Bahona College

Students' Feedback Analysis

2017-18

IQAC
9/24/2018

STUDENTS FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

For the Session 2017-2018

IQAC, Bahona College, Bahona Jorhat

Foreword

Students' Feedback Analysis on faculty's performance, by nature, is a self assessing mechanism and helps to go for adequate steps for quality improvement so far as course and class room transactions are concerned. Students' feedback whatever done in classroom is unobservable and unquantifiable. Academic excellence of an educational institution is the ultimate goal which is to feed by a number of quality inputs; the important ones are teaching and teacher's quality. A teacher with best academic performance may not be teaching friendly whether it is inside and outside the class room. Without making fruitful classroom transactions, just compulsory completion of workload as per course allocation and attendance in classes as per routine allotment are not but futile exercises. It requires measuring the lacks in one's achievements from student's students. With this understanding the IQAC of Bahona College develops a mechanism of students' feedback analysis as a measure of self-evaluation and to find the policy path for quality development. A ten-point quality index mechanism was formulated, with little modification of the method used for the session 2012-13.

Objectives

1. To make faculty and departmental level assessment of teaching and teachers' quality in the perception of students.
2. To develop a competitive zeal in teaching environment.
3. To trace policy path for quality development and necessary action there on.

Methods

The steps followed in this students analysis are

1. Teachers qualities have been covered on the basis of following quality indicators-

Sl. No	Quality Indicators
1	Clarity in explanation (CE) 1.a: Audibility 1.b: Intelligibility 1.c: Note down opportunity 1.d: Remembrance impact
2	Knowledgeable (Knl) 2.a : Subject knowledge 2.b : Specificity 2.c : Course consistency in teaching
3	Responsibility (Res) 3.a : Completion of syllabus 3.b : Remedial measure 3.c : Opportunity to inter-action
4	Cooperation (Cop) 4.a : Off class room guidance 4.b : Material support
5	Punctuality (Punc) 5.a : Class regularity 5.b : Timely result
6	Motivation (Mot) 6.1 : Inspiration 6.2 : Higher education counseling
7	Friendliness (Frn)

	7.1 : Approachability 7.2 : Response students' query
8	Stability (Stab)
9	Mentorability (Ment)
10	Sense of humour (SH)

To make the quality indicators observable, they were converted to four grades – less than average (A), average (B), good (C) and excellent (D). Thus a questionnaire was so prepared to have in-built descending order of quality parameters. That is, more important quality indicators are placed before the less important ones. Again, to have consistency in importance, the number of questions put against each quality parameters decreases from 4 to 1. To make the grade measurable they are converted to numbers - 1 is assigned for grade A, 2 for B, 3 for C and 4 for D. To get single value for an indicator, average is taken for those parameters having more than one question.

2. Students' feedback index (SFI) was formulated as follows –

$$SFI = 1 - \frac{Maximum\ value\ of\ feedback\ response - Actual\ value\ of\ feedback\ response}{Maximum\ value\ of\ feedback\ response - Minimum\ value\ of\ feedback\ response}$$

Here,

- Maximum value of feedback response = Students' number × highest value (=4)
  Minimum value of feedback response = Students' number × lowest value (=0)
- Actual value of feedback response = Students' number × value actually assigned
- SFI ranges from 0 to 1

Thus, SFI, being a relative measure, it neutralizes the difference in students' and faculty number among the departments having response to the feedback questionnaire. So it is comparable across the faculties, departments and above mentioned indicators.

On the basis of SFI following three Composite Quality Indicators can be derived.

1. **Quality Height:** the position of the quality graph matters. The more is the upward position of the graph, the more is the achievement in quality attainment and vice versa. In case of faculty it can be measured by finding the sum of SFIs attained across the quality parameters. In case of department it can be measured by averaging faculty total SFI. The faculty/department with highest total SFI/average SFI can be termed as **Best Quality Achiever (QA)**.

2. **Quality balance:** A quality graph can be fitted for each faculty and department across its SFI attainment across quality parameters. The horizontal straightness of this graph is reflective of quality balance. The more is the horizontal, the more is quality balance and vice versa. Statistically it can be measured in terms of variance of the SFI attained across the quality parameters. The faculty/department with lowest SFI variance can be termed as **Best Quality Balancer (QB)**.

