



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 Student: VITAY .P

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 Student



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 Student: *Indhrajprath.D*

Degree: *ME -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, 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

D. Indhrajprath.D
Signature of the Student



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 Student: B. VIGNESH

Degree: M.E (STRUCTURAL ENGRG)

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 Student



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 Student: *K Sivaneshan*

Degree: *ME Structures*

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

K Sivaneshan
Signature of the Student



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 Student: SYED ZAHEERUDIN KHADIR

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, 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

Signature of the Student