



DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED ENGINEERING
Minutes of CDMC Meeting

17-03-2016

The members of Curriculum Design and Monitoring Committee for B.Tech Agriculture Engineering program met on 17-03-2016 at AFTF-05, 'U' block, of VFSTR. The following members attended the meeting.

S.No	Members	Designation	Signatures
1.	Dr. K. P. Vidhu Professor & Head	Chairman	
2.	Dr. V.K. Tewari	Member	
3.	Dr. Aum Sharma	Member	
4.	Dr.K. Phaneendra Kumar	Member	

Agenda of the meeting

Analysis of the feedback collected from various stakeholders such as Alumni, Employers, Faculty, Parents and Students during the academic year 2015-16.

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

The feedback analysis reveals that laboratory sessions help to improve the student's technical skills and the courses placed in the curriculum supports both the advanced learners as well as slow learners.

Times to time meetings were conducted at the department level to leverage new and advanced techniques to combat the learning difficulties of the students by considering their Employer's feedback.

The feedback analysis reveals that laboratory sessions help to improve the student's technical skills and the courses placed in the curriculum supports both the advanced learners as well as slow learners.

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 1
UG STUDENT FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

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

- Q1.The Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes
- Q2.The Course Contents are designed to enable Problem Solving Skills and Core competencies
- Q3.Courses placed in the curriculum serves the needs of both advanced and slow learners
- Q4.Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Satisfiable
- Q5.Electives have enabled the passion to learn new technologies in emerging areas of Civil Engineering
- Q6.The Curriculum is providing opportunity towards Self learning to realize the expectations
- Q7.Composition of Basic Sciences, Engineering, Humanities and Management Courses is a right mix and satisfiable
- Q8.No. of Laboratory Sessions Integrated with Theory Courses have been sufficient to improve the technical as well as practical skills in Civil Engineering
- Q9.Inclusion of Minor Projects with Theory Courses have enhanced the technical competency and leadership 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 2015-16 (Academic Year) - UG – B. Tech (AG)

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 2015 – 16

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	30.4	36.2	18.8	8.7	5.8	3.764	Very Good
Q2	36.2	27.5	18.8	11.6	5.8	3.764	Very Good
Q3	24.6	33.3	23.2	11.6	7.2	3.562	Very Good
Q4	17.4	43.5	20.3	8.7	10.1	3.494	Good
Q5	47.8	21.7	13	7.2	10.1	3.893	Very Good
Q6	18.8	29	31.9	10.1	10.1	3.36	Good
Q7	37.7	33.3	15.9	7.2	5.8	3.896	Very Good
Q8	33.3	40.6	7.2	10.1	8.7	3.794	Very Good
Q9	33.3	34.8	8.7	8.7	14.5	3.637	Very Good

The highest score of 3.764 was given to the parameter “Q2: The Course Contents are designed to enable Problem Solving Skills and Core competencies” followed by “Q1: The Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes” with a score of 3.764 and has been rated as Very Good.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters “Q4: Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Satisfiable” and “Q5: Electives have enabled the passion to learn new technologies in emerging areas of Agriculture Engineering” obtained average scores 3.562 and 3.494 respectively and has been rated as Good.

The parameters “Q3: Courses placed in the curriculum serves the needs of both advanced and slow learners” and “Q7: Composition of Basic Sciences, Engineering, Humanities and Management Courses is a right mix and satisfiable” obtained the scores of 3.562 and 3.896 respectively and has been rated as Very Good which clearly reflects the benefit towards the student expectations.

Average scores of 3.794; 3.637 and 3.36 were obtained by the parameters “Q8: No. of Laboratory Sessions Integrated with Theory Courses have been sufficient to improve the technical as well as practical skills in Agriculture Engineering”; “Q9: Inclusion of Minor Projects with Theory Courses have enhanced the technical competency and leadership skills” and “Q6: The Curriculum is providing opportunity towards Self learning to realize the expectations”.

Time to time meetings were conducted at the department level to leverage new and advanced techniques to combat the learning difficulties of the students. The feedback analysis reveals that laboratory sessions help to improve the student’s technical skills and the courses placed in the curriculum supports both the advanced learners as well as slow learners.

UG ALUMNI FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

Feedback has been received from the Alumni students’ on the following seven parameters:

Q1. Curriculum has paved a good foundation in understanding the basic engineering concepts.

