

## School of Studies in Chemistry

### Action Taken Report

&


### Summary of Analysis

Session: 2016 – 17

#### A. Feedback Inventory for Students


### Parameters of Responses (%) 2016 – 17 – IV SEM

Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total Response
30.2	45.6	18.2	0.7	30.00



## Parameters of Responses (%) 2016 – 17 – II SEM

Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total Response
43.6	46.9	9.5	0.0	27.00



### Session: 2016 – 17 [II – SEM]


S.N.	TEACHERS	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1.	PROF. K. K. GHOSH	65.8	32.1	2.1	0.0
2.	PROF. M. K. DEB	65.8	24.7	9.5	0.0
3.	PROF. S. PERVEZ	59.3	29.6	11.1	0.0
4.	PROF. S. S. BHOITE	29.6	30.0	39.9	0.4
5.	DR. M. K. RAI	32.9	33.7	30.5	2.9
6.	DR. M. L. SATNAMI	72.0	23.9	4.1	0.0
7.	BHUPENDRA KUMAR	45.3	40.3	14.4	0.0
8.	BHARTI VERMA	37.0	34.2	26.3	1.6

### Session 2016-17 (II Semester)



### Session: 2016 – 17 [IV – SEM]

S.N.	TEACHERS	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1.	PROF. K. K. GHOSH	48.1	44.6	6.0	1.1
2.	PROF. M. K. DEB	55.1	36.5	6.3	1.8
3.	PROF. S. PERVEZ	53.3	31.9	10.2	4.2
4.	PROF. S. S. BHOITE	35.8	41.4	16.1	6.0
5.	DR. M. K. RAI	38.9	46.0	14.4	0.4
6.	DR. M. L. SATNAMI	47.0	41.4	10.5	0.4
7.	BHUPENDRA KUMAR	46.0	37.2	14.4	2.5
8.	BHARTI VERMA	36.5	46.0	13.7	3.2



## B. Action Taken Report

The feedback given by the students were analysed and discussed in Staff council meeting. Suitable action was taken so as to satisfy the expectations of students. This further helped us to improve the teaching methodology and pedagogy as per the expectations of the students.

## School of Studies in Chemistry

### Action Taken Report

&

### Summary of Analysis

Session: 2017 – 18

#### A. Feedback Inventory for Students

### Parameters of Responses (%) 2017 - 18


Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total Response
31.35	28.96	32.94	6.75	28.00

### 2017-18



## Session: 2017 – 18

S.N.	TEACHERS	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1.	PROF. K. K. GHOSH	49.28	23.57	10.71	16.42
2.	PROF. M. K. DEB	48.57	31.42	6.42	13.57
3.	PROF. S. PERVEZ	67.5	16.42	5.35	10.71
4.	PROF. S. A. BHOITE	45	24.28	17.14	13.57
5.	DR. M. K. RAI	49.64	24.64	13.21	15.71
6.	DR. M. L .SATNAMI	72.85	14.28	3.57	9.28
7.	DR. K. K. SHRIVAS	76.78	13.21	3.21	9.64
8.	DR. I. KARBHAL	82.5	7.14	1.78	8.57



## B. Action Taken Report

The feedback given by the students were analysed and discussed in Staff council meeting. Suitable action was taken so as to satisfy the expectations of students. This further helped us to improve the teaching methodology and pedagogy as per the expectations of the students.

## School of Studies in Chemistry

### Action Taken Report

&


### Summary of Analysis

Session: 2018 – 19

#### A. Feedback Inventory for Students


### Parameters of Responses (%) 2018 - 19

Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total Response
46.1	38.9	10.4	4.5	34.00



## Session: 2018 – 19

S.N.	TEACHERS	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1.	PROF. K. K. GHOSH	69.6	25.2	4.2	1
2.	PROF. M. K. DEB	63.1	30.1	5.5	0.3
3.	PROF. S. PERVEZ	72.9	24.2	2.9	0
4.	DR. M. K. RAI	20.9	39.2	27.4	12.4
5.	DR. M. L. SATNAMI	55.9	42.4	1.6	0
6.	DR. K. K. SHRIVAS	72.9	26.5	0.6	0
7.	DR. I. KARBHAL	89.9	10.1	0	0
8.	RAM SINGH KURREY	35.3	47	16	1.6





## **B. Action Taken Report**

The feedback given by the students were analysed and discussed in Staff council meeting. Suitable action was taken so as to satisfy the expectations of students. This further helped us to improve the teaching methodology and pedagogy as per the expectations of the students.

## School of Studies in Chemistry

### Action Taken Report

&

### Summary of Analysis

Session: 2019 - 2020

#### A. Feedback Inventory for Students

#### Parameters of Responses (%) 2019 – 20 – I SEM

Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total Response
34.96	50.68	13.27	1.08	41.00

#### 2019-20 (I Semester)



#### Parameters of Responses (%) 2019 – 20 – III SEM

Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total Response
52.28	38.23	6.86	2.61	34.00


## 2019-20 (III Semester)



### Session: 2019 – 20 [I – SEM]

S.N.	TEACHERS	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1.	PROF. K. K. GHOSH	65.58	28.99	5.14	0.27
2.	PROF. M. K. DEB	57.72	36.85	5.42	0.27
3.	PROF. S. PERVEZ	54.20	36.58	8.67	0.27
4.	DR. M. K. RAI	15.17	48.23	35.77	0.81
5.	DR. K. K. SHRIVAS	43.08	47.96	8.40	0.54
6.	DR. M. L .SATNAMI	63.68	33.33	2.71	0.27
7.	DR. I. KARBHAL	71.54	25.47	2.71	0.27


### Session 2019-20 (I Semester)



### Session: 2019 – 20 [III – SEM]

S.N.	TEACHERS	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1.	PROF. K. K. GHOSH	62.74	28.10	14.70	5.22
2.	PROF. M. K. DEB	54.90	33.98	17.64	4.57
3.	PROF. S. PERVEZ	52.94	33.00	17.64	7.51
4.	DR. M. K. RAI	33.66	31.37	30.39	15.68
5.	DR. K. K. SHRIVAS	77.12	21.89	9.80	2.28
6.	DR. M. L. SATNAMI	69.28	26.79	13.39	1.63
7.	DR. I. KARBHAL	87.90	13.07	8.49	1.63

## Session 2019-20 (III Semester)



## B. Action Taken Report

The feedback given by the students were analysed and discussed in Staff council meeting. Suitable action was taken so as to satisfy the expectations of students. This further helped us to improve the teaching methodology and pedagogy as per the expectations of the students.

## School of Studies in Chemistry

### Action Taken Report

&


### Summary of Analysis

Session: 2020 - 21

#### A. Feedback Inventory for Students


### Parameters of Responses (%) 2020 - 21

Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total Response
32.77	39.44	25.27	2.5	40.00



## Session: 2020 – 21

S.N.	TEACHERS	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1.	PROF. K. K. GHOSH	75.5	14	7.75	2.75
2.	PROF. M. K. DEB	59.5	24.5	12.75	3.25
3.	PROF. S. PERVEZ	54.75	27.5	13.75	4
4.	DR. M. K. RAI	32	13.25	39.5	9.5
5.	DR. K. K. SHRIVAS	75.75	11.25	8.5	1.75
6.	DR. M. L. SATNAMI	69.5	18.5	9	3.25
7.	DR. I. KARBHAL	82	11.25	5.5	1.25



## **B. Action Taken Report**

The feedback given by the students were analysed and discussed in Staff council meeting. Suitable action was taken so as to satisfy the expectations of students. This further helped us to improve the teaching methodology and pedagogy as per the expectations of the students.