60	20	0	0	4.2	Excellent

The highest score of 4.8 was given to the parameter "Curriculum imparted all the required Job Oriented Skills / prerequisite to pursue higher education".

Followed by "Tools and Methodologies followed during practical sessions has enriched the required practical knowledge to serve in Industry", "Course Contents of Curriculum fulfilled the specified Program Outcomes" and "Electives of Curriculum served the technical advancements needed to serve in the industry" and with a score of 4.6, 4.4 and 4.4 has been rated as Excellent.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameter, "Curriculum has paved a good foundation in understanding the basic engineering concepts", "Competency with your peers from other Institutions" and "Current curriculum meets the present industry demands" obtained average 4.2, 4 and 4.2 has been rated as Excellent respectively.

FEEDBACK ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYERS ON M. Tech-Machine Design Curriculum in AY: 2016 – 17

Feedback has been received from the employer on the following parameters:

Q1. Course Contents of M.Tech Machine Design Curriculum is in tune with the Program Outcomes
Q2. Relevance of the Course Contents in tune with the Industry Demands
Q3. Elective are in-line with the technology advancements in Modelling and Design Sectors
Q4. Applicability of the tools and technologies described in the curriculum will be enough to practice in Industry

The categorization of rating is as follows: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Moderate (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1).

Feedback Analysis is carried based on Average Satisfaction Rating. Rating categorization is carried based on Excellent (≥4); Very Good (≥3.5&<4); Good (≥3&<3.5); Moderate (>2 &<3) and Unsatisfactory (<2)

Feedback from Employer 2016-17 (Academic Year) - PG –M. Tech (MMD)

The result derived in terms of percentage of employer with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Analysis of feedback from Employer 2016–17

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	66.7	33.3	0	0	0	3.996	Very Good
Q2	33.3	66.7	0	0	0	4.333	Excellent
Q3	100	0	0	0	0	5	Excellent
Q4	66.7	33.3	0	0	0	4.667	Excellent

The highest score of 5 was given to the parameter "Elective are in-line with the technology advancements in Modelling and Design Sectors"

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters "Course Contents of M.Tech Machine Design Curriculum is in tune with the Program Outcomes" and "Applicability of the tools and technologies described in the curriculum will be enough to practice in Industry" obtained average scores 3.996 and 4.667 respectively and has been rated as Very Good and Excellent.

The parameter "Relevance of the Course Contents in tune with the Industry Demands" obtained the scores of 4.333 and has been rated as Excellent which will be considered and benefit the students.

Time to time meetings were conducted at the department level to leverage new and advanced techniques to improve the problem solving skills and soft skills of the students which enable them to be placed in Mechanical Industry.

The feedback analysis given by employer reveals that by improving the required skills of students and enable Industry Demands helps the student to get placements.

FEEDBACK ANALYSIS OF FACULTY ON
M. Tech-Machine Design Curriculum in AY: 2016 – 17

Feedback has been received from the Faculty on the following parameters:

Q1. Course Contents of Curriculum in tune with the Program Outcomes
Q2. Course Contents designed offered enriches Core Competencies
Q3. Courses offered in the curriculum serves the needs of Mechanical Industries
Q4. Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Satisfiable
Q5. Electives have enabled the passion to learn new technologies in emerging and Interdisciplinary Areas
Q6. Curriculum providing enable towards self-learning
Q7. No. of Laboratory sessions and Theory Courses have been sufficient to improve the technical skills
The categorization of rating is as follows: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Moderate (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1).

Feedback Analysis is carried based on Average Satisfaction Rating. Rating categorization is carried based on Excellent (≥4); Very Good (≥3.5&<4); Good (≥3&<3.5); Moderate (>2 &<3) and Unsatisfactory (<2)

Feedback from Faculty 2016-17 (Academic Year) - PG –M. Tech (MMD)

The result derived in terms of percentage of Faculty with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Analysis of feedback from Faculty 2016–17

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	100	0	0	0	0	4.111	Excellent
Q2	88.9	11.1	0	0	0	4.889	Excellent
Q3	11.1	88.9	0	0	0	4.111	Excellent
Q4	100	0	0	0	0	5	Excellent
Q5	0	100	0	0	0	4	Excellent
Q6	0	0	100	0	0	3.444	Good
Q7	100	0	0	0	0	5	Excellent

The highest score of 5 was given to the parameter "Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Satisfiable" and "No. of Laboratory sessions and Theory Courses have been sufficient to improve the technical skills" followed by "Course Contents designed offered enriches Core Competencies" with a score of 4.889 and has been rated as Excellent.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters "Course Contents of Curriculum in tune with the Program Outcomes" , "Courses offered in the curriculum serves the needs of Mechanical Industries" and "Electives have enabled the passion to learn new technologies in emerging and Interdisciplinary Areas" obtained average scores 4.111,4.111 and 4 respectively and has been rated as Excellent.

