Mittal Institute of Education Student Satisfaction Survey Report 2023-24

Mittal Institute of Education for the purpose of student satisfaction survey, developed a questionnaire to understand the satisfaction of the students and how to improve the academics thereafter.

A google sheet was generated and the link was shared with our students. The feedback generated is being put up as follows:

1.

What s	What subject area are you currently pursuing?								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent				
Valid	B. Sc	68	28.0	28.0	28.0				
	B.Com	64	26.3	26.3	54.3				
	B.Ed	14	5.8	5.8	60.1				
	BBA	59	24.3	24.3	84.4				
	BCA	11	4.5	4.9	89.7				
	M.Ed	25	10.3	10.7	100				
	Total	243	100.0	100.0					

The data represents the distribution of respondents based on the subject area they are currently pursuing. Here's a summary:

• **B. Sc**: 68 respondents (28.0%)

• **B. Com**: 64 respondents (26.3%)

• **B.Ed**: 14 respondents (5.8%)

• **BBA**: 59 respondents (24.3%)

• **BCA**: 11 respondents (4.5%)

• **M.Ed**: 25 respondents (10.3%)

The total number of respondents is 243, with the cumulative percentage showing the gradual buildup of respondents as each subject area is listed.

Gender							
					Cumulative		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent		
Valid	Female	104	42.8	42.8	42.8		
	Male	139	57.2	57.2	100.0		
	Total	243	100.0	100.0			

This dataset represents the gender distribution of 243 respondents. Here's the breakdown:

Female: 104 respondents (42.8%)Male: 139 respondents (57.2%)

The percentages show the proportion of each gender among the total respondents, with males making up the majority.

3.

		Age	
N	Valid	243	
	Missing	0	
Median		20.0000	
Mode		19.00	
Std. Deviatio	n	4.05837	
Skewness		2.975	
Std. Error of	Skewness	.156	
Kurtosis		10.538	
Std. Error of	Kurtosis	.311	

This data provides statistical information about the ages of 243 respondents. Here's what each metric indicates:

- **N Valid**: 243 respondents, meaning no data is missing for age.
- **Median Age**: 20 years. This means that 50% of respondents are younger than 20, and 50% are older.
- Mode: 19 years. This is the most frequently occurring age in the dataset.

- **Standard Deviation**: 4.05837. This indicates the average spread of ages from the mean. A higher value would suggest greater variability in ages.
- **Skewness**: 2.975. A positive skewness value indicates that the distribution is skewed to the right, meaning more respondents are on the younger side, with a few older respondents pulling the distribution.
- Standard Error of Skewness: 0.156. This measures the accuracy of the skewness estimate.
- **Kurtosis**: 10.538. A high kurtosis value indicates a sharp peak in the distribution, implying that most respondents are clustered around a particular age (likely near 19 or 20).
- **Standard Error of Kurtosis**: 0.311. This measures the accuracy of the kurtosis estimate.

4.	† .						
Age							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	18.50	1	.4	.4	.4		
	18.90	1	.4	.4	.8		
	19.00	89	36.6	36.6	37.4		
	19.11	1	.4	.4	37.9		
	20.00	58	23.9	23.9	61.7		
	21.00	27	11.1	11.1	72.8		
	22.00	20	8.2	8.2	81.1		
	23.00	9	3.7	3.7	84.8		
	24.00	2	.8	.8	85.6		
	25.00	9	3.7	3.7	89.3		
	26.00	4	1.6	1.6	90.9		
	27.00	4	1.6	1.6	92.6		
	28.00	5	2.1	2.1	94.7		
	30.00	1	.4	.4	95.1		
	32.00	4	1.6	1.6	96.7		
	33.00	3	1.2	1.2	97.9		
	37.00	2	.8	.8	98.8		
	39.00	1	.4	.4	99.2		
	43.00	1	.4	.4	99.6		
	45.00	1	.4	.4	100.0		
	Total	243	100.0	100.0			