3. **Quality Direction:** The direction of the graph is reflective of the importance assigned to quality parameters. The more is the negative slope the less importance is given to less important quality parameters and vice versa. The slope being negative but covering all the quality parameter implies more importance is given to more important quality parameters and less importance to less important parameters. Contrary to this, the slope of the graph being positive implies that more importance is given to less important quality parameters and less importance is given to more important ones. Here negative slope deserves. Statistically it can be measured by

finding the trend coefficient (rate of change) of the SFI attained across the quality parameters. One is in quality concentrator (QC) when the coefficient (or slope) is negative and in quality de-track when the coefficient is positive. A faculty / department with highest negative coefficient can be recognized as **Best Quality Concentrator (QC)**.

4. It is to note here that quality tracking and quality balancing are mutually exclusive. That is, a best balancer can never be a best quality tracker. Here an issue of value judgement occurs – who is better – quality tracker or quality balancer? Balancing all the qualities is better than avoiding certain qualities.

   It has already been stated that QC and QB are mutually exclusive. It implies that one being quality achiever can either be quality balancer or quality concentrator. It implies that one being quality balancer (giving more or less equal importance to all quality parameters) cannot be quality concentrator (Giving more importance to more important quality parameters and vice versa). Of QB and QC which is better is a matter of value judgment. If ranked as per quality teaching-learning transaction the preference pattern is QA>QB>QC. (here '>' implies 'preferred to'). Giving more importance to more important quality parameters is better than giving low level equal importance to all quality parameters. Thus, this preference pattern is transitive in this way – QA+QB > QA+QC. That is achieving higher balance in all quality parameters is better than achieving high by concentrating to a few quality parameters. Considering this transitive preference pattern faculties and departments have been ranked.

Special considerations

1. The students participating in the feedback mechanism are mostly of 6th semester.
2. They are assumed to be impartial and independent in assigning grades to the faculties.
3. The ten indicators considered here are assumed to be so comprehensive so as to cover all the quality aspects of teaching and teachers.
4. The results are rough in nature only as per students' perception, as such depends how far students are mature, impartial and neutral in their judgment.

Discussions

Discussion will be made in tabular and diagrammatic forms. Here the results will be placed in toto. Anyone interested can collect the soft copies of the calculation and can further its analysis.

Discussion heads are

1. Intra-departmental comparison
2. Inter departmental comparison
3. Ranking of Faculties
4. Ranking of departments

Department of Political Science

Table 1 : SFI distribution of faculties

Facuities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	SFI
1 Sanjoy Mili	3.94	4.00	3.93	3.78	3.89	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.99
2 Ranjit Pegu	3.56	3.48	3.48	3.44	3.78	3.89	3.44	3.78	4.00	3.78	0.92
3 Mridul Dutta	3.78	3.93	3.85	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.78	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.98
4 Pankaj Bora	3.94	3.93	3.93	3.89	3.89	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.99

Table 2 : Composite quality indicators

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average (QA)
Sanjoy Mili	0.0100	0.0054	0.9884
Ranjit Pegu	0.0438	0.0419	0.9157
Mridul Dutta	0.0204	0.0098	0.9750
Pankaj Bora	0.0111	0.0023	0.9894

Note:

1. Best Quality Achiever : Dr. Pankaj Bora
2. Best Quality Balancer : Dr. Pankaj Bora
3. Best Quality Concentrator : Sanjay Mili

Table 3 : Ranking the faculties

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
Sanjay Mili	4	3	3	6	2nd
Ranjit Pegu	1	1	1	2	4th
Mridul Dutta	2	2	2	4	3rd
Pankaj Bora	3	4	4	8	1st

