



DIVISION OF STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 025

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

(July 2015 – June 2017)

Name of the Parent: K. PALANIVELU
Degree: M. EC Structural Engg

The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

1. The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc)

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as on modern/advanced topics.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. Was there a balance between theory and practical?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practical etc)?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. Are the prescribed books relevant?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. Were the Labs better equipped?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

HOD (CIVIL)
PROFESSOR AND HEAD
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI - 600 025

Signature of the Parent



STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI 600 025

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

(July 2018 – June 2019)

Name of the Parent: K VENKATA RAMANA F/O K VENKATA NARESH

Degree: M-E, STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING

The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

1. The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc)

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as on modern/advanced topics.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. Was there a balance between theory and practical?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicals etc)?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. Are the prescribed books relevant?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. Were the Labs better equipped?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree


Signature of the Parent



STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI 600 025

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

(July 2018 – June 2019)

Name of the Parent: *Syed Naseer F/O Syed Zaheerudin Khadri*

Degree: *M.E Structural Engineering*

The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

1. The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc)

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as on modern/advanced topics.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. Was there a balance between theory and practical?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicals etc)?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. Are the prescribed books relevant?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. Were the Labs better equipped?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Signature of the Parent