5. Wha	5.What degree program are you pursuing now?						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	Α	1	.4	.4	.4		
	Bachelor's	176	72.4	72.4	72.8		
	Bba	1	.4	.4	73.3		
	BBA	1	.4	.4	73.7		
	BBA 2 year	1	.4	.4	74.1		
	Bca	1	.4	.4	74.5		
	Bcom	1	.4	.4	74.9		
	Bsc	1	.4	.4	75.3		
	Bsc computer	1	.4	.4	75.7		
	Diploma	17	7.0	7.0	82.7		
	Graduation	5	2.1	2.1	84.8		
	Master's	34	14.0	14.0	98.8		
	MPhil	1	.4	.4	99.2		
	Ug	1	.4	.4	99.6		
	एम. एड	1	.4	.4	100.0		
	Total	243	100.0	100.0			

This dataset provides the distribution of ages among 243 respondents. Here's a breakdown:

- Most Frequent Age (Mode): 19 years, with 89 respondents (36.6%) falling in this category.
- **Ages between 18 and 22**: The majority of respondents fall in this age range, making up 72.8% of the total.
 - o **19 years**: 89 respondents (36.6%)
 - o **20 years**: 58 respondents (23.9%)
 - o **21 years**: 27 respondents (11.1%)
 - o **22 years**: 20 respondents (8.2%)
- Older Age Groups:
 - o Ages 23-28 account for a smaller but significant portion, with 9 respondents at 23 years, 9 at 25 years, and 5 at 28 years.
 - o A few outliers are present in the older age ranges (30–45 years), but these are much less common (each age has between 0.4% and 1.6% representation).

This distribution supports the earlier analysis that the dataset is skewed towards younger respondents, with a strong peak around the age of 19. The older respondents, while present, form a long tail in the distribution.

6.

6.	6. How much of the syllabus was covered in the class?							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	30 to 54%	1	.4	.4	.4			
	55 to 69%	58	23.9	23.9	24.3			
	70 to 84%	88	36.2	36.2	60.5			
	85 to 100%	90	37.0	37.0	97.5			
	Below 30%	6	2.5	2.5	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data represents the respondents' perception of how much of the syllabus was covered in their classes. Here's the breakdown:

• **30 to 54%**: 1 respondent (0.4%)

• **55 to 69%**: 58 respondents (23.9%)

• **70 to 84%**: 88 respondents (36.2%)

• **85 to 100%**: 90 respondents (37.0%) – the largest group

• **Below 30%**: 6 respondents (2.5%)

Key Insights:

• The majority (73.2%) of respondents felt that **70% or more** of the syllabus was covered in class, with **85 to 100%** being the most common response (37.0%).

• A small minority (2.9%) felt that less than 54% of the syllabus was covered.

7.

7.	7. How well did the teachers prepare for the classes?							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Indifferently	17	7.0	7.0	7.0			
	Poorly	6	2.5	2.5	9.5			
	Satisfactorily	132	54.3	54.3	63.8			
	Thoroughly	83	34.2	34.2	97.9			
	Won't teach at all	5	2.1	2.1	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data shows respondents' perceptions of how well teachers prepared for their classes. Here's the breakdown:

• **Thoroughly**: 83 respondents (34.2%)

• **Satisfactorily**: 132 respondents (54.3%) – the largest group

• **Indifferently**: 17 respondents (7.0%)

• **Poorly**: 6 respondents (2.5%)

• Won't teach at all: 5 respondents (2.1%)

Key Insights:

- The majority of respondents (88.5%) felt that teachers prepared either satisfactorily (54.3%) or thoroughly (34.2%).
- A small group (4.6%) felt that the teachers prepared **indifferently** or **poorly**.
- A very small minority (2.1%) felt that the teachers "won't teach at all."

8.

8.	8. How well were the teachers able to communicate?							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Always effective	158	65.0	65.0	65.0			
	Generally ineffective	1	.4	.4	65.4			
	Just satisfactorily	29	11.9	11.9	77.4			
	Sometimes effective	47	19.3	19.3	96.7			
	Very poor communication	8	3.3	3.3	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data reflects the respondents' perceptions of how well teachers were able to communicate. Here's the breakdown:

• Always effective: 158 respondents (65.0%) – the majority

• **Sometimes effective**: 47 respondents (19.3%)

• **Just satisfactorily**: 29 respondents (11.9%)

• **Very poor communication**: 8 respondents (3.3%)

• **Generally ineffective**: 1 respondent (0.4%)

Key Insights:

- The vast majority (65.0%) felt that teachers were **always effective** in communication.
- A significant portion (19.3%) found teachers **sometimes effective**, with 11.9% feeling communication was **just satisfactory**.
- Very few respondents (3.7%) felt communication was **very poor** or **generally ineffective**.