Department of Economics

Table 1 : SFI distribution of faculties

Faculties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Avg SFI
Rofique Ahmed	3.95	3.84	3.98	3.93	3.77	3.67	3.90	3.80	3.87	3.80	1.000
Binoda Bora	3.52	3.56	3.80	3.83	3.77	3.53	3.63	3.87	3.60	3.27	0.997
Mainumoni Saikia	3.93	3.87	3.80	3.77	3.80	3.63	3.87	3.93	3.73	3.60	1.000
Reema Rabha	3.98	3.87	3.91	3.83	3.83	3.73	3.83	3.93	3.60	3.60	1.000

Table 2 : Composite quality indicators

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)
Rofique Ahmed	-0.014	0.009	1.000
Binoda Bora	-0.015	0.032	0.997
Mainumoni Saikia	-0.019	0.014	1.000
Reema Rabha	-0.032	0.018	1.000

Note:

4. Best Quality Achiever : Dr. Rofique Ahmed
5. Best Quality Balancer : Dr. Rofique Ahmed
6. Best Quality Concentrator : Dr. Rofique Ahmed

Table 3 : Ranking the faculties

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
Binoda Bora	2	4	4	8	3rd
Rofique Ahmed	1	1	1	2	1st
Mainu Moni Saikia	3	2	3	5	2nd
Reema Rabha	4	3	2	5	2nd

Department of Assamese

Table 1 : SFI distribution across faculties

Faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Avg
N C Saikia	3.824	3.804	3.333	3.324	3.441	3.706	3.765	4.000	3.706	3.294	0.90
S Borthakur	3.515	3.686	3.255	3.029	3.382	3.706	3.441	3.882	3.647	3.647	0.88
M B Changkakoti	3.426	3.412	3.176	3.765	3.441	3.412	3.412	3.235	3.529	3.176	0.85
B. Das	3.441	3.608	3.157	3.235	3.235	3.500	3.588	3.353	3.824	3.588	0.86
S Das	3.794	3.804	3.392	3.441	3.353	3.647	3.676	3.765	3.706	3.353	0.89

Table 2 : Composite quality indicators

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)
N C Saikia	-0.003	0.0626	0.905
S Borthakur	0.034	0.0624	0.880
M B Changkakoti	-0.013	0.0311	0.850
B. Das	0.031	0.0436	0.863
S Das	-0.011	0.0351	0.898

Note:

1. Best Quality Achiever : Dr. M.B. Changkakoti
2. Best Quality Balancer : Namita Chutia Saikia
3. Best Quality Concentrator : Dr. S. Borthakur

able 3 : Ranking the faculties

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
Santosh Borthakur	5	4	3	7	3rd
Namita Chutia Saikia	1	5	1	6	2nd
Madhusmita B. Changkakoti	3	1	5	6	2nd
Biba Rani Das	4	3	4	7	3rd
Sarala Das	2	2	2	4	1st

Department of Education

Table 1 : Faculty wise distribution of SFI

Faculties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	SFI
I Borthakur	3.725	3.833	3.689	3.583	3.600	3.667	3.850	3.800	3.600	3.633	0.925
B Deka	3.692	3.656	3.733	3.450	3.700	3.700	3.867	3.733	3.633	3.300	0.912
A J Bharali	3.600	3.722	3.744	3.533	3.700	3.617	3.883	3.833	3.633	3.333	0.915
I Bora	3.600	3.867	3.744	3.700	3.833	3.667	3.917	3.900	3.800	3.400	0.936

Table 2 : Distribution of Composite Index

Faculty	Slope	Variance	SFI
I Borthakur	-0.006	0.010	0.925
B Deka	-0.015	0.026	0.912
A J Bharali	-0.010	0.025	0.915
I Bora	-0.006	0.025	0.936

Note :

1. Best Quality Achiever : B. Deka
2. Best Quality Balancer : I Borthakur
3. Best Quality Concentrator : B. Deka

Table 3 : Ranking of the faculities

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
I Borthakur	3.5	4	3	7	1st
B Deka	1	1	1	2	4th
A J Bharali	2	2.5	2	4.5	3rd
I Bora	3.5	2.5	4	6.5	2nd

