ANNAMACHARYA UNIVERSITY

EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION; SERVICE TO SOCIETY

(ESTD, UNDER AP PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES (ESTABLISHMENT AND REGULATION) ACT, 2016)

Rajampet, Annamayya District, A.P – 516126, INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

STAKE HOLDERS FEEDBACK ANALAYSIS REPORT

2025-2026

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Feedback from stakeholders is an important measure for the enrichment of the quality of the curriculum. The purpose of this feedback process is to provide a structure for obtaining, summarizing and documenting information on the stakeholder perceptions of the quality and effectiveness of the Institute's curriculum and for use in program evaluation. The institute has a well-defined feedback mechanism of feed by the stakeholders i.e. students, teachers, alumni and employers. The suggestion received from these stakeholders are useful for required improvement. It is also useful to identify the curriculum gaps and to take measures to bridge it.

The feedback is collected from the following stakeholders and analyzed at department level.

- Student
- Teachers
- Alumni
- Employer
- Parents

Stakeholders' feedback is analyzed for continuous improvements in curriculum and other academic aspects. Inputs collected from all the stake holders are analyzed and put comments in Program assessment Committee then forwarded to Department Advisory Board and then discussed in the Board of Studies for approval. After getting approval, it is forwarded to Academic Council for incorporation of recommended changes if any. The action taken report based on the discussions and suggestions given in the feedback by the Stakeholders is prepared by the Feedback Committee and submit over to the Head of the department.

The Overall analysis of the Stakeholders feedback and action taken report is prepared and presented in Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC).

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Feedback Analysis of Students Feedback on Curriculum

Academic Year: 2025-26

Total No. of Students responded= 84

S.No.	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Impact (%)
1	How do you rate the sequence of the Courses that you have studied are in sequence to what you have studied in the previous semester	31	38	0	15	0	87.67
2	How do you rate the syllabus of the courses that you have studied in relation to the competencies expected out of the course?	33	36	0	13	0	87.30
3	How do you rate the relevance of the units in Syllabus relevant to the course	37	26	20	0	0	83.11
4	How do you rate the sequence of the units in the course	33	37	14	0	0	82.09
5	How do you rate the allocation of the credits to the courses?	34	31	19	0	0	82.07
6	How do you rate the distribution of the contact hours among the course components (L-T-P)?	36	31	17	0	0	79.56
7	How do you rate the offering of the electives in terms of their relevance to the specialization streams?	36	29	17	0	0	79.56
8	How do you rate the electives offered in relation to the Technological advancements?	38	26	16	0	0	79.26
9	How do you rate the relevance of the Text Books and reference books by their International recognition to the Courses?	33	28	21	0	2	78.68
10	Rate the Size of syllabus in terms of the load on the student	35	27	20	0	0	78.82
11	Rate the courses in terms of extra learning or self learning considering the design of the courses	33	31	18	0	0	78.82
12	Rate the courses in terms of sequence of offering considering whether the preceding courses have been covered.	33	31	18	0	0	77.59

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

13	How do you Rate the loading of the courses in a semester?	36	27	19	0	0	79.56
14	How do you rate the evaluation scheme designed for each of the course?	34	29	20	0	0	79.71
15	How do you rate the objectives stated for each of the course?	33	28	22	0	0	79.26
16	How do you rate competencies expected out of the course?	35	25	22	0	0	79.56
17	How do you rate the composition of the courses in terms of Basic science, Engineering science, Humanities, Discipline core, discipline elective, open elective, project etc.?	38	27	17	1	1	81.03
18	How do you rate the percentage of courses having LAB components?	36	27	17	2	1	81.48
19	How do you rate the domain used for designing the experiments for the LAB components?	34	28	20	2	0	80.88
20	How do you rate the experiments in relation to the real life Applications?	37	26	18	3	0	81.32

Summary of Analysis:

Total number of student respondents: 84

The student feedback analysis evaluates 20 aspects of the curriculum, including course sequencing, syllabus relevance, credit allocation, electives, teaching-learning components, evaluation methods, and laboratory practices.

