



INSTITUTE OF REMOTE SENSING
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 025

PG
IV Sem

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

(July 2018 – June 2019)

Name of the Parent: N. RAJADURAI - nsnydurai@gmail.com Flo Iniya galyabir
Degree: M.E - REMOTE SENSING & GEOMATICS RegNO: 2018186031
The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

1. The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc)

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as on modern/advanced topics.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. Was there a balance between theory and practical?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practical etc)?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. Are the prescribed books relevant?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. Were the Labs better equipped?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Signature of the Parent

HOD (CIVIL)
PROFESSOR AND HEAD
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI - 600 025



INSTITUTE OF REMOTE SENSING
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 025

PG
IV sem

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

(July 2018 – June 2019)

Name of the Parent: S. SUNDARRAJAN - smaarthika@gmail.com f/o Aarthika.S

Degree: M.E. Remote Sensing & Geomatics Reg No - 2018186026

The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

1. The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc)

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as on modern/advanced topics.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. Was there a balance between theory and practical?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicals etc)?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. Are the prescribed books relevant?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. Were the Labs better equipped?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

S. Sundarajan
Signature of the Parent

Bek
HOD (CIVIL)
PROFESSOR AND HEAD
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI - 600 025



INSTITUTE OF REMOTE SENSING
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 025

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

(July 2018 – June 2019)

Name of the Parent: P. Soornameena.

Cisp5196@gmail.com)

Degree: M.E. (Remote Sensing and Geomatics).

The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

1. The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc)

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as on modern/advanced topics.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. Was there a balance between theory and practical?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practical etc)?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. Are the prescribed books relevant?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. Were the Labs better equipped?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Parent


HOD (CIVIL)
PROFESSOR AND HEAD

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI - 600 025


Signature of the Parent