Department of History

Table 1 : Faculty wise distribution of SFI

Faculties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	SFI
K C Nath	4.000	4.000	3.833	3.875	3.917	3.875	3.958	4.000	4.000	3.833	0.98
Ajit Gogoi	3.500	3.528	3.500	3.750	3.583	3.542	3.875	3.833	3.750	3.583	0.91
P P Bora	3.688	3.694	3.722	3.750	3.708	3.667	3.833	3.750	3.750	3.833	0.93

Table 2 : Composite indicators

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)
K C Nath	-0.003	0.005	0.982
Ajit Gogoi	0.026	0.020	0.911
P P Bora	0.012	0.003	0.935

Note :

1. Best Quality Achiever : K. C. Natha
2. Best Quality Balancer : P.P. Bora
3. Best Quality Concentrator : K. C. Nath

Table 3 : Ranking of the faculties

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
K C Nath	3	2	3	5	1st
Ajit Gogoi	1	1	1	2	2nd
P P Bora	2	3	2	5	1st

Department of Zoology

Table 1 : SFI distribution among the faculties

Faculties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	SFI
A G Bora	3.848	3.819	3.841	3.837	3.957	3.685	3.935	3.391	3.826	2.826	0.924
B Bakalial	3.918	3.891	3.906	3.957	3.957	3.783	3.946	3.935	3.913	2.913	0.953
Avg. SFI	3.883	3.855	3.873	3.897	3.957	3.734	3.940	3.663	3.870	2.870	0.939

Table 2 : Composite quality indicators

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)
A G Bora	-0.069	0.1189	0.9241
B Bakalial	-0.054	0.1023	0.9529

Note :

1. Best Quality Achiever : Dr. Bikramaditya Bakaliyal
2. Best Quality Balancer : Dr. Bikramaditya Bakaliyal
3. Best Quality Concentrator : Dr. Bikromaditya Bakaliyal

Table 3 : Ranking of the faculties

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
A G Bora	1	1	1	2	2nd
B Bakalial	2	2	2	4	1st

Department of Botany

Table 1 : SFI distribution across faculties

Faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	SFI
D. Bhuyan	3.192	2.822	3.318	3.198	3.535	3.570	3.605	3.698	3.535	2.907	0.834
P. Borah	3.936	3.845	3.798	3.733	3.837	3.733	3.849	3.837	3.860	3.651	0.952
S. Das	3.843	3.775	3.597	3.593	3.744	3.663	3.686	3.907	3.721	3.349	0.922

Table 2 : Composite quality indicators of

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Average (QA)
D. Bhuyan	0.0338	0.0917	0.8344
P. Borah	-0.0122	0.0067	0.9520
S. Das	-0.0187	0.0241	0.9219

Note:

1. Best Quality Achiever : Dr. S. Das
2. Best Quality Balancer : P. Bora
3. Best Quality Concentrator : P. Bora

Table 3 : Ranking the faculties

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Total SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
D. Bhuyan	1	1	1	2	3rd
P. Borah	2	3	3	6	1st
S. Das	3	2	2	4	2nd

Department of Physics

Table 1 : SFI distribution across faculties

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	SF
J Nath	3.94	3.94	3.86	3.79	4.00	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	3.75	0.9
G Hazarika	3.94	3.86	3.86	3.92	4.00	3.83	3.96	4.00	4.00	3.92	0.9
S Chaliha	3.94	3.89	3.81	3.88	3.96	3.79	3.92	3.92	4.00	3.92	0.9
D Gogoi	3.94	3.94	3.83	3.88	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.92	0.9

Table 2 : Composite quality indicators

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Total SFI (QA)
Jiten Nath	-0.0037	0.0090	0.9748
Gopal Hazarika	0.0087	0.0039	0.9821
Sumbit Chaliha	0.0067	0.0041	0.9752
Diganta Pd. Gogoi	0.0070	0.0072	0.9814

Note:

1. Best Quality Achiever : Gopal Hazarika
2. Best Quality Balancer : Gopal Hazarika
3. Best Quality Concentrator : Jiten Kr. Nath

Table 3 : Faculty ranking

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Total SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
Jiten Nath	4	1	1	2	3rd
Gopal Hazarika	1	4	4	8	1st
Sumbit Chaliha	3	3	2	5	2nd
Diganta Pd. Gogoi	2	2	3	5	2nd

