



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING**  
**Minutes of CDMC Meeting**

08-05-2017

The members of Curriculum Design and Monitoring Committee for M.Tech Structural Engineering (MSE) program met on 08-05-2017 at AFF-10, 'U' block, of VFSTR. The following members attended the meeting.

S.No	Members	Designation	Signatures
1.	Dr. Alimelu V. Hebsur Associate & Head	Chairman	A.V. Hebsur
2.	Mr.P.PadmaRao	Member	W
3.	Mr.B.J.N.Satish	Member	B.J.N. Satish
4.	Mr.P.Sathish	Member	P. Satish

**Agenda of the meeting**

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:**

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.

From the feedback analysis, provision of advanced laboratory equipment helps students in getting deep knowledge on the subject.

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.

A.V. Hebsur  
Chairman, CDMC

## ANNEXURE 1

### PG 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 Structural Engineering
- Q6.The Curriculum is providing opportunity towards Self learning to realize the expectations of present trend in design and research needs
- Q7.Inclusion of Employability Orientation Program and Research Methodology in the curriculum is useful in career enhancement
- Q8.No. of Laboratory Sessions Integrated with Theory Courses have been sufficient to improve the technical as well as practical skills in Structural Engineering
- Q9.Introducing Mini Projects and Socio-centric Projects along with Theory Courses improved the research 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 ( $\geq 4$ ); Very Good ( $\geq 3.5$  &  $< 4$ ); Good ( $\geq 3$  &  $< 3.5$ ); Moderate ( $> 2$  &  $< 3$ ) and Unsatisfactory ( $< 2$ )

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

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**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Avg. Rating	Grade
Q1	56.8	38.6	4.5	0	0	4.519	Excellent
Q2	50	47.7	2.3	0	0	4.477	Excellent
Q3	22.7	59.1	18.2	0	0	4.045	Excellent
Q4	31.8	34.1	31.8	2.3	0	3.954	Very Good
Q5	18.2	61.4	18.2	0	2.3	3.935	Very Good
Q6	34.1	47.7	18.2	0	0	4.159	Excellent
Q7	27.3	56.8	15.9	0	0	4.114	Excellent
Q8	29.5	59.1	11.4	0	0	4.181	Excellent
Q9	27.3	52.3	18.2	0	2.3	4.026	Excellent

The highest score of 4.519 was given to the parameter “Q1: Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes” followed by “Q2: Course Contents are designed to enable Problem Solving Skills and Core competencies” with a score of 4.477 and has been rated as Excellent.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters “Q8: No. of Laboratory Sessions Integrated with Theory Courses have been sufficient to improve the technical as well as practical skills in Structural Engineering; “Q6: The Curriculum is providing opportunity towards Self learning to realize the expectations of present trend in design and research needs ”; “Q7: Inclusion of Employability Orientation Program and Research Methodology in the curriculum is useful in career enhancement; and “Q3: Courses placed in the curriculum serves the needs of both advanced and slow learners” and “Q9: Introducing Mini Projects and Socio-centric Projects along with Theory Courses improved the research competency and leadership skills among the students” obtained the average scores are 4.181; 4.159; 4.114, 4.045 and 4.026 respectively has been rated as Excellent. Average scores of 3.954 and 3.935 were obtained by 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 Structural Engineering”.

## **PG ALUMNI 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 ( $\geq 4$ ); Very Good ( $\geq 3.5$  &  $< 4$ ); Good ( $\geq 3$  &  $< 3.5$ ); Moderate ( $> 2$  &  $< 3$ ) and Unsatisfactory ( $< 2$ )

### **Feed Back from Alumni Students 2016-17 (Academic Year) - PG – M. Tech (CIVIL)**

The result derived in terms of percentage of students with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Analysis of feedback from Alumni students 2016 – 17**