9.

9. The teacher's approach to teaching can best be described as

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	94	38.7	38.7	38.7
	Fair	7	2.9	2.9	41.6
	Good	51	21.0	21.0	62.6
	Poor	9	3.7	3.7	66.3
	Very good	82	33.7	33.7	100.0
	Total	243	100.0	100.0	

This data represents the respondents' views on the teacher's approach to teaching. Here's the breakdown:

• **Excellent**: 94 respondents (38.7%) – the largest group

• **Very good**: 82 respondents (33.7%)

• **Good**: 51 respondents (21.0%)

Fair: 7 respondents (2.9%)Poor: 9 respondents (3.7%)

Key Insights:

- A combined **72.4%** of respondents rated the teacher's approach as either **Excellent** (38.7%) or **Very good** (33.7%).
- A smaller portion, 21.0%, described the approach as Good, while only 6.6% rated it as Fair or Poor.

10.

10. F	10. Fairness of the internal evaluation process by the teachers.							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Always fair	152	62.6	62.6	62.6			
	Sometimes unfair	24	9.9	9.9	72.4			
	Unfair	10	4.1	4.1	76.5			
	Usually fair	45	18.5	18.5	95.1			
	Usually unfair	12	4.9	4.9	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data represents respondents' perceptions of the fairness of the internal evaluation process by teachers. Here's the breakdown:

• Always fair: 152 respondents (62.6%) – the majority

• Usually fair: 45 respondents (18.5%)

• **Sometimes unfair**: 24 respondents (9.9%)

• Usually unfair: 12 respondents (4.9%)

• **Unfair**: 10 respondents (4.1%)

Key Insights:

- A significant majority (81.1%) of respondents believe the evaluation process is **always** or **usually fair**.
- Around 9.9% feel the process is **sometimes unfair**, with 9.0% believing it to be **usually unfair** or outright **unfair**.

11.

11. Was your performance in assignments discussed with you?							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	Every time	151	62.1	62.1	62.1		
	Never	11	4.5	4.5	66.7		
	Occasionally/Sometimes	34	14.0	14.0	80.7		
	Rarely	10	4.1	4.1	84.8		
	Usually	37	15.2	15.2	100.0		
	Total	243	100.0	100.0			

This data reflects how often respondents' performance in assignments was discussed with them. Here's the breakdown:

• **Every time**: 151 respondents (62.1%) – the majority

• Usually: 37 respondents (15.2%)

• Occasionally/Sometimes: 34 respondents (14.0%)

Never: 11 respondents (4.5%)Rarely: 10 respondents (4.1%)

Key Insights:

- A strong majority (77.3%) of respondents reported that their performance was discussed either **every time** or **usually**.
- About 14.0% said it was discussed occasionally or sometimes.

12.

12. The institute takes active interest in promoting internship, student exchange, field visit opportunities for students.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	14	5.8	5.8	5.8
	Often	29	11.9	11.9	17.7
	Rarely	9	3.7	3.7	21.4
	Regularly	161	66.3	66.3	87.7
	Sometimes	30	12.3	12.3	100.0
	Total	243	100.0	100.0	

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of how actively the institute promotes opportunities such as internships, student exchanges, and field visits. Here's the breakdown:

• **Regularly**: 161 respondents (66.3%) – the majority

• **Sometimes**: 30 respondents (12.3%)

Often: 29 respondents (11.9%)
Rarely: 9 respondents (3.7%)
Never: 14 respondents (5.8%)

Key Insights:

- A significant majority (78.6%) of respondents feel that the institute promotes these opportunities **regularly** or **sometimes**.
- Only a small percentage (9.5%) reported that the institute does so **rarely** or **never**.

This indicates a generally positive perception of the institute's efforts to facilitate practical experiences for students.

13.

13. cogniti	13. The teaching and mentoring process in your institution facilitates you in cognitive, social and emotional growth.								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent				
Valid	Marginally	6	2.5	2.5	2.5				
	Moderately	37	15.2	15.2	17.7				
	Not at all	14	5.8	5.8	23.5				
	Significantly	71	29.2	29.2	52.7				
	Very well	115	47.3	47.3	100.0				
	Total	243	100.0	100.0					

This is a great summary of the data regarding respondents' perceptions of the institute's promotion of internships, student exchanges, and field visits.