Department of Mathematics

Table 1 : SFI distribution across faculties

aculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	SFI
. Bordoloi	3.975	4.000	3.967	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	0.999
. K. Dutta	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.950	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	0.999
N Bora	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.000
M J Bora	3.950	3.967	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	0.998

Table 2 : Composite Quality Indicators

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Total SFI (QA)
Prasanta Bordoloi	0.00	0.00	0.999
Alok Kr. Dutta	0.00	0.00	0.999
Papori Neog Bora	0.00	0.00	1.000
Manash Jyoti Bora	117.14	0.00	0.998

Note:

1. Best Quality Achiever : Papori Neog Bora
2. Best Quality Balancer : Undefined
3. Best Quality Concentrator : P. Bordoloi, P. N. Bora, Alok Kr. Dutta

Table 3 : Faculty Ranking

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Total SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
Prasanta Bordoloi	3	3	3	6	2nd
Papori Neog Bora	3	3	4	7	1st
Alok Kr. Dutta	3	3	3	6	2nd
Manash Jyoti Bora	1	3	3	6	2nd

Department of Statistics

Table 1 : SFI distribution across faculties

Faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	SFI
A Baruah	3.853	3.941	4.000	3.971	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.824	0.990
L Kakoty	3.882	4.000	3 980	3.941	3.941	3.941	3.941	3.941	4.000	3.941	0.988

Table 2 : Composite Quality Indicators

Faculties	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Total SFI (QA)
Aditi Baruah	0.0014	0.00446	0.990
Lalit Kakoty	0.002	0.001217	0.988

Note:

1. Best Quality Achiever
2. Best Quality Balancer
3. Best Quality Concentrator

Table 2 : Composite Quality Indicators

Faculties	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Total SFI (QA)	Total (QA+QB)	Ranks
Aditi Baruah	2	1	1	2	2nd
Lalit Kakoty	1	2	1	3	1st

Inter-Departmental Comparison

Table No 1 : Distribution of composite quality index across departments

Faculty	Slope (QC)	Variance (QB)	Total SFI (QA)
P. Sc. Avg	0.0213	0.0148	0.9671
Eco Avg	-0.0199	0.0181	1.0395
Ass Avg	0.0075	0.0470	0.8792
Edn Avg	-0.0092	0.0214	0.9217
Hist Avg	0.0119	0.0096	0.9428
Zoo Avg	-0.0616	0.1106	0.9385
Bot Avg	0.0010	0.0408	0.9028
Phy avg	0.0047	0.0060	0.9784
Math Avg	29.2864	0.0002	0.9988
Stats Avg	0.0017	0.0028	0.9887

The highest QC rank goes to the department of Zoology and the lowest QB rank to the department of Mathematics. The highest QB rank goes to the department of Mathematics and the lowest QB rank to the department of Zoology. Again the highest rank of QA goes to the department of Economics and the lowest QA rank goes to the department of Assamese.

Table no 2 : Ranking the departments

Department	Rank in (QC)	Rank in (QB)	Rank in (QA)	Total Rank (QB+QA)	Quality position of the Department
Zoo Avg	1st	10th	7th	17	6th
Eco Avg	2nd	6th	1st	7	3rd
Edn Avg	3rd	7th	8th	15	5th
Bot Avg	4th	8th	9th	17	6th
Stats Avg	5th	2nd	3rd	5	2nd
Phy avg	6th	3rd	4th	7	3rd
Ass Avg	7th	9th	10th	19	7th
Hist Avg	8th	4th	6th	10	4th
P. Sc. Avg	9th	5th	5th	10	4th
Math Avg	10th	1st	2nd	3	1st

The best department, as shown in the above table is Mathematics

If arts and science departments are considered separately the departmental ranking will be as follows -

Table no 3 : Ranking the Arts Departments

Department	Rank in (QC)	Rank in (QB)	Rank in (QA)	Total Rank (QB+QA)	Quality position of the Department
Ass	3rd	5th	5th	10	3rd
Edn	2nd	4th	4th	8	2nd
Hist	4th	1st	3rd	4	1st
P. Sc.	5th	2nd	2nd	4	1st
Eco	1st	3rd	1st	4	1st

