

## TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

## A VISVESWARAYA GROUP INSTITUTION

## **FEEDBACK**

Sign in to Google to save your progress. Learn more

## Name

Your answer

## Branch

Your answer

Are you satisfied with the facilities provided by the Request edit access.

Paw As



Your answer

Are you satisfied with the facilities provided by the college	
O Yes	
O No	
2.Do you think that the college provides you with adequate sports facilities	
O Yes	
O No	

3. Is it easy to get the resources you need from the

Paw As



A 2000

♥ FEEDBACK C Adg
3. Is it easy to get the resources you need from the college library
O Yes
O No
4.Whether your college is ecofriendly
O Yes
O No
5.Do you think you would recommend this college to others
Yes / Request edit access
O No.

Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Maltakara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564 KOTTAYAM - 686 564



4.Whether your college is ecofriendly
○ Yes
O No
5.Do you think you would recommend this college to others
O Yes
O No
Page 1 of 1
Submit Clear form
Never submit passwords through Google Forms.
This centert is neither created nor endersed by Google <u>Report Abuse</u> - Terms of Service - Privacy <u>Policy</u>
Gc Request edit access






## STUDENTS FEEDBACK

## **FEEDBACK**

Name








Pass As

Branch

□ Сору



1. Are you satisfied with the facilities provided by the college

TEGE OF ENGI

KOTTAYAM - 686 564


□ Сору



Paw Ai


2.Do you think that the college provides you with adequate sports facilities





3. Is it easy to get the resources you need from the college library







Paw. Aj


## 4. Whether your college is ecofriendly





## 5.Do you think you would recommend this college to others

□ Сору



COLLEGE OF ENGINE KOLTAYAM - 686 584 Paw Ai

## Alumni feedback form


Sign in to Google to save your progress Learn more

I feel proud to be associated with Toms College

- Strongly disagree
- O Disagree
- O Neutrai
- O Agree
- O Strongly agree

I feel that the college taught me some valuable lessons in character building

- O Strongly Agree
- Agree





Par A

Director TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING MARINE A TO NOTTA-AM RCHALA - 888 584

1	feel	that	the	coll	ege	tau	ght	me	some	e
v	alua	ble l	ess	ons	in cl	nan	acte	r bu	illding	1

Strongly Agr	66
--------------	----

f 1	Agree
	- Mai 0.0

- ) Neutral
- O Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

O Option 1

The college played an important role in increasing my level of confidence

Streenly disagree







Paw. Aj



The college played an important role in increasing my level of confidence
O Strongly disagree
O Disagree
O Neutral
O Agree
Strongly Agree
The extra curricular activities gave me an opportunity to develop my personality
Strongly disagree
Disagree
O Neutral
Agree
Strongly Agree
← ↑ 2



Paw As

3. Is it easy to get the resources you need from the college library	
O Yes	
4. Whether your college is ecofriendly	
O Yes	and the second s
O No	manger of the section
5.Do you think you would recommend this college to others	e de la composition della comp
Yes / Request edit access	
No No	unit the second second


Paw. Aj



## Alumni Feedback


I feel proud to be associated with Toms College





I feel that the college taught me some valuable lessons in character building





Strongly Agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree


Strongly Disagree

Paw As




The college played an important role in increasing my level of confidence





The extra curricular activities gave me an opportunity to develop my personality





Paw Ai





## EMPLOYER FEEDBACK

Sign in to Google to save your progress. Learn more

The facilities and infrastructure provided for for the students are sufficient

- Strongly agree
- O Agree
- O Neutral
- O Disagree
- O Strongly disagree

/ Request edit access

Par AV

Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENCINEERING
MACHINE PO
KOTTAYAM, ALHALA- ESS 564



an an ≥632 •••••	G do Ope A man
المراق	
O Agree	
O Neutral	
O Disagree	
Strongly disagree	
The students employed fro institution possess adapta	
Strongly agree	
O Agree	
O Neutral	
O Disagree	
<ul> <li>Strongly disagree</li> </ul>	
The students ' Reque:	st edit access