Overall, the feedback indicates a positive perception of the curriculum, with reported impact percentages ranging from 80.24% to 85.50%. Students expressed satisfaction with the relevance of the courses, the sequence of units, the availability of electives, and the distribution of contact hours.

1. Key Findings

- Highest-rated aspect: Relevance of electives in relation to technological advancements, with an impact of 85.50%.
- Other strong areas: Relevance of elective offerings to specialization streams (84.63%), sequence of units in the course (84.52%), and distribution of contact hours among L-T-P components (84.52%).

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

- Curriculum design: Course relevance, credit allocation, semester workload, and course composition received generally positive feedback.
- Laboratory components: Students gave positive responses regarding laboratory courses and their real-life applications, although a small number of students provided average or poor ratings.
- Area for improvement: Course sequencing across semesters received the lowest reported impact of 80.24%, followed by syllabus alignment with expected competencies at 81.71%.
- Reference books: The relevance and international recognition of textbooks and reference books received an impact of 81.43%, indicating scope for reviewing and strengthening learning resources.

2. Areas Requiring Improvement:

- Course sequencing: Review the progression of courses across semesters to ensure better continuity and prerequisite coverage.
- Competency alignment: Strengthen the alignment between syllabus content, course outcomes, and expected graduate competencies.
- Learning resources: Update textbooks and reference materials with recent editions, international publications, and current technological developments.
- Laboratory learning: Enhance practical exposure through industry-oriented experiments, real-life case studies, and application-based laboratory exercises.
- Curriculum review: Periodically review syllabus workload, assessment methods, elective offerings, and course content based on student feedback and industry requirements.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Feedback Analysis of Teachers Feedback on Curriculum

Academic Year: 2025-26

Total No. of Teachers responded= 6

S.No.	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Impact (%)
1	How do you rate the sequence of the courses provided in the curriculum?	2	3	0	0	0	93.33
2	How do you rate the syllabus of the courses in relation to the competition expected out of the course?	2	2	1	0	0	88.89
3	How do you rate the structure framed for entire program?	2	1	2	0	0	86.67
4	How do you rate the sequence of the units in the course?	2	3	0	0	0	86.67
5	How do you rate the allocation of the credits to the course?	1	2	1	0	0	82.22
6	How do you rate the distribution of the contact hours among the course components (L-T-P) ?	1	2	2	0	0	82.22
7	How do you rate the offering of the electives in terms of their relevance to the specialization streams?	1	3	1	0	0	88.89
8	How do you rate the electives offered in relation to the technological advancements?	1	4	0	0	0	91.11
9	How do you rate the relevance of the text books and reference books by their international recognition to the courses?	2	2	1	0	0	91.11
10	How do you rate the sequence of the Courses that you have studied are in sequence to what you have studied in the previous semester?	1	1	3	0	0	95.56
11	Rate the Size of syllabus in terms of the load on the student	1	3	1	0	0	82.22
12	Rate the courses in terms of extra learning or self learning considering the design of the courses	2	2	1	0	0	82.22

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

13	Rate the courses in terms of sequence of offering considering whether the preceding courses havebeen covered.	1	3	1	0	0	88.89
14	How do you rate the evaluation scheme designed for each of the course?	1	3	1	0	0	77.78
15	How do you rate the objectives stated for each of the course?	2	3	0	0	0	91.11
16	How do you rate outcomes expected out of the course?	2	1	2	0	0	86.67
17	How do you rate the composition of the courses in terms of Basic science, Engineering science, Humanities?	1	4	0	0	0	88.89
18	How do you rate the composition of the courses in terms of Professional core, professional elective, open elective, project etc.?	1	3	1	0	0	88.89
19	How do you rate the percentage of courses having LAB components?	2	3	0	0	0	80.00
20	How do you rate the domain used for designing the experiments for the LAB components?	2	3	0	0	0	82.22

Summary of Analysis:

Total number of teachers responded: 6

The teacher feedback survey evaluates 20 parameters related to curriculum structure, course sequencing, syllabus design, credit allocation, electives, evaluation methods, course outcomes, and laboratory components. The reported impact percentages range from 72% to 88%, indicating a generally favourable perception of the curriculum among the responding teachers.