Table No 4 : Ranking the Science Departments

Department	Rank in (QC)	Rank in (QB)	Rank in (QA)	Total Rank (QB+QA)	Quality position of the Department
Bot	2nd	4th	5th	9	4th
Zoo	1st	5th	4th	9	4th
Phy	4th	3rd	3rd	6	3rd
Stats	3rd	2nd	2nd	4	2nd
Math	5th	1st	1st	2	1st

Table no 2 : Ranking the departments

Department	Rank in (QC)	Rank in (QB)	Rank in (QA)	Total Rank (QB+QA)	Quality position of the Department
Zoo Avg	1st	10th	7th	17	6th
Eco Avg	2nd	6th	1st	7	3rd
Edn Avg	3rd	7th	8th	15	5th
Bot Avg	4th	8th	9th	17	6th
Stats Avg	5th	2nd	3rd	5	2nd
Phy avg	6th	3rd	4th	7	3rd
Ass Avg	7th	9th	10th	19	7th
Hist Avg	8th	4th	6th	10	4th
P. Sc. Avg	9th	5th	5th	10	4th
Math Avg	10th	1st	2nd	3	1st

The best department, as shown in the above table is Mathematics

If arts and science departments are considered separately the departmental ranking will be as follows -

Table no 3 : Ranking the Arts Departments

Department	Rank in (QC)	Rank in (QB)	Rank in (QA)	Total Rank (QB+QA)	Quality position of the Department
Ass	3rd	5th	5th	10	3rd
Edn	2nd	4th	4th	8	2nd
Hist	4th	1st	3rd	4	1st
P. Sc.	5th	2nd	2nd	4	1st
Eco	1st	3rd	1st	4	1st

Table No 4 : Ranking the Science Departments

Department	Rank in (QC)	Rank in (QB)	Rank in (QA)	Total Rank (QB+QA)	Quality position of the Department
Bot	2nd	4th	5th	9	4th
Zoo	1st	5th	4th	9	4th
Phy	4th	3rd	3rd	6	3rd
Stats	3rd	2nd	2nd	4	2nd
Math	5th	1st	1st	2	1st

Ranking the Faculties

Table No 5 : Distribution of Parameters - Faculty-wise

Department	Faculty	Slope (QC)	Varience (QB)	Average (QA)
Political Sc.	Sanjoy Mili	0.0100	0.0054	0.9884
Political Sc.	Ranjit Pegu	0.0438	0.0419	0.9157
Political Sc.	Mridul Dutta	0.0204	0.0098	0.9750
Political Sc.	Pankaj Bora	0.0111	0.0023	0.9894
Education	I Borthakur	-0.006	0.010	0.925
Education	B Deka	-0.015	0.026	0.912
Education	A J Bharali	-0.010	0.025	0.915
Education	I Bora	-0.006	0.025	0.936
History	K C Nath	-0.003	0.005	0.982
History	Ajit Gogoi	0.026	0.020	0.911
History	P P Bora	0.012	0.003	0.935
Assamese	N C Saikia	-0.003	0.0626	0.905
Assamese	S Borthakur	0.034	0.0624	0.880
Assamese	M B Changkakoti	-0.013	0.0311	0.850
Assamese	B. Das	0.031	0.0436	0.863
Assamese	S Das	-0.011	0.0351	0.898
Economics	R. Ahmed	-0.014	0.009	1.061
Economics	B. Bora	-0.015	0.032	0.997
Economics	M. Saikia	-0.019	0.014	1.047
Economics	R. Rabha	-0.032	0.018	1.053
Zoology	A G Bora	-0.06891	0.1189	0.9241
Zoology	B Bakalial	-0.05429	0.1023	0.9529
Physics	J Nath	-0.0037	0.0090	0.9748
Physics	G Hazarika	0.0087	0.0039	0.9821
Physics	S Chaliha	0.0067	0.0041	0.9752
Physics	D Gogoi	0.0070	0.0072	0.9814
Botany	D. Bhuyan	0.0338	0.0917	0.8344
Botany	P. Borah	-0.0122	0.0067	0.9520
Botany	S. Das	-0.0187	0.0241	0.9219
Mathematics	P. Bordoloi	0.00	0.00	1.00
Mathematics	A. K. Dutta	0.00	0.00	1.00
Mathematics	P N Bora	0.00	0.00	1.00
Mathematics	M J Bora	117.14	0.00	1.00
Statistics	A Baruah	0.001426	0.00446	0.990
Statistics	L Kakoty	0.00202	0.001217	0.988