Key Highlights:

- **Majority Perception**: With 66.3% reporting that these opportunities are promoted **regularly**, it's clear that most students feel supported in gaining practical experience.
- **Positive Engagement**: The combined percentage of those who said these opportunities are promoted **regularly** or **sometimes** (78.6%) suggests a strong commitment from the institute to facilitate student engagement outside the classroom.
- **Minimal Negativity**: The low percentage (9.5%) of respondents indicating that such opportunities are promoted **rarely** or **never** shows that concerns about lack of engagement are minimal.

14.

14.	The institution provides multiple opportunities to learn and grow.						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	Agree	90	37.0	37.0	37.0		
	Disagree	11	4.5	4.5	41.6		
	Neutral	31	12.8	12.8	54.3		
	Strongly agree	101	41.6	41.6	95.9		
	Strongly disagree	10	4.1	4.1	100.0		
	Total	243	100.0	100.0			

This data provides insights into respondents' perceptions of whether the institution offers multiple opportunities for learning and growth. Here's a detailed breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

- **Strongly agree**: 101 respondents (41.6%)
- **Agree**: 90 respondents (37.0%)
- Neutral: 31 respondents (12.8%)
- **Disagree**: 11 respondents (4.5%)
- **Strongly disagree**: 10 respondents (4.1%)

Key Insights:

- **Positive Perception**: A combined **79.6%** of respondents either **strongly agree** (41.6%) or **agree** (37.0%), indicating a strong positive perception of the institution's efforts to provide learning and growth opportunities.
- **Neutral Stance**: About **12.8%** of respondents are **neutral**, suggesting they have neither a strong positive nor negative view.
- **Minimal Discontent**: Only **8.6%** of respondents indicated that they **disagree** or **strongly disagree** with the statement, reflecting a generally favorable outlook on the institution's offerings.

Overall, the data indicates that most respondents feel positively about the institution's role in facilitating their learning and growth, with only a small percentage expressing dissatisfaction.

15.

15. progra	15. Teachers inform you about your expected competencies, course outcomes and programme outcomes.								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent				
Valid	Every time	151	62.1	62.1	62.1				
	Never	14	5.8	5.8	67.9				
	Occasionally/Sometimes	23	9.5	9.5	77.4				
	Rarely	9	3.7	3.7	81.1				
	Usually	46	18.9	18.9	100.0				
	Total	243	100.0	100.0					

his data reflects respondents' perceptions of how often teachers inform them about expected competencies, course outcomes, and program outcomes. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

• **Every time**: 151 respondents (62.1%) – the majority

• Usually: 46 respondents (18.9%)

• Occasionally/Sometimes: 23 respondents (9.5%)

Rarely: 9 respondents (3.7%)Never: 14 respondents (5.8%)

Key Insights:

- **Strong Communication**: A significant majority (81.0%) of respondents report that teachers inform them **every time** (62.1%) or **usually** (18.9%) about competencies and outcomes.
- **Minimal Infrequency**: A small percentage (9.5%) indicated that they are informed **occasionally/sometimes**, while an even smaller portion (9.5%) stated they are **rarely** or **never** informed.

Overall, the data suggests that most respondents feel well-informed about their expected competencies and course outcomes, indicating effective communication from teachers. The small percentage of respondents who feel uninformed points to areas for potential improvement.

16.

16. Yo	16. Your mentor does a necessary follow-up with an assigned task to you.									
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent					
Valid	Every time	135	55.6	55.6	55.6					
	Never	10	4.1	4.1	59.7					
	Occasionally/Sometimes	33	13.6	13.6	73.3					
	Rarely	14	5.8	5.8	79.0					
	Usually	51	21.0	21.0	100.0					
	Total	243	100.0	100.0						

his data reflects respondents' perceptions of how often their mentor follows up on assigned tasks. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

• Every time: 135 respondents (55.6%) – the majority

• Usually: 51 respondents (21.0%)

• Occasionally/Sometimes: 33 respondents (13.6%)

Rarely: 14 respondents (5.8%)Never: 10 respondents (4.1%)

Key Insights:

- **Strong Follow-Up**: A substantial majority (76.6%) of respondents report that their mentor follows up **every time** (55.6%) or **usually** (21.0%).
- **Minimal Lack of Follow-Up**: A small percentage (9.9%) indicated that follow-up occurs **rarely** or **never**.

