

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								
	Name of the Parent: K.PALANIVELU Degree: M. E (Structural Engg)								
	The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.								
	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
1.	The course was well of changes etc)	organized (e	g. teaching hou	irs, content flow	, access to materials, notifications				
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
2.	The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as onmodem/advancedtopics.								
	OStrongly Agree	ØAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
3.	Was there a balance between theory and practical?								
	OStrongly Agree	O Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
4.	Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicaletc)?								
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
5.	The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.								
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
6.	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				

Signature of the Parent

PROFESSOR AND HEAD DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING ACMA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI - 600 025

STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING DIVISION DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI 600 025

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

(July 2018 – June 2019)

	(out) 2010 June 2017)							
	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	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
1.	The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, not infications of changes etc.)							
	OStrongly Agree	Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
2.	The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as onmodem/advancedtopics.							
	OStrongly Agree	Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
3.	Was there a balance between theory and practical?							
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	Disagree	OStronglyDisagree			
4.	Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicaletc)?							
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	Neutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
5.	The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.							
	OStrongly Agree	Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
6.	. Are the prescribed books relevant?							
	Strongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
7.	Were the Labs bette	Vere the Labs better equipped?						
	OStrongly Agree	Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
8.	Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?							
	OStrongly Agree	Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
9.	Were the assessmen OStrongly Agree	ts conducted Agree	on time with pr ONeutral	oper coverage o ODisagree	f syllabus? OStronglyDisagree			

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	Norseer	F/0 S.	ged Zaheandin Khadhi			
	Degree: M.E.S	fructural	Engineering	an .)			
	The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.							
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	O Neutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
1.	The course was well of changes etc)	l organized (e	e.g. teaching hou	ırs, content flow	v, access to materials,noti fications			
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
2.	The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as onmodem/advancedtopics.							
	OStrongly Agree	O Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
3.	Was there a balance between theory and practical?							
	OStrongly Agree	O Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
4.	Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicalete)?							
	OStrongly Agree	O Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
5.	The overall environs	ment in the cl	ass was conduc	ive to learning.				
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
6.	Are the prescribed b	ooks relevan	t?					
	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
7.	Were the Labs better	r equipped?						
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
8.	Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?							
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	O Neutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
9.	Were the assessments conducted on time with proper coverage of syllabus?							
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			

Signature of the Parent