Title of the Best Practice #1:

Feedback System

Objectives of the Practice:

To periodically review the progress of the course design and delivery, to discuss issues concerning curricula, syllabi and the conduct of the classes including the method of teaching in the respective courses for ensuring effective learning.

The Context:

Teaching being the primary function of the faculty, Information on quality of teaching, course delivery, etc., is collected through (a) Class Review Committee (CRC) (b) Semester end feedback of students (c) Faculty Review Committee (FRC). Feedback system helps in identifying the short falls in the teaching learning process and take corrective measures for the benefit of students. It also aids in identifying some of the best practices adopted by some of the faculty and to encourage other faculty also to adopt these best practices for their respective subjects.

The Practice:

a) **Class Review Committee (CRC)**

- This committee consists of Management Representative, Principal, Head of the respective department, and four students from each section of the programme, with more than 75% attendance and varying levels of academic record/performance representing slow, average and fast learners.
- This committee meets once in a semester to discuss the progress in the courses being taught, the teaching-learning methodology practiced in the classroom, faculty performance in terms of their preparedness, innovative teaching practices and other related issues. The committee considers the inputs given by the students for improving the teaching- learning practices and overall development.

b) **Semester end feedback of students:**

At the end of the semester, all the students are required to give their feedback online for all their respective subject teachers on a ten-point metrics as listed below:

- Coverage of syllabus.
- Ability to explain the concepts in clear and simple language
- Creating interest through examples
- Audibility while giving the lecture
- Eye contact, voice modulation and mannerisms, etc.
- Interaction in the class
- Overall class control and discipline
- Punctuality
- Internal tests and assignments – Quality

Each of these parameters has been given different threshold limits and the overall threshold limit is 80.5%.

Faculty members who could perform above the desired thresholds were

1. Encouraged to pursue research by providing seed money grant if necessary.
2. Encouraged to upgrade qualification by deputing them on academic leave.

Faculty members who could not perform to the desired thresholds are

1. Advised to undergo pedagogical trainings to improve their teaching methods and techniques.
2. Referred to Faculty Review Committee to identify their areas of improvement.
3. Deputed for Faculty development programs

b) Faculty Review Committee:

A review committee is constituted with the following members:

- Subject Expert(s)
- HOD
- Principal
- Management representative(s)

The Committee assesses performance of the faculty on the following metrics:

Parameter	**Marks**	
	Max.	**Min.**
Subject knowledge	60	40
Clarity in presentation	20	13

Innovation in Teaching Methodology	10	6
Blackboard management	10	6
Total	100	65

The faculty whose performance is to be reviewed are given adequate notice to appear before the Review Committee. Based on his/her choice of interest of the subjects taught, the faculty is required to give a presentation on the chosen topic. During the presentation, the subject experts interact with the faculty and assess his/her subject knowledge, clarity in presentation, etc. in the courses taught by him / her. The assessment report is prepared based on the parameters shown above and the assessment is considered as successful if the minimum requirement is met in all the parameters.

Effectiveness and follow-up action:

The performance review by the Faculty Review Committee has been in vogue for several years and it is for newly recruited/promoted faulty during their probation period, and is also for faculty whose performance has not been satisfactory based on the student feedback through CRC. The performance of non-teaching staff is monitored at the laboratory/department level. In case of those working in the laboratory, the faculty in-charge for the laboratory conducts skill tests occasionally to make sure that their performance is up to date.

c) Exit Survey

Program exit feedback is collected from the graduating students to improve upon the course content, its delivery mechanism and evaluation system.

Evidence of Success:

Result Analysis

	2021-22				2020-21			
Programme	**Appeared**	**Passed**	**Pass %**	**First Class With Distinctions**	**Appeared**	**Passed**	**Pass %**	**First Class With Distinctions**
Civil	67	67	100.00	44	76	76	100.00	53
CSE	130	130	100.00	115	144	144	100.00	121
EEE	68	67	98.52	40	69	68	98.55	35
ECE	132	131	99.24	114	145	143	98.62	113
Mechanical	128	122	95.31	62	134	131	97.76	62
IT	129	125	96.89	95	139	137	98.56	89
Total	**654**	**642**	**98.16**		**707**	**699**	**98.86**	