Paw Ai

The students have been provided with a industry oriented curriculum	
O Strongly agree	
O Agree	
O Neutral	
Olsagree	
Strongly disagree	
Will consider the students from our institution for future recruitment also	
Strongly agree	
O Agree	
O Neutral	
O Disagree	
Strongly c Request edit access	


Pad. As

## **EMPLOYER FEEDBACK**

The facilities and infrastructure provided for for the students are sufficient

[ Copy


16 responses



The students employed from this institution possess adaptability nature

Copy

16 responses




Paw. Aj



## The students have been provided with a industry oriented curriculum

Copy


16 responses



Will consider the students from our institution for future recruitment also

Сору

16 responses



Director TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakara P.O. KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564

Paw As

## **FACULTY FEEDBACK**


## Accepting responses Summary Question Individual Name of faculty 1 Copy 2 2 (551%) AKHIL Arpin R. Helan Jo Lakish. Reena Shijina B. Vin... Adithy Baji ko. Jayam. Prasan. STEFFY Sreelak.

COLLEGE OF ENGINE KOTTAYAM - 689 504 ) 20)

Department

39 responses

Сору




(5 (KOTTON - 688 55)

## 1.Syllabus is need based

[ Сору

39 responses




Paw. Ai



## 2. Programmes outcomes of the syllabi is well defined and clear to teacher & students

□ Сору

38 responses





Paw AN


TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

MONTAYAM KERALA - 886 564

## Sufficient number of prescribed books are available in the library

Сору

38 responses




Paul Ai



4.Tests& examinations are conducted well in time with proper coverage of all units in the syllabus

Copy

39 responses




Paw AV



## 

39 responses



Paw Ai





## A VISVESWARAYA GROUP INSTITUTION



Feedback



## Feedback

Sign in to Google to save your progress. Learn more


Name of faculty

Your answer

Department

Your strewer

Syllabus is need based.









D () Excellent



1.Syllabus is need based
O Excellent
○ Good
Satisfactory
O Poor
2. Programmes outcomes of the
syllabilis well defined and clear to
teacher & students
O Excellent
Good
Satisfactory
Poor Request edit access

Paw. Aj



3.Sufficient number of prescribed books are available in the library
○ Excellent
O Good
O Satisfactory
Poor
4.Tests& examinations are conducted well in time with proper coverage of all units in the syllabus
O Excellent
○ Good
O Satisfactory
O Poor

Par. Ai



	16 10 K 16 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18
$\overline{}$	o-o-o-o-o
0	Satisfactory
0	Poor
	he curriculum has been focus on I development
210	. <b></b>
0	Excelent
0	Good
0	Satisfactory
0	Poor

Never submit passwords through Google Forms

Submit

This coment is neither created nor endorsed by Google, Report Abuse - Terms of Service - Privacy

Police

Gc / Request edit access

Clear form

Paw. Ai



# TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING FOR STARTUPS

## STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

UNNIKANNAN R.V Name ...

......Academic year 2018...... Semester.... S.s...... Branch..... C. H.

Mechania - F 3 ø Perus Y. F. 20 R 3 3 Parkel. Gedr. cc 4 d: 4 4 4 4 4 3 Year R Limes. Algebora Subject Name 1 723 7 5 4 5 S 6 5 V इमान इ 2 700 X X 1 5 5 5 4 5 W N CPC 72 75 4 4 4 \* 4 4 5 CPE-I 3 Yes 4 4 4 10 4 4 S 4 co-operation to solve individual problems Availability beyond normal classes and Has the Teacher covered the portions as Has the teacher covered relevant topics Pace on which contents were covered How do you rate the contents of the Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of prescribed by University? (Yes/No) How do you rate lab facilities, if Use of Non print teaching aids Course Contents beyond Syllabus (Yes/No) Description Communication skills Overall effectiveness Technical content curriculum? applicable? SI. No 5 :≣ .≥ B :=



(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4- Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below Average)

5

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564 Mattakara P.O.