The parameters "Curriculum providing enable towards self-learning" the score is 3.444, and has been rated as Good.

FEEDBACK ANALYSIS OF PARENTS ON
M. Tech-Machine Design Curriculum in AY: 2016 – 17

Feedback has been received from the parents on the following parameters:

Q1. Satisfaction of Academic and Emotional Progression of your ward
Q2. Satisfaction with the offered curriculum for your wards future endeavours
Q3. Overall assessment of technical knowledge acquired by your ward who is pursuing his/her program in our University
Q4. Your ward's competency with the students from other Institutes
Q5. Curriculum offered is in tune with current Industry needs

The categorization of rating is as follows: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Moderate (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1).

Feedback Analysis is carried based on Average Satisfaction Rating. Rating categorizations carried based on Excellent (≥4); Very Good (≥3.5&<4); Good (≥3&<3.5); Moderate (>2 &<3) and Unsatisfactory (<2)

Feedback from Parent 2016-17 (Academic Year) - PG –M. Tech (MMD)

The result derived in terms of percentage of Parent with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Analysis of feedback from Parent 2016–17

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	37.5	62.5	0	0	0	4.375	Excellent
Q2	75	25	0	0	0	4.75	Excellent
Q3	37.5	50	12.5	0	0	4.25	Excellent
Q4	37.5	37.5	25	0	0	4.125	Excellent
Q5	62.5	37.5	0	0	0	4.625	Excellent

The highest score of 4.75 was given to the parameter "Satisfaction with the offered curriculum for your wards future endeavours" is rated as Excellent. From the table "Curriculum offered is in tune with current Industry needs" followed by "Satisfaction of Academic and Emotional Progression of your ward" with a score of 4.625, 4.375 respectively and has been rated as Excellent.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters "Overall assessment of technical knowledge acquired by your ward who is pursuing his/her program in our University" and "Your ward's competency with the students from other Institutes" obtained average scores 4.25 and 4.125 respectively and has been rated as Excellent.

FEEDBACK ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS ON M. Tech-Machine Design Curriculum in AY: 2016 – 17

Feedback has been received from the students on the following parameters:

Q1. Course Contents of Curriculum in tune with the Program Outcomes
Q2. Course Contents designed offered enriches Core Competencies
Q3. Courses offered in the curriculum serves the needs of Mechanical Industries
Q4. Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Satisfiable
Q5. Electives have enabled the passion to learn new technologies in emerging and Interdisciplinary Areas
Q6. Curriculum providing enable towards self-learning
Q7. No. of Laboratory sessions and Theory Courses have been sufficient to improve the technical skills

The categorization of rating is as follows: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Moderate (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1).

Feedback Analysis is carried based on Average Satisfaction Rating. Rating categorization is carried based on Excellent (≥4); Very Good (≥3.5&<4); Good (≥3&<3.5); Moderate (>2 &<3) and Unsatisfactory (<2)

Feedback from Students 2016-17 (Academic Year) - PG –M. Tech (MMD)

The result derived in terms of percentage of students with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Analysis of feedback from Students 2016–17

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	87.5	12.5	0	0	0	4.875	Excellent
Q2	62.5	12.5	25	0	0	4.375	Excellent
Q3	62.5	37.5	0	0	0	4.625	Excellent
Q4	37.5	62.5	0	0	0	4.375	Excellent
Q5	62.5	37.5	0	0	0	4.625	Excellent
Q6	100	0	0	0	0	5	Excellent
Q7	62.5	12.5	25	0	0	4.375	Excellent

The highest score of 5 was given to the parameter "Curriculum providing enable towards self-learning".

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters "Course Contents of Curriculum in tune with the Program Outcomes" and ".Courses offered in the curriculum serves the needs of Mechanical Industries" obtained average scores 4.875 and 4.625 respectively and has been rated as excellent.

The parameter "Course Contents designed offered enriches Core Competencies", " Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Satisfiable" and " No. of Laboratory sessions and Theory Courses have been sufficient to improve the technical skills" obtained the scores of 4.375 and has been rated as excellent.

Chairman, CDMC