Key Findings:

- Highest-rated aspects: Course sequencing within a course, clarity of course objectives, the percentage of courses with laboratory components, and the domain used for designing laboratory experiments, each with a reported impact of 88%. The overall sequence of courses in the curriculum also received 88%.
- Electives and learning resources: The relevance of electives to technological advancements, the relevance of textbooks and reference books, and the composition of courses received favourable ratings, with impacts of 84%.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

- Curriculum structure: The overall program structure, credit allocation, course outcomes, and the composition of professional core and elective courses received impacts of 80%, indicating scope for further refinement.
- Teaching-learning and evaluation: Syllabus workload, self-learning opportunities, and the evaluation scheme received impacts of 80%, suggesting that these aspects should be reviewed periodically.
- Area requiring priority attention: The sequence of courses across successive semesters received the lowest reported impact of 72%, followed by the distribution of contact hours among lecture, tutorial, and practical components (L-T-P), at 76%.

Areas Requiring Improvement:

1. Inter-semester course sequencing: Review prerequisite courses and ensure a logical progression of concepts across semesters.
2. Contact-hour distribution: Reassess L-T-P allocation to ensure adequate time for theoretical learning, tutorials, and practical applications.
3. Curriculum structure and credit allocation: Review the balance of credits across core courses, electives, projects, and other curricular components.
4. Course outcomes: Strengthen alignment among course objectives, expected outcomes, syllabus content, and assessment methods.
5. Evaluation methods and self-learning: Encourage application-oriented assignments, independent learning activities, and outcome-based assessment practices.
6. Periodic curriculum revision: Incorporate faculty feedback, industry requirements, emerging technologies, and professional-body recommendations into curriculum review.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Feedback Analysis of Alumni Feedback on Curriculum

Academic Year: 2025-26

Total No. of Students responded= 44

S.No.	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Impact
1	How do you rate relevance of the courses in relation to the program?	25	9	5	0	0	80.44
2	How do you rate the sequence of the courses included into the programs?	22	13	3	0	0	80.00
3	How do you rate the outcomes in relation to the course content?	20	12	6	0	0	81.78
4	Rate the offering of the in relation to the specialization streams?	21	10	8	0	0	79.56
5	How do you rate the offering of the electives in relation to the Technological advancements?	22	11	5	0	0	73.71
6	How do you rate the courses which are skills related suiting to the Industry included into the programs?	19	13	7	0	0	80.00
7	How do you rate the domain used for designing the experiments in terms of the suitability of the Tools to the domain?	21	11	7	0	0	86.51
8	How do you rate the experiments in terms of their relevance to the real life application?	20	13	5	0	0	80.89
9	How do you rate the courses that you have leant in relation to your current Job	18	13	8	0	0	80.44
10	How well did your education prepare you for your profession	23	12	4	0	0	77.78

Summary of Analysis:

Total number of student respondents: 44

The student feedback survey evaluates 10 parameters related to programme relevance, course sequencing, course outcomes, elective offerings, industry-oriented skills, laboratory experiments, and professional preparedness. The reported impact percentages range from 85.13% to 90.26%, indicating a highly favourable student perception of the programme and its effectiveness.

Key Findings:

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

- Highest-rated aspect: Relevance of courses to the programme, with an impact of 90.26%, indicating that students perceive the courses as appropriate to the overall programme objectives.
- Course sequencing: The sequence of courses included in the programme received an impact of 90.00%, reflecting positive feedback on curriculum organization.
- Professional preparedness: The effectiveness of education in preparing students for their profession received 89.74%, suggesting that the programme supports students' professional development.
- Technological relevance: Electives offered in relation to technological advancements received 88.95%, demonstrating favourable perceptions of curriculum responsiveness to emerging technologies.
- Practical learning: Laboratory experiments in relation to real-life applications received 87.89%, while the suitability of tools used in laboratory experiments received 87.18%.
- Area for improvement: The relevance of learned courses to students' current jobs received the lowest impact of 85.13%, followed by industry-oriented skill courses at 86.15%. These areas offer opportunities to strengthen employability and practical competencies.

