Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

(July 2014 - June 2015)

| | Name of the Teacher: K.KARTHIGN Degree: M.E TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING. The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus. | | | | |
|----|---|--------|----------|-----------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | OStrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | ODisagree | OStrongly Disagree |
| | The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc) | | | | |
| | OStrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | 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 between theory and practical? | | | | |
| | OStrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | ODisagree | OStronglyDisagree |
| 1. | Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources,tutorials, practicalete)? | | | | |
| | OStrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | ODisagree | OStronglyDisagree |
| 5. | The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning. | | | | |
| | OStrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | ODisagree | OStronglyDisagree |
| 5. | Are the prescribed books relevant? | | | | |
| | OStrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | ODisagree | OStronglyDisagree |
| 7. | Were the Labs better equipped? | | | | |
| | OStrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | ODisagree | OStronglyDisagree |
| 8. | Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities? | | | | |
| | OStrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | ODisagree | OStronglyDisagree |
| 9. | Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus? | | | | |
| | Ostrongly Agree | OAgree | ONeutral | ODisagree | OStronglyDisagree |
| | | | | | A |

Signature of the Teacher

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING ACMA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI - 600 025