Overall, this data suggests that most respondents feel well-supported by their mentors, with consistent follow-up on assigned tasks. The small percentage of respondents who feel that follow-up is lacking may indicate areas for improvement.

17.	The teachers illustrate the concepts through examples and applications.							
					Cumulative			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent			
Valid	Every time	143	58.8	58.8	58.8			
	Never	12	4.9	4.9	63.8			

Occasionally/Sometimes	29	11.9	11.9	75.7
Rarely	11	4.5	4.5	80.2
Usually	48	19.8	19.8	100.0
Total	243	100.0	100.0	

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of how often teachers illustrate concepts through examples and applications. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

• Every time: 143 respondents (58.8%) – the majority

• Usually: 48 respondents (19.8%)

• Occasionally/Sometimes: 29 respondents (11.9%)

Rarely: 11 respondents (4.5%)Never: 12 respondents (4.9%)

Key Insights:

• **Effective Illustration**: A significant majority (78.6%) of respondents report that teachers illustrate concepts **every time** (58.8%) or **usually** (19.8%).

• **Limited Negativity**: Only a small percentage (9.4%) indicated that teachers illustrate concepts **rarely** or **never**.

Overall, the data suggests that most respondents feel that teachers effectively use examples and applications to clarify concepts, enhancing their understanding. The small proportion of respondents who feel this is lacking indicates that there is room for improvement, but the overall perception is positive.

18

18. right le	18. The teachers identify your strengths and encourage you with providing right level of challenges.								
	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent				
Valid	Fully	144	59.3	59.3	59.3				
	Partially	18	7.4	7.4	66.7				
	Reasonably	52	21.4	21.4	88.1				
	Slightly	15	6.2	6.2	94.2				
	Unable to	14	5.8	5.8	100.0				
	Total	243	100.0	100.0					

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of how well teachers identify their strengths and provide the right level of challenges. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

• Fully: 144 respondents (59.3%) – the majority

Reasonably: 52 respondents (21.4%)
Partially: 18 respondents (7.4%)
Slightly: 15 respondents (6.2%)

• **Unable to**: 14 respondents (5.8%)

Key Insights:

- **Strong Support**: A significant majority (80.7%) of respondents feel that teachers identify their strengths and provide appropriate challenges either **fully** (59.3%) or **reasonably** (21.4%).
- Minor Concerns: About 19.6% indicated that teachers do this partially, slightly, or are unable to do so, which suggests there may be some areas for improvement.

Overall, the data indicates a positive perception regarding teachers' ability to recognize students' strengths and encourage them appropriately. While the majority feel well-supported, the minority expressing concern may highlight areas where additional focus could enhance the learning experience.

19.

19. Teachers are able to identify your weaknesses and help you to overcome them.								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Every time	146	60.1	60.1	60.1			
	Never	17	7.0	7.0	67.1			
	Occasionally/Sometimes	24	9.9	9.9	77.0			
	Rarely	12	4.9	4.9	81.9			
	Usually	44	18.1	18.1	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of how well teachers are able to identify their weaknesses and help them overcome these challenges. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

• **Every time**: 146 respondents (60.1%) – the majority

• Usually: 44 respondents (18.1%)

• Occasionally/Sometimes: 24 respondents (9.9%)

Rarely: 12 respondents (4.9%)Never: 17 respondents (7.0%)

Key Insights:

- **Strong Identification**: A significant majority (78.2%) of respondents feel that teachers are able to identify their weaknesses and assist them **every time** (60.1%) or **usually** (18.1%).
- **Limited Negativity**: Only a small percentage (11.9%) indicated that teachers do this **rarely** or **never**.