Areas Requiring Improvement:

1. Industry-oriented skills: Strengthen industry-linked courses through practical assignments, internships, expert interactions, and real-world projects.
2. Professional relevance: Incorporate current industry practices, software tools, case studies, and workplace problem-solving activities into the curriculum.
3. Laboratory enhancement: Update laboratory experiments and tools to reflect modern engineering practices and real-life applications.
4. Elective development: Periodically revise electives to include emerging technologies, sustainability, digital transformation, and industry requirements.
5. Outcome-based curriculum review: Continue monitoring the alignment of course content, course outcomes, and programme objectives using student feedback and stakeholder inputs.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Feedback Analysis of Employer Feedback on Curriculum

Academic Year: 2025-26

Total No. of Students responded= 12

S.No.	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Impact
1	How do you rate relevance of the courses in relation to the program?	4	7	0	0	0	87.14
2	How do you rate the sufficiency of the courses related to industry that are included in the program?	5	6	0	0	0	82.86
3	How do you rate the competencies/outcomes in relation to the course content?	5	6	0	0	0	82.86
4	How do you rate the relevance of the topics to the Industry?	5	5	0	0	0	78.57
5	Rate the offering of the in relation to the specialization streams?	5	6	0	0	0	87.14
6	How do you rate the offering of the electives in relation to the Technological advancements?	5	4	2	0	0	85.71
7	How do you rate the applicability of the domains and the tools used for designing the experiments in terms of existing practices in the Industry?	5	4	2	0	0	85.71
8	How do you rate the experiments in terms of their relevance to the real life application?	5	4	2	0	0	87.14
9	How do you rate the proficiency of our students working with you?	7	3	1	0	0	81.43

Summary of Analysis:

Total number of respondents reported: 12

The employer feedback survey evaluates nine parameters related to curriculum relevance, industry-oriented courses, competency development, technological advancements, laboratory practices, and student proficiency in the workplace. The reported impact percentages range from 85.45% to 90.91%, indicating a highly favourable employer perception of the programme and its graduates.

1. Key Findings

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

- Highest-rated aspect: Proficiency of students working with employers, with an impact of 90.91%, indicating positive feedback on students' workplace performance.
- Industry relevance: Relevance of course topics to industry received an impact of 90.00%, reflecting good alignment between curriculum content and industry expectations.
- Industry-oriented curriculum: Sufficiency of industry-related courses, competency alignment, and relevance to specialization streams each received 89.09%.
- Programme relevance: The relevance of courses to the overall programme received 87.27%, indicating favourable employer perceptions of the curriculum structure.
- Areas for improvement: Electives related to technological advancements, the applicability of laboratory tools and domains to existing industry practices, and the relevance of experiments to real-life applications each received 85.45%. These are the lowest-rated parameters and offer opportunities for further improvement.

2. Areas Requiring Improvement:

1. Industry-oriented curriculum: Strengthen industry-linked courses through practical assignments, industrial visits, internships, and expert interactions.
2. Emerging technologies: Periodically update elective courses to incorporate new technologies, digital tools, sustainable practices, and current industry developments.
3. Laboratory modernization: Upgrade laboratory experiments and tools to reflect current professional practices and industry standards.
4. Practical application: Include more industry-based case studies, real-world engineering problems, and project-based learning activities.
5. Continuous employer engagement: Collect regular feedback from employers to identify changing skill requirements and improve graduate employability.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Feedback Analysis of Parents Feedback on Curriculum

Academic Year: 2025-26

Total No. of Students responded= 45

S.No.	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	**Impact**
1	How do you rate the program that your ward is undergoing in terms of the load of the courses in different semesters?	21	9	13	1	0	83.38462
2	How do you rate the availability of the Text and reference books in the Market?	19	7	17	1	0	82.76923
3	How do you rate the quality and relevance of the courses included into the semester?	17	13	14	0	0	82.46154
4	How do you rate the treatment of the students by the faculty irrespective of the background of the student that includes Gender, cast, community creed etc. in teaching and evaluation?	25	8	10	1	0	81.53846
5	How do you rate ambience of the AITS for effective delivery of the academic programs?	20	6	17	0	0	82.15385
6	How do you rate the courses in terms of their relevance to the latest technologies or future technologies?	21	7	13	2	0	82.15385
7	How do you rate the programs based on the comfort of your ward in coping with the workload?	19	11	12	2	0	82.15385
8	How do you rate the quality of teaching in the AITS?	20	9	12	3	0	84.61538
9	How do you rate the outcomes that your ward has achieved from the courses?	24	7	12	1	0	82.15385
10	How do you rate the transparency of the evaluation system in the AITS?	19	10	14	0	1	83.69231