Ranking the faculties of both arts and science streams

Table No 6 : Ranking the Faculties

Department	Faculties	QC	QB	QA	Ranks
Mathematics	P N Bora	18	1	4	1st
Mathematics	P. Bordoloi	22	2	6	2nd
Mathematics	A. K. Dutta	19	3	6	3rd
Mathematics	M J Bora	35	4	6	4th
Political Sc.	Pankaj Bora	27	6	10	5th
Statistics	L Kakoty	21	5	12	6th
Economics	R. Ahmed	8	16	1	7th
Statistics	A Baruah	20	10	9	8th
Physics	G Hazarika	25	8	14	9th
Economics	M. Saikia	4	19	3	10th
Economics	R. Rabha	3	20	2	11th
Political Sc.	Sanjoy Mili	26	12	11	12th
History	K C Nath	17	11	13	13th
Physics	S Chaliha	23	9	16	14th
History	P P Bora	28	7	22	15th
Physics	D Gogoi	24	14	15	16th
Botany	P. Borah	19	13	20	17th
Physics	J Nath	15	15	18	18th
Political Sc.	Mridul Dutta	29	17	17	19th
Economics	B. Bora	6	27	8	20th
Education	I Borthakur	13	18	23	21th
Education	I Bora	14	24	21	22nd
Botany	S. Das	5	22	25	23rd
History	Ajit Gogoi	30	21	29	24th
Education	A J Bharali	12	23	27	25th
Education	B Deka	7	25	28	26th
Zoology	B Bakalial	2	34	19	27th
Political Sc.	Ranjit Pegu	34	29	26	28th
Assamese	S Das	11	28	31	29th
Zoology	A G Bora	1	35	24	30th
Assamese	M B Changkakoti	9	26	34	31st
Assamese	N C Saikia	16	32	30	32nd
Assamese	B. Das	31	30	33	33rd
Assamese	S Borthakur	33	31	32	34th
Botany	D. Bhuyan	32	33	35	35th

Ranking

Department
Mathematics
Mathematics
Mathematics
Mathematics
Political Sc.
Statistics
Economics
Statistics
Physics
Economics
Economics
Political Sc.
History
Physics
History
Physics
Botany
Physics
Political Sc.
Economics
Education
Education
Botany
History
Education
Education
Zoology
Political Sc.
Assamese
Zoology
Assamese

Ranking the faculties of the Arts Departments

Table No 7 : Ranking the faculties of Arts Departments

Department	Faculties	QC	QB	QA	QB+QA
Economics	R. Ahmed	5	5	1	1st
Political Sc.	4 Pankaj Bora	14	1	5	1st
History	K C Nath	11	3	7	2nd
Political Sc.	1 Sanjoy Mili	13	4	6	2nd
Economics	R. Rabha	1	9	2	3rd
Economics	M. Saikia	2	8	3	3rd
History	P P Bora	15	2	10	4th
Political Sc.	3 Mridul Dutta	16	6	8	5th
Education	I Borthakur	9	7	11	6th
Economics	B. Bora	4	15	4	7th
Education	I Bora	10	12	9	8th
Education	A J Bharali	8	11	13	9th
History	Ajit Gogoi	17	10	15	10th
Education	B Deka	3	13	14	11th
Political Sc.	2 Ranjit Pegu	20	17	12	12th
Assamese	S Das	7	16	17	13th
Assamese	M B Changkakoti	6	14	20	14th
Assamese	N C Saikia	12	20	16	15th
Assamese	B. Das	18	18	19	16th
Assamese	S Borthakur	19	19	18	16th