Overall, the data suggests a positive perception regarding teachers' ability to recognize students' weaknesses and provide support. The high percentage of respondents who feel supported in overcoming their weaknesses indicates effective teaching practices, while the smaller proportion expressing dissatisfaction points to potential areas for improvement.\

20

20.	The institution makes effort to engage students in the monitoring, review and							
contin	uous quality improve	ment of the te	aching learn	ing process.				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Agree	95	39.1	39.1	39.1			
	Disagree	11	4.5	4.5	43.6			
	Neutral	25	10.3	10.3	53.9			
	Strongly agree	101	41.6	41.6	95.5			
	Strongly disagree	11	4.5	4.5	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of the institution's efforts to engage students in monitoring, reviewing, and continuously improving the teaching-learning process. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

- **Strongly agree**: 101 respondents (41.6%) the largest group
- **Agree**: 95 respondents (39.1%)
- Neutral: 25 respondents (10.3%)
- **Disagree**: 11 respondents (4.5%)
- **Strongly disagree**: 11 respondents (4.5%)

Key Insights:

• **Positive Engagement**: A combined total of **80.7%** of respondents either **strongly agree** (41.6%) or **agree** (39.1%) that the institution actively engages students in the quality improvement process.

- **Neutral Stance**: About **10.3%** of respondents are **neutral**, indicating they have neither a strong positive nor negative view on this matter.
- **Minimal Discontent**: Only **9.0%** of respondents expressed that they **disagree** or **strongly disagree**, suggesting that most students perceive the institution's efforts positively.

Overall, the data indicates a generally favorable perception of the institution's initiatives to involve students in enhancing the teaching-learning process. The majority of respondents feel that their voices are heard in these efforts, while a small percentage expresses dissatisfaction, highlighting potential areas for improvement.

21.

21. The institute/ teachers use student-centric methods, such as experiential learning, participative learning and problem-solving methodologies for enhancing learning experiences.								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Moderate	64	26.3	26.3	26.3			
	Not at all	14	5.8	5.8	32.1			
	Somewhat	21	8.6	8.6	40.7			
	To a great extent	126	51.9	51.9	92.6			
	Very little	18	7.4	7.4	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of the extent to which the institute and teachers use student-centric methods, such as experiential learning, participative learning, and problem-solving methodologies to enhance learning experiences. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

- **To a great extent**: 126 respondents (51.9%) the largest group
- Moderate: 64 respondents (26.3%)
- **Somewhat**: 21 respondents (8.6%)
- **Very little**: 18 respondents (7.4%)
- Not at all: 14 respondents (5.8%)

Key Insights:

- **Positive Utilization**: A significant majority (78.2%) of respondents feel that student-centric methods are used **to a great extent** (51.9%) or **moderately** (26.3%).
- **Limited Negative Perception**: Only a small percentage (13.2%) indicated that these methods are used **very little** or **not at all**.

Overall, the data indicates a favorable perception of the institute's use of student-centric methodologies. The majority of respondents believe that these approaches significantly enhance their learning experiences, while the smaller proportion expressing dissatisfaction suggests room for improvement in specific areas.

22.

22. Teachers encourage you to participate in extracurricular activities.								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Agree	89	36.6	36.6	36.6			
	Disagree	7	2.9	2.9	39.5			
	Neutral	24	9.9	9.9	49.4			
	Strongly agree	110	45.3	45.3	94.7			
	Strongly disagree	13	5.3	5.3	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of whether teachers encourage participation in extracurricular activities. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

• **Strongly agree**: 110 respondents (45.3%) – the largest group

Agree: 89 respondents (36.6%)
Neutral: 24 respondents (9.9%)
Disagree: 7 respondents (2.9%)

• **Strongly disagree**: 13 respondents (5.3%)

Key Insights:

- Strong Support for Extracurricular Participation: A significant majority (81.9%) of respondents feel that teachers encourage participation in extracurricular activities either strongly agree (45.3%) or agree (36.6%).
- **Limited Negative Responses**: Only **8.2%** of respondents expressed that teachers **disagree** or **strongly disagree** regarding encouragement for extracurricular activities.

Overall, the data indicates a positive perception of teachers' encouragement for students to engage in extracurricular activities. The high percentage of respondents who feel supported in this regard suggests that the institution values holistic development through such opportunities, while the small minority indicating otherwise may point to areas for improvement.

23.