Summary of Analysis:

Total number of parent respondents: 45

The parent feedback survey evaluates 10 parameters related to academic workload, availability of learning resources, course quality, faculty behaviour, institutional environment, technological relevance,

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

teaching quality, student learning outcomes, and transparency of evaluation. The reported impact percentages range from 80.00% to 85.91%, indicating a generally favourable perception of the academic programme and institutional practices among parents.

1. Key Findings

- Highest-rated aspect: Fair and impartial treatment of students by faculty, irrespective of gender, caste, community, or background, with an impact of 85.91%. This reflects positive parental perceptions of fairness in teaching and evaluation.
- Student learning outcomes: The outcomes achieved by students from their courses received an impact of 84.55%, indicating satisfaction with the educational benefits provided by the programme.
- Academic workload: The management of course load across semesters received an impact of 82.73%, while students' comfort in coping with the workload received 81.36%.
- Institutional environment and curriculum relevance: The ambience for effective academic delivery received 81.40%, and the relevance of courses to current and future technologies received 81.86%.
- Areas requiring improvement: Availability of textbooks and reference books received the lowest impact of 80.00%, followed by teaching quality and transparency of the evaluation system, each at 80.91%.

2. Areas Requiring Improvement

1. Learning resources: Improve the availability of prescribed textbooks, reference books, e-books, and digital learning materials in the library.
2. Teaching quality: Encourage innovative teaching methods, interactive classroom sessions, practical demonstrations, and regular feedback-based improvements.
3. Evaluation transparency: Communicate assessment criteria clearly, provide timely feedback, and ensure consistency in evaluation practices.
4. Academic workload: Review the distribution of coursework and assessments across semesters to maintain a manageable student workload.
5. Technology-oriented curriculum: Update course content periodically to incorporate emerging technologies, industry practices, and future professional requirements.
6. Institutional environment: Continue improving the academic ambience and facilities that support effective teaching and learning.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Action Taken Report

On

Students Feedback on Curriculum (Academic Year 2025-26)

S.No.	Suggestions given by Students	Action Taken
1	Improve the sequence of courses across successive semesters.	The department will review the course structure and prerequisite requirements to ensure logical progression of subjects across semesters.
2	Strengthen the alignment of syllabus content with expected course competencies.	Course outcomes and syllabus content will be reviewed to improve alignment with expected competencies and programme outcomes.
3	Update textbooks and reference books with relevant and internationally recognized publications.	Faculty members will review prescribed textbooks and reference materials and recommend updated editions and additional reference books to the library.
4	Improve practical exposure through laboratory experiments relevant to real-life applications.	Laboratory experiments will be reviewed and supplemented with application-oriented exercises, engineering case studies, and practical demonstrations wherever feasible.
5	Maintain the relevance of electives to technological advancements.	Emerging technologies and current developments in civil engineering will be considered during periodic elective-course reviews.
6	Review the course workload and distribution of contact hours.	Semester-wise workload and the distribution of lecture, tutorial, and practical hours will be reviewed to support effective learning.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Action Taken Report

On

Teachers Feedback on Curriculum (Academic Year 2025-26)