Q2. Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes

Q3. Curriculum imparted all the required Job Oriented Skills

Q4. Professional and Open Electives of Curriculum served the technical advancements needed to serve in the industry

Q5. Tools and Technologies learnt during laboratory sessions has enriched the problem-solving skills

Q6. Ability to compete with your peers from other Universities

Q7. Current Curriculum is superior to your studied Curriculum

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)

UG FACULTY FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

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

- Q1. Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes
- Q2. Course Contents enhance the Problem-Solving Skills and Core competencies
- Q3. Allocations of Credits to the Courses are satisfiable
- Q4. Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Justifiable
- Q5. Electives enable the passion to learn new technologies in emerging areas
- Q6. Curriculum is providing opportunity towards Self learning
- Q7. Composition of Basic Sciences, Engineering, Humanities and Management Courses is satisfiable
- Q8. Courses with laboratory sessions are sufficient to improve the technical skills of students
- Q9. Inclusion of Minor/ Mini Projects improved the technical competency and leadership skills among the students

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 2015-16 (Academic Year) - UG – B. Tech (AG)

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 2015–16

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	50	22.7	18.2	4.5	4.5	4.089	Excellent
Q2	50	36.4	4.5	9.1	0	4.273	Excellent
Q3	50	45.5	4.5	0	0	4.455	Excellent
Q4	50	22.7	22.7	4.5	0	4.179	Excellent
Q5	54.5	45.5	0	0	0	4.545	Excellent
Q6	59.1	27.3	9.1	4.5	0	4.41	Excellent
Q7	54.5	27.3	13.6	4.5	0	4.315	Excellent
Q8	63.6	27.3	9.1	0	0	4.545	Excellent
Q9	54.5	36.4	4.5	4.5	0	4.406	Excellent

The highest score of 5 was given to the parameters “Q3, Q5 and Q8: Allocations of Credits to the Courses are satisfiable, Composition of Basic Sciences, Engineering, Humanities and Management Courses is satisfiable, Courses with laboratory sessions are sufficient to improve the technical skills of students” followed by “Q6: Curriculum is providing opportunity towards Self learning” with a score of 4.41 and has been rated as Excellent.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters “Q4 and Q9: Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Justifiable”, “Q9: Inclusion of Minor/ Mini Projects improved the technical competency and leadership skills among the students”, “Q2: Course Contents enhance the Problem-Solving Skills and Core competencies”, “Q5: Electives enable the passion to learn new technologies in emerging areas”, and “Q1: Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes” obtained average scores 4.179, 4.406, 4.273 and 4.545 respectively and has been rated as Excellent.

UG EMPLOYER FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

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

- Q1.The Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes
- Q2.The Course Contents are enriching the Construction Industry Demands
- Q3.Core Electives and Open Elective are in-line with the technology advancements
- Q4.Applicability of the tools and technologies described in the curriculum are sufficient to practice in Existing Construction Practices
- Q5.Problem Solving and Soft Skills acquired by the students through the course contents will enable them to be placed in Public Sector Units, MNC's and Government Sectors

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 2015-16 (Academic Year) - UG – B. Tech (AG)

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 2015–16

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	16.7	0	33.3	50	0	2.834	Good
Q2	16.7	0	33.3	50	0	2.834	Good
Q3	16.7	50	33.3	0	0	3.834	Very Good
Q4	16.7	33.3	50	0	0	3.667	Very Good
Q5	50	33.3	16.7	0	0	4.333	Very Good

The highest score of 4.333 was given to the parameter “The Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes” followed by “The Course Contents are enriching the Construction Industry Demands” with a score of 4.333 and has been rated as Excellent.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters “Applicability of the tools and technologies described in the curriculum are sufficient to practice in Existing Construction Practices” and “Core Electives and Open Elective are in-line with the technology advancements” obtained average scores 4.333 and 2.834 respectively and has been rated as Very Good.

The parameter "Problem Solving and Soft Skills acquired by the students through the course contents will enable them to be placed in Public Sector Units, MNC's and Government Sectors" obtained the scores of 4.333 and has been rated as Excellent which will be considered and benefit the students towards the Construction Industry.

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 Construction Industry.

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

UG PARENTS FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

Feedback has been received from the Parents on the following five parameters:

1. Curriculum enhances the intellectual aptitude of your ward
2. Curriculum realizes the personality development and technical skilling of your ward
3. Satisfaction about the Academic, Emotional Progression of your ward
4. Competency of your ward is on par with the students from other Universities/Institutes
5. Course Curriculum is of the global standard and is in tune with the needs of construction 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 Parents 2015-16 (Academic Year) - UG – B. Tech (AG)

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

Table 1: Analysis of feedback from Parents 2015–16

Parameters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	46.7	38.3	0	0	1.7	3.884	Very Good
Q2	46.7	43.3	6.7	1.7	1.7	4.319	Excellent
Q3	33.3	56.7	5	0	5	4.133	Excellent
Q4	46.7	36.7	11.7	0	5	4.204	Excellent
Q5	61.7	18.3	15	1.7	3.3	4.334	Excellent

The highest score of 3.884 was given to the parameters “Curriculum enhances the intellectual aptitude of your ward”, “Curriculum realizes the personality development and technical skilling of your ward”, Competency of your ward is on par with the students from other Universities/Institutes”, Course Curriculum is of the global standard and is in tune with the needs of construction Industry followed by “Satisfaction about the Academic, Emotional Progression of your ward” with rating 4.133 which is also Excellent

Time to time meetings were conducted at the department level to leverage new and advanced techniques to combat the learning difficulties of the students.



Head of Department and Chairman – CDMC
B.Tech – Agriculture Engineering
Department of Applied Engineering