23. and en	23. Efforts are made by the institute/ teachers to inculcate soft skills, life skills and employability skills to make you ready for the world of work.							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Moderate	60	24.7	24.7	24.7			
	Not at all	17	7.0	7.0	31.7			
	Somewhat	24	9.9	9.9	41.6			
	To a great extent	126	51.9	51.9	93.4			
	Very little	16	6.6	6.6	100.0			
	Total	243	100.0	100.0				

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of the efforts made by the institute and teachers to inculcate soft skills, life skills, and employability skills to prepare students for the workforce. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

• **To a great extent**: 126 respondents (51.9%) – the largest group

Moderate: 60 respondents (24.7%)Somewhat: 24 respondents (9.9%)

• Very little: 16 respondents (6.6%)

• Not at all: 17 respondents (7.0%)

Key Insights:

- Strong Focus on Skills Development: A significant majority (76.6%) of respondents feel that efforts are made to inculcate these essential skills either to a great extent (51.9%) or moderately (24.7%).
- **Limited Negative Perception**: Only a small percentage (13.6%) indicated that efforts are made **very little** or **not at all**.

Overall, the data suggests a positive perception regarding the institute's commitment to developing students' soft, life, and employability skills. The majority of respondents feel that they are well-prepared for the world of work, while the minority expressing dissatisfaction highlights potential areas for further enhancement.

24.

24. What percentage of teachers use ICT tools such as LCD projector, Multimedia, etc. while teaching.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	30 – 49%	20	8.2	8.2	8.2
	50 – 69%	49	20.2	20.2	28.4
	70 – 89%	84	34.6	34.6	63.0
	Above 90%	64	26.3	26.3	89.3
	Below 29%	26	10.7	10.7	100.0
	Total	243	100.0	100.0	

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of the percentage of teachers using ICT (Information and Communication Technology) tools, such as LCD projectors and multimedia, while teaching. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

- **Above 90%**: 64 respondents (26.3%) indicating a high usage
- **70 89%**: 84 respondents (34.6%) also a significant group
- 50 69%: 49 respondents (20.2%)
- **30 49%**: 20 respondents (8.2%)
- **Below 29%**: 26 respondents (10.7%)

Key Insights:

- **High Usage of ICT Tools**: A combined total of **60.9%** of respondents feel that ICT tools are used **to a high extent**, either **above 90%** (26.3%) or **70-89%** (34.6%).
- Moderate to Low Usage: The remaining 39.1% report lower usage levels, with 20.2% using 50-69% and 18.9% using below 49%.

Overall, the data suggests a generally positive perception of ICT tool usage among teachers, with a substantial portion of respondents indicating that a majority of teachers effectively incorporate these technologies into their teaching. This trend highlights the institution's commitment to enhancing learning experiences through technology. However, the responses also indicate that there may be room for improvement in further integrating ICT tools into teaching practices.

25. T	The overall quality of teaching-learning process in your institute is very good.						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	Agree	94	38.7	38.7	38.7		
	Disagree	9	3.7	3.7	42.4		
	Neutral	27	11.1	11.1	53.5		

	Strongly agree	97	39.9	39.9	93.4
	Strongly disagree	16	6.6	6.6	100.0
	Total	243	100.0	100.0	

This data reflects respondents' perceptions of the overall quality of the teaching-learning process at the institute. Here's the breakdown:

Frequency Distribution:

• **Strongly agree**: 97 respondents (39.9%) – indicating a strong positive sentiment

Agree: 94 respondents (38.7%)
Neutral: 27 respondents (11.1%)
Disagree: 9 respondents (3.7%)

• Strongly disagree

Qualitative Analysis

Based on the feedback provided, here are three observations and suggestions to improve the overall teaching-learning experience in your institution:

- 1. **Enhance Active Learning**: Encourage more active learning strategies where students can engage in discussions, group projects, and hands-on activities. This could involve using multimedia presentations and interactive classroom sessions to make learning more engaging. Students benefit from applying what they learn, so incorporating real-life case studies and problem-solving activities can significantly enhance their understanding.
- 2. **Provide Regular Feedback**: Establish a feedback loop where both teachers and students can share insights about the teaching and learning process. Teachers should offer constructive feedback on assignments and performance, while students should be encouraged to provide input on teaching styles and classroom activities. This two-way communication can help identify areas for improvement and tailor the learning experience to better meet student needs.
- 3. Leverage Technology and Resources: Incorporate modern teaching technologies and resources, such as digital tools for presentations, e-libraries with access to study materials, and smart classrooms equipped with the latest gadgets. Providing students with access to online resources and encouraging the use of educational software can enhance their learning experience. Additionally, regular updates to lab equipment and resources will ensure that students are learning with current tools and technologies.

These suggestions aim to create a more dynamic and supportive educational environment that fosters student engagement and success.