

## **CENTER FOR WATER RESOURCES**

## COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 025

## Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

	Name of the Faculty	with design	nation: CARD	IN ARU-1	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		
	Degree: るに、						
	Degree: B.E. Agri (R-2015) The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.						
	OStrongly Agree	<b>T</b> Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree		
1.	The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc)						
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	<b>W</b> Neutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree		
2.	The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as onmodem/advancedtopics.						
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	-ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree		
3.	Was there a balance		eory and practic		OStronglyDisagree		
	OStrongly Agree			ODisagree			
4.	Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicaletc)?						
	OStrongly Agree		ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree		
5.	The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.						
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree		
	Are the prescribed  Ostrongly Agree	books releva OAgree	ant? ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree		
7.	Were the Labs bett OStrongly Agree	er equipped OAgree	? ONcutral	<b>∽</b> ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree		
8.	Did the course con OStrongly Agree		ill enhancement	and better career ODisagree	opportunities? OStronglyDisagree		
	Were the assessme OStrongly Agree	nts conducte OAgree	od on time with ONeutral	proper coverage o ODisagree	of syllabus? OStronglyDisagree		

Signature of the Faculty

PROFESSOR & DIRECTOR
CENTRE FOR WATER RESOURCES
ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI-25

## CENTER FOR WATER RESOURCES COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 025

## Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

	Name of the Fact	ilty with desig	gnation: D91	. N. K. A	nbujan, Peofessor			
	Degree: B.E.	Agricul	ture and	Dowigation	nbujam , Professor 1 Engineering (R 2015)			
	The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.							
	OStrongly Agree	Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
1	er changes etc)		(e.g. teaching	hours, content flo	w, access to materials, notifications			
	OStrongly Agree	<b>O</b> Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
2	<ol> <li>The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as onmodem/advancedtopics.</li> </ol>							
	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
3	3. Was there a balance between theory and practical?							
	Strongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicalete)?								
	OStrongly Agree	<b>O</b> Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
5.	5. The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.							
	<b>O</b> Strongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
6.	Are the prescribed	books retevar	nt?		-			
	OStrongly Agree	<b>O</b> Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
7. Were the Labs better equipped?  OStrongly Agree ONeutral ODisagree OStrongly Disagree								
	8	-		_	OStronglyDisagree			
8.	Did the course contr			_	171472			
	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
9.	Were the assessment OStrongly Agree	ts conducted OAgree	on time with p ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	roper coverage of ODisagree	f syllabus? OStronglyDisagree			

Signature of the Faculty

PROFESSOR & DIRECTOR CENTRE FOR WATER RESOURCES ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI-25

# CENTER FOR WATER RESOURCES COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 026

## Feedback on Sylabus/Curriculum

Name of the Faculty with o	designation: \	1. RAMSI,	Aux. Professor (Si Gr)					
Degree: B.E. (AZA.	h Irren ?	ingg)						
The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.								
OStrongly Agree &Agr								
<ol> <li>The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications</li> </ol>								
OStrongly Agree OAgre	ce Neutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree					
<ol> <li>The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as onmodem/advancedtopics.</li> </ol>								
OStrongly Agree SAgre		ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree					
3. Was there a balance between	theory and prac-	tical?						
OStrongly Agree OAgree	Neutral		OStronglyDisagree					
4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicalete)?								
OStrongly Agree OAgree	<b>N</b> eutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree					
5. The overall environment in th	e class was cond	ucive to learning						
O Strongly Agree JAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree					
6. Are the prescribed books relev	ant?							
OStrongly Agree DAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree					
7. Were the Labs better equipped	?		3					
Ostrongly Agree OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree					
8. Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and the								
	Medital	ODisagree	OStronglyDies					
9. Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus?  Ostrongly Agree Objects O								
OStrongly Agree PAgree	ONeutral	roper coverage of ODisagree	syllabus? OStronglyDisagree					

Signature of the Faculty

PROFESSOR & DIRECTOR
CENTRE FOR WATER RESOURCES
ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI-25