<b>Parameters</b>	<b>Rating 5</b>	<b>Rating 4</b>	<b>Rating 3</b>	<b>Rating 2</b>	<b>Rating 1</b>	<b>Average Score</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Q1</b>	57.1	42.9	0	0	0	4.571	Excellent
<b>Q2</b>	57.1	14.3	28.6	0	0	4.285	Excellent
<b>Q3</b>	57.1	42.9	0	0	0	4.571	Excellent
<b>Q4</b>	42.9	57.1	0	0	0	4.429	Excellent
<b>Q5</b>	57.1	14.3	28.6	0	0	4.285	Excellent
<b>Q6</b>	42.9	42.9	14.3	0	0	4.29	Excellent
<b>Q7</b>	42.9	42.9	0	14.3	0	4.147	Excellent

The highest score of 4.571 was given to the parameter “Curriculum has paved a good foundation in understanding the basic engineering concepts.” And “Curriculum imparted all the required Job Oriented Skills” followed by “Professional and Open Electives of Curriculum served the technical advancements needed to serve in the industry” with a score of 4.429 and has been rated as Excellent.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters “Ability to compete with your peers from other Universities”, “Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes” and “Tools and Technologies learnt during laboratory sessions has enriched the problem-solving skills” with a scores of 4.29, 4.285, 4.285 respectively and has been rated as Excellent.

The parameter “Current Curriculum is superior to your studied Curriculum” with a scores of 4.147 has been rated as Excellent.

### **PG FACULTY FEEDBACK ANALYSIS**

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

Q1: The Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes

Q2: Course Contents can enhance the Problem Solving Skills and Core competencies

Q3: Allocation of Credits to the Courses are Satisfiable

Q4: Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Satisfiable

Q5: Electives enable the passion to learn new technologies in emerging areas of Structural Engineering

Q6: The Curriculum is providing opportunity towards Self learning to realize the expectations of present trend in design and research needs

Q7: The inclusion of Employability Orientation Program and Research Methodology in the curriculum Satisfiable

Q8: The number of theoretical courses amalgamated with laboratory sessions are sufficient to improve the technical skills of students

Q9: Introducing Mini Projects and Socio-centric Projects along with Theory Courses improved the research 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 ( $\geq 4$ ); Very Good ( $\geq 3.5$  &  $< 4$ ); Good ( $\geq 3$  &  $< 3.5$ ); Moderate ( $> 2$  &  $< 3$ ) and Unsatisfactory ( $< 2$ )

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 ( $\geq 4$ ); Very Good ( $\geq 3.5$  &  $< 4$ ); Good ( $\geq 3$  &  $< 3.5$ ); Moderate ( $> 2$  &  $< 3$ ) and Unsatisfactory ( $< 2$ )

#### **Feedback from faculty 2016-17 (Academic Year) - PG – M.Tech (MSE)**

The result derived in terms of percentage of faculty with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Analysis of feedback from faculty 2016–17**

Parameters	Rating 5	Rating 4	Rating 3	Rating 2	Rating 1	Average Score	Rating
Q1	90.5	9.5	0	0	0	4.905	Excellent
Q2	81	19	0	0	0	4.81	Excellent
Q3	95.2	4.8	0	0	0	4.952	Excellent
Q4	76.2	23.8	0	0	0	4.762	Excellent
Q5	85.7	14.3	0	0	0	4.857	Excellent
Q6	85.7	14.3	0	0	0	4.857	Excellent
Q7	85.7	9.5	4.8	0	0	4.809	Excellent
Q8	85.7	14.3	0	0	0	4.857	Excellent
Q9	76.2	9.5	0	4.8	4.8	4.334	Excellent

The highest score of 4.952 was given to the parameter "Q3: Allocation of Credits to the Courses are satisfiable " followed by "Q1: The Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes", "Q5,Q6 and Q8: Electives enable the passion to learn new technologies in emerging areas of Structural Engineering, The Curriculum is providing opportunity towards Self learning to realize the expectations of present trend in design and research needs and The number of theoretical courses amalgamated with laboratory sessions are sufficient to improve the technical skills of students" is scored as 4.857. followed by Q2: Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Justifiable, Q7: The inclusion of Employability Orientation Program and Research Methodology in the curriculum satisfiable",Q4: Contact Hour Distribution among the various Course Components (LTP) is Satisfiable",Q9: Introducing Mini Projects and Socio-centric Projects along with Theory Courses improved the research competency and leadership skills among the students" with scores are respectively 4.81, 4.809, 4.762 and 4.334 has been rated as Excellent.

