

## Best Practice I

### 1. Title of the Practice : Students' feedback

### 2. The Context

Since the first assessment of the institute by the NAAC in 2003, it has experienced the needs of the Students' Feedback on different aspects of the institute to increase the institutional responsibility of both students and teachers. Now the institution seriously feels that Students' Feedback makes the teaching-learning process more students centric. It is also a process of self-evaluation and self-correction. Now it has become a part and parcel of the institute. To make it more scientific, an analysis mechanism was developed and also modified time to time on the basis of which one students' feedback index is fitted. This index helps in ranking the departments and faculties. Required information is collected on the basis of a well-designed questionnaire. This offline mechanism continued annually up to 2017. From 2018 onward, the same is being done six monthly online after designing a software jointly with a private firm Corex, Guwahati. The six monthly students' feedback report is submitted to the principal after reviewing and approving it in IQAC sitting. The principal of the college takes necessary on the basis of this report.

### 3. Objectives

- a. To involve the students in assessing different quality aspects of the institute.
- b. To develop a sense of responsibility and belongingness of the students.
- c. To make the college stakeholders aware of the strength and weakness of institute.
- d. To trace the path of quality development of the institute.
- e. To develop the skill of critical evaluation.

### 4. The goal of the Practice:

The steps followed in this students' feedback analysis are –

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

Sl. No.	Quality criteria	Activities	Responses (A, B, C & D) against each faculty of the Dept.					
1.	Efficiency of explanation	Is the lecture audible?						
		Is the explanation intelligible?						
		Is the explanation facilitated to note down?						
		Is the presentation memorable even after the classes over?						
2.	Knowledge Base	Is the teacher comprehensive in explaining the topic allotted to him?						
		Is the teaching course specific?						
		Is the presentation appreciably conclusive?						
3.	Responsibility and Accountability	Is the allotted portion of the syllabus completed in a session?						
		Does the teacher go for remedial measures?						
		Is feedback taken from students in classroom?						
4.	Cooperation	Does the teacher guide in off classroom activities such as seminar, GD, field study etc?						
		Does the teacher go for material (books, notes etc) support?						
5.	Punctuality	Is the teacher routinely regular in the class?						
		Does the teacher perform evaluation jobs in time( such as notes checking, examining script						

		of class test etc.)?					
6.	Motivation	Do you think the teacher is ideal?					
		Does the teacher motivate or offer counselling for job placement, higher education, higher ideal life?					
7.	Friendliness	Is the teacher approachable for academic need?					
		Does the teacher make you understand on the things better as you ask for?					
8.	Stability	Is the teacher stable in his words & works?					
9.	Mentoring	As a mentor is the teacher beneficent for you?					
10.	Breaking Monotony	Does the teacher take any measure to break class room monotony?					

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 –

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

Here,

- Maximum value of feedback response = Students' number  $\times$  highest value (=4)
- Minimum value of feedback response = Students' number  $\times$  lowest value (=0)
- Actual value of feedback response = Students' number  $\times$  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.

## 5. **Obstacles faced and strategies adopted to overcome them –**

Feedback information is collected from degree final year students. Formerly it was difficult to get filled the questionnaire unbiased. Students when filled the questionnaire were generally effected by the views of fellow students having discussions among there. To make the questionnaire more clear and understood the questionnaire was made bi-lingual – Assamese and English. To make questionnaire filling was tried to make independent and unbiased, the students were seated in exam like arrangement and it was done in presence of a faculty to clarify any doubt regarding the questions in questionnaires. Formerly it was a random study and analysis was made on the basis Microsoft excel tool. When online, it becomes a common practice and reports are partially auto-generated; but the data of students’ feedback on teachers is exported to Microsoft excel to fit students’ feedback index as stated above.

## 6. **Impact of the practice –**

On the basis of the analysis over the feedback information a report is prepared. The report contains ranking of departments and faculties in case of ten qualities of teaching. The report is submitted to the principal. Principal arranges a counseling session giving a overview on the report. The report is also made available to each department. Thus all the faculties are made aware of their strength and weakness. Thus, students’ feedback on teachers has enhanced the zeal of faculties in excelling their class-room transactions. This has also developed a sense of corporate responsibility among the students. As such they are becoming more and more serious in providing feedback information.

## 7. **Resources required –**

A computer assistant versed with computer works and net connectivity. Also a computer with net connectivity is required. Moreover Rs. 50,000/- was required to develop feedback software.

Contact person – Dr. Rofique Ahmed  
[iqacbahonacollege@gmail.com](mailto:iqacbahonacollege@gmail.com)  
0376-2398044 (Phone)  
0376-2398668 (Fax)

## Best Practice II

### 1. Title of the Practice : Community Services

### 2. The Context

*Higher educational institute can not keep its eyes closed to its responsibility and impact in the neighbouring locality. Bahona College is itself situated at a flood prone interior locality on the bank of the river Brahmaputra, where a good percentage of the community consists of SC, ST and minority people affected by socio-economic and environmental issues. The college considers the social odds of this locality as chance to treat it as practical book both for students and faculties. Students are oriented with the social issues to have practical knowledge there on through field studies and involving students in outreach welfare activities. For faculties, social issues are subjects of research, study and consultancy. Community service is road maker to the rural areas and a better way to have practical observation on social issues and also to collect required information of the same.*

### 3. Objectives -

- a. To orient students with socio-economic and environmental issues.
- b. To open a path for issue oriented research and study for both students and faculties.
- c. To have spill over effect of the institution in neighbouring localities.
- d. Imparting both collaboration and non collabor outreach and in campus effort for rural development.

### 4. The goal of the Practice -

*The IQAC of Bahona College has a Community Extension Cell to perform community services. Initially it adopted the village in the bank of Brahmaputra, Kakila Kumar Gaon for extension care. By norms, a village is taken for socio-economic care for three years. Accordingly, up till now, there are seven villages under care. The nature of care is of both kind, consultancy and motivational. Sometimes care is taken in collaborative effort with govt. departments and NGO's. the issues are traced and observed on the basis of compiling base live data. Funds are contributory and sponsored by different agencies.*

### 5. Obstacles faced and strategies adopted to overcome them -

*At initial stage of adopting villages for community care people were not cooperative and did not put faith on the proposals. Later it was solved collaborating with SEWA; a NGO working in these villages, more-over a coordination committee has been formed in each village involving colleges' ex-students living there in. coorporation of the villagers inceresed gardually when they were benefitted by the activities undertaken therein. Another problem was that villagers were more aspirant about the role of college. This problem was solved by counseling the villagers regarding the area of activities coverd by the college at the very outset.*

### 6. Impact of the Practice

*Community services that are community extension care have already been institutionalized. It has helped the students to have awareness of the social issues. It has developed the sense of humanity, equity and enhances the sense of social belongingness along with imparts the need of helping hands. Community services extend help to the researchers to have practical knowledge and experiments of*

*socio-economic and environmental issues. Working here, the college has this been placed in the list of colleges taking part in Unnat Bharat Abhiyan (UBA), by the Govt. of India.*

## **7. Resources required**

*A committee or Cell consisting of at least fine members having interest in social work, also a fund of considerable amount is required to provide community service on optional basis. Collaborative effort is also required with different govt. departments corking for to operate different social welfare schemes and NGO's working for social causes.*