Ranking the faculties of Science Departments

Table No 8 : Ranking the faculties of Science Departments

Department	Faculties	QC	QB	QA	QB+QA
Mathematics	P. Bordoloi	6	1	1	1st
Mathematics	A. K. Dutta	6	1	1	1st
Mathematics	P N Bora	6	1	1	1st
Mathematics	M J Bora	13	1	1	1st
Statistics	L Kakoty	8	2	3	2nd
Physics	G Hazarika	11	3	4	3rd
Statistics	A Baruah	7	5	2	3rd
Physics	S Chaliha	9	4	6	4th
Physics	D Gogoi	10	7	5	5th
Botany	P. Borah	4	6	9	6th
Physics	J Nath	5	8	7	6th
Zoology	B Bakalial	2	11	8	7th
Botany	S. Das	3	9	11	8th
Botany	D. Bhuyan	12	10	12	9th
Zoology	A G Bora	1	12	10	9th

Identifying the weakness and Strength

Table 9 : Department average SFI Arts and Science divided

	Clarity in explanation	Knowledge ability	Respon-sibility	Cooperation	Punctuality	Motivation	Friendliness	Stability	Mentoring	Sense of humour
SFI Average (Arts Dept)	0.9317	0.9395	0.9172	0.9141	0.9234	0.9282	0.9479	0.9576	0.9441	0.9045
SFI Average (Science Dept)	0.966	0.960	0.963	0 961	0.980	0.958	0.980	0.970	0.979	0.896

Table 10 : Ordering the parameters (Science)

Parameters	Science
Stability	1st
Friendliness	2nd
Mentoring	3rd
Knowledgability	4th
Clarity in explanation	5th
Motivation	6th
Punctuality	7th
Responsibility	8th
Cooperation	9th
Sense of humour	10th

Table 10 shows that the of the teachers quality parameters of Science departments as a whole. the parameter of stability stands at the first rank. second is friendliness. third is mentoring and the last is sense of humour.

Table 11 : Ordering the parameters (Arts)

Parameters	Arts
Friendliness	1st
Punctuality	2nd
Mentoring	3rd
Stability	4th
Clarity in explanation	5th
Responsibility	6th
Cooperation	7th
Knowledgability	8th
Motivation	9th
Sense of humour	10th

Table 11 shows that the of the teachers quality parameters of Arts departments as a whole. the parameter of friendliness stands at the first rank. second is punctuality. third is mentoring and the last is sense of humour.

Table 12 : Matching the teacher quality parameters in between Science and Arts streams

Weight	Parameters	Science	Arts
1	Clarity in explanation	5	5
2	Knowledgability	4	8
3	Responsibility	8	6
4	Cooperation	9	7
5	Punctuality	7	2
6	Motivation	6	9
7	Friendliness	2	1
8	Stability	1	4
9	Mentoring	3	3
10	Sense of humour	10	10

Matching shows that both Arts and Science stream gives weight of fifth position in clarity of explanation. by option which was given first position weight. In case of knowledgeabilty emphasis gven by science department is better than Arts departments. The reverse happens in case of responsibility. Both streams are giving same level of emphasis to mentoring and sense of humour.

Conclusions

The IQAC of the College makes feedback analysis not to commend and recommend on policy measures. The findings as shown above are open to all for self analysis and evaluation and to take necessary action as required. This copy is also to be submitted to the Principal of the College so that he can take necessary measures in matter of quality improvement considering students' perception of teachers and teachings. Utmost care has

been taken in formulating methods and analysis. Neutrality in analysis is 100 percent assured. Any clarification regarding formulation and analysis is always welcome.

Two departments, one each from Arts and Science streams did not take part in this feedback mechanism. So report made here is not comprehensive. In future, it should be taken care of. Shifting this mechanism to on line, such incompletion is expected to be no more.

Co-ordinator
IQAC
Bahona College, Jorhat
Pin 785101

Sd/-
(Dr. R. Ahmed)
Coordinator
IQAC, Bahona College