Campus Placement

Bachelor of Engineering [B.E] Campus Placements Details									
S.No.	Branch	No. of Students eligible		Gross		Net		% of Selection	
		2021 -22	2020-21	2021 - 22	2020-21	2021 - 22	2020-21	2021 - 22	2020-21
1	CSE	126	137	314	295	126	133	100.00	97.08
2	ECE	131	135	298	251	129	117	98.47	86.67
3	EEE	57	55	94	56	53	37	92.98	67.27
4	IT	122	120	316	240	121	115	99.18	95.83
5	MECH.	84	81	115	90	79	58	94.05	71.60
6	CIVIL	55	60	42	34	31	26	56.36	43.33
	Total	**575**	**588**	**1179**	**966**	**539**	**486**	**93.74**	**82.65**

Problems Encountered:

- Low response rate: One of the significant challenges is obtaining a significant number of responses. Students may be busy or may not prioritize providing feedback, leading to a low response rate. This can affect representativeness and reliability of the feedback.
- Bias and Skewed Feedback: Feedback may be skewed due to various biases, such as extreme opinions or a lack of diverse perspectives. Some students may be more vocal

or critical than others, while some may hesitate to express their honest opinions. This can impact the accuracy and validity of the feedback.

- Lack of Specificity: Students may provide vague or general feedback that lacks specific details. This makes it challenging to identify actionable areas for improvement or address specific concerns effectively.

Being aware of these potential problems can help us anticipate and address them effectively .Implementing strategies such as clear communication, targeted reminders, ensuring anonymity, and providing a feedback loop can help mitigate these challenges and improve the overall feedback collection process.

Resources Required:

- Feedback Forms or Surveys: Creating feedback forms or surveys to collect structured feedback from students.
- Anonymity and Privacy: Ensuring that students feel comfortable providing honest feedback by assuring them of the anonymity and privacy of their responses.
- Time and Scheduling: Allocating sufficient time for students to provide feedback considering factors such as student workload, exam schedules, and availability.
- Feedback Action Plan: Allocating resources to analyse and act upon the feedback received.

By leveraging these resources, we can gather feedback from students and use their insights to enhance the learning experience and improve the overall educational environment

Title of the Best Practice #2:

Encouraging the faculty members and students to publish papers in refereed journals and to complete SWAYAM-NPTEL Online Certification Courses on a regular basis.

Objective of the practice:

- Enhancing the quality of the research publications;

- Updation of the subject knowledge by doing SWAYAM-NPTEL Courses.

The Context:

- Publishing the research findings in refereed/indexed journals by a faculty or student ensures a better review of their research work. It also improves the research profile of a faculty and/or in terms of citation index/H-Index, etc.
- Regular updation of the subject knowledge is the need of the hour for a faculty to engage the class effectively and also for a student to prepare in their academics. Regular registration and completion of the relevant SWAYAM-NPTEL Courses ensures the updation of subject knowledge and applications/relevance of the subject(s) they are teaching.

The Practice:

- Encouraging/guiding the faculty to publish papers in refereed/Scopus/SCI/SCIE Indexed Journals only.

- Regular review of the publications with time-bound targets.

- Financial support/incentives for faculty to publish papers in refereed/Scopus/SCI/SCIE Journals.

- Financial support and incentive to faculty and students towards completion of SWAYAM-NPTEL Courses.

- Review & mentoring towards doing SWAYAM-NPTEL Courses on a regular basis.

Evidence of Success:

- **Publications:**

Source	2020-21	**2021-22**
Web of science	64	**70**
Scopus	116	**133**

- **Citations:**

Source	2020-21	**2021-22**
Web of science	91	**278**
Scopus	304	**415**

- **Patents**

No. of Patents Granted	
2020-21	**2021-22**
1	**4**
No. of Patents Published	
2020-21	**2021-22**
0	**8**

Problem(s) encountered:

- Lack of seriousness of faculty towards publications.

- Access to research facilities at various R & D Organizations towards carrying-out experimental and/or analysis works by the faculty.

- Non-alignment of the institute's academic calendar (temporarily) with the SWAYAM-NPTEL schedules.

Resources required:

Following resources are provided by the College for the effective implementation of the practice:

- Subscription to online Journals viz., Elsevier, IEEE, ASME etc.

- Remote access facility to browse all library resources, including online journals.

- Digital Library facility for doing NPTEL Coursework/assignments.

- Wi-Fi facility with 450 MBPS Leased-line and 1 GBPS Broadband.

- Financial support/incentives towards quality publications and completion of NPTEL Courses on merit.