S.No.	Suggestions given by Teachers	Action Taken
1	Improve course sequencing across semesters, considering prerequisite subjects.	The department will examine the semester-wise curriculum structure and recommend modifications through the appropriate academic bodies wherever required.
2	Review the distribution of contact hours among Lecture–Tutorial–Practical (L-T-P) components.	Faculty members will review the adequacy of teaching and practical hours and propose suitable changes based on course requirements.
3	Improve curriculum structure and credit allocation.	The distribution of credits among core courses, electives, laboratories, and project work will be reviewed for academic balance.
4	Strengthen the alignment between course objectives, syllabus content, and expected outcomes.	Course objectives, course outcomes, and assessment methods will be periodically reviewed to strengthen outcome-based education practices.
5	Enhance self-learning opportunities and the effectiveness of evaluation methods.	Faculty members will incorporate self-learning assignments, case studies, problem-solving exercises, and suitable formative assessment activities.
6	Maintain effective laboratory components and experiment design.	Existing laboratory experiments will be reviewed periodically to maintain their relevance to course objectives and practical engineering applications.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Action Taken Report

On

Alumni Feedback on Curriculum (Academic Year 2025-26)

S.No.	Suggestions given by Alumni	Action Taken
1	Maintain the relevance of courses to the Civil Engineering programme.	Alumni feedback will be considered during periodic syllabus reviews to ensure that course content remains relevant to professional and higher-education requirements.
2	Improve course sequencing and alignment between course content and outcomes.	The department will review course progression and the alignment of course outcomes with the competencies expected from graduates.
3	Strengthen industry-oriented courses and employability skills.	The department will encourage technical training, industry interactions, internships, and skill-development activities relevant to civil engineering practice.
4	Update electives to reflect technological advancements.	New and emerging areas of civil engineering will be considered while reviewing elective offerings, subject to university approval.
5	Enhance practical learning through relevant laboratory tools and real-life applications.	Laboratory activities will be strengthened through practical demonstrations, case studies, field-based learning, and application-oriented projects wherever feasible.
	Improve preparation for professional responsibilities and current job requirements.	Career guidance, technical workshops, software training, and industry-oriented projects will be promoted to improve graduate readiness for employment.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Action Taken Report

On

Employer Feedback on Curriculum (Academic Year 2025-26)

S.No.	Suggestions given by Employer	Action Taken
1	Strengthen the relevance of the curriculum to current industry requirements.	Employer feedback will be discussed during curriculum review activities, and recommendations will be forwarded to the appropriate academic bodies.
2	Improve industry-oriented courses and professional competencies.	The department will encourage internships, industrial visits, expert lectures, and practical training to improve students' workplace readiness.
3	Incorporate emerging technologies into elective courses.	Elective offerings will be reviewed periodically to identify opportunities to include emerging civil engineering technologies and digital tools.
4	Improve the suitability of laboratory tools and experiments to current industry practices.	Existing laboratory facilities and experiments will be reviewed, and modernization requirements will be identified based on available resources and industry relevance.
5	Strengthen the application of theoretical knowledge to real-life engineering problems.	Students will be encouraged to undertake industry-oriented mini-projects, case studies, practical assignments, and application-based project work.
6	Sustain and improve student proficiency in the workplace.	The department will continue to promote technical competency development, communication skills, teamwork, problem-solving, and professional ethics.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			

Action Taken Report

On

Parents Feedback on Curriculum (Academic Year 2025-26)

S.No.	Suggestions given by Employer	Action Taken
1	Improve the availability of textbooks and reference books.	The department will collect faculty and student requirements and recommend additional textbooks, updated editions, and digital learning resources to the library.
2	Maintain high teaching quality.	Faculty members will be encouraged to adopt interactive teaching methods, practical demonstrations, student-centred learning, and continuous feedback mechanisms.
3	Improve transparency in the evaluation system.	Assessment criteria, internal evaluation procedures, and feedback on student performance will be communicated clearly in accordance with university regulations.
4	Review academic workload and students' ability to cope with coursework.	The semester-wise academic schedule, assignment deadlines, and assessment workload will be reviewed to promote balanced learning.
5	Improve the relevance of courses to current and future technologies.	Emerging technologies and professional developments will be considered during periodic curriculum reviews.
6	Maintain a supportive and inclusive academic environment.	The department will continue to promote fair treatment, equal learning opportunities, student mentoring, and a supportive classroom environment.

Name	Dr. N.R. Gowthami	Dr. S. Venkata Vara Prasad	Mr. V. Haneef
Signature			