## **PG 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 and Research Needs
- 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 place in Public Sector Units, MNC's, Government Sectors and Research Agencies.

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 ( $\geq 4$ ); Very Good ( $\geq 3.5$  &  $< 4$ ); Good ( $\geq 3$  &  $< 3.5$ ); Moderate ( $> 2$  &  $< 3$ ) and Unsatisfactory ( $< 2$ )

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

The result derived in terms of percentage of employer with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Analysis of feedback from Employer 2016 – 17**

Parameters	Rating 5	Rating 4	Rating 3	Rating 2	Rating 1	Average Score	Rating
Q1	86.4	13.6	0	0	0	4.864	Excellent
Q2	88.6	11.4	0	0	0	4.886	Excellent
Q3	70.5	29.5	0	0	0	4.705	Excellent
Q4	59.1	27.3	13.6	0	0	4.455	Excellent
Q5	27.3	18.2	36.4	18.2	0	3.549	Very Good

The highest score of 4.886 was given to the parameter “The Course Contents are enriching the Construction Industry Demands and Research Needs” followed by “The Course Contents of Curriculum are in tune with the Program Outcomes” with a score of 4.864 and has been rated as Very Good and Good.

It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters “Core Electives and Open Elective are in-line with the technology advancements” and “Applicability of the tools and technologies described in the curriculum are sufficient to practice in Existing Construction Practices” obtained average scores 4.705 and 4.455 respectively and has been rated as Good.

The parameter “Problem Solving and Soft Skills acquired by the students through the course contents will enable them to be place in Public Sector Units, MNC’s, Government Sectors and Research Agencies” obtained the scores of 3.549 and has been rated as Moderate 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 Problem Solving and Soft Skills acquired by the students through the curriculum will enable them to be placed in Construction Industry

## PG PARENTS FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

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

6. Curriculum enhances the intellectual aptitude of your ward
7. Curriculum realizes the personality development and technical skilling of your ward
8. Satisfaction about the Academic, Emotional Progression of your ward
9. Competency of your ward is on par with the students from other Universities/Institutes
10. 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 ( $\geq 4$ ); Very Good ( $\geq 3.5$  &  $< 4$ ); Good ( $\geq 3$  &  $< 3.5$ ); Moderate ( $> 2$  &  $< 3$ ) and Unsatisfactory ( $< 2$ )

### Feedback from Parents 2016-17 (Academic Year) - PG – M. Tech (MSE)

The result derived in terms of percentage of Parents with common views, average score, and ratings is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Analysis of feedback from Parents 2016 – 17**

Parameters	Rating 5	Rating 4	Rating 3	Rating 2	Rating 1	Average Score	Rating
<b>Q1</b>	83.3	16.7	0	0	0	4.833	Excellent
<b>Q2</b>	83.3	0	16.7	0	0	4.666	Excellent
<b>Q3</b>	50	50	0	0	0	4.5	Excellent
<b>Q4</b>	50	50	0	0	0	4.5	Excellent
<b>Q5</b>	33.3	50	16.7	0	0	4.166	Excellent

The highest score of 4.833 was given to the parameter “Curriculum enhances the intellectual aptitude of your ward” followed by “Curriculum realizes the personality development and technical skilling of your ward” and has been rated as Excellent. It is clearly visible from the table that the parameters “Satisfaction about the Academic, Emotional Progression of your ward” and “Competency of your ward is on par with the students from other Universities/Institutes” obtained average score 4.5 has been rated as Excellent. The parameter “Course Curriculum is of the global standard and is in tune with the needs of construction Industry” obtained the score of 3.832 and has been rated as good.

A.V. Hebbar

Head of Department and Chairman – CDMC