	Any suggestion regarding norary facility	
Cl	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	
m	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	
4	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	
50	Any other suggestions	

Name & Signature of the stadent



# TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING FOR STARTUPS

## STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Semester. Semester. Name Vrohna . 1

Branch...( Kerrica)

Chesta Control	the second state and the second state of the s					and the second s	
SL No	Description	. Vin zufferführte bildens, dersegliste digestigen	in Profesor yang dan dan programmen Miller on Am	S.	Subject Name		
3	Course Conteng	703	2	(OF	perm	47	187
-	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Nes No.)			7			3
r.;	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	And the second s			11		1
-	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of	Transfer of the state of the st	And the second s	entre de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la companya del la companya de	e de participa de la confederación de co	es que de presentado de constituir e en en este de la presentación de la companya de la properencia de la prope	And the state of t
	l'echnical content			7	Col.	4	
ii.	Communication skills	77		da,		Commence of the commence of th	4
İΞ	Use of Non print teaching aids	3	v	5)	And A	And the second s	2
2	Availability beyond normal classes and co-operation to solve individual problems	77	7	7	e4	d	-
	Pace on which contents were covered	5	S	ę	7	7	C
, X	Overall effectiveness	d - J	r	500	S	CV.	
-	How do you rate the contents of the			8	( g		7
\s	How do you rate lab facilities, if			J	Ţ,	To appear to the second	
	CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR O	6	0	5	in the		-

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4- Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below Average)

KOTTAYAM - 686 554

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakora P.O. KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564 Director

particular and the second seco	Any suggestion regarding library facility	
	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	The company contrary of the
r,	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	Le word yelling any car bringles
	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	Non-Vo beca clear.
3	Any other suggestions	Every book the legall please.

Name & Signature of the stud

Vishmu P Saba

Lisap





# TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING FOR STARTUPS

## STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Name Raysen Roy

.....Academic year ...... Semester ....... Branch ....

Course Contents    Has the Teacher covered the portions as provided by University? (YesNo)   2   Has the reacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (YesNo)   3   Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of	SI. No	Description			Su	Subject Name		
Convered the portions as 3 \( \text{U}_1 \) is covered the portions as 3 \( \text{U}_1 \) is covered the portions 3 \( \text{S}_2 \) is covered relevant topics 3 \( \text{S}_2 \) is contents were covered 3 \( \text{S}_2 \) is contents were covered 3 \( \text{S}_2 \) is contents of the 3	(4)	Course Contents	1	Pervicte	charries y	(1) moder	<b>4</b>	Xines
ous (Yes/No)  of Teacher in terms of  fent  of Teacher in terms of  of Teacher	garagei	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Yes/No)	~	3	5	٠	J	J
of Teacher in terms of tent and skills tent as the contents and classes and contents were covered 2, 3, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4,	c1	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	8	90	J	J	J	J
tent	60	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of				*		
an skills         th         3         th         4           syond normal classes and syond normal classes and so solve individual problems         5         5         th         th           contents were covered contents were covered solveness         5         3         th         th         th           veness         5         3         4         th         th         th         th           veness         5         3         4         5         5         5         th         th           veness         5         3         4         5		Technical content	W	M	J	5		, ,
int teaching aids  syond normal classes and so solve individual problems  contents were covered  contents of the  contents were covered	;=	Communication skills	ٿا:	w	5		r	را
regiond normal classes and so solve individual problems solve	III	Use of Non print teaching aids	~	n	3	<i>y</i>	5	
contents were covered   2	2.	Availability beyond normal classes and co-operation to solve individual problems	3	×	3	5	J	<i>y</i>
veness         g         3         4         5         5           te the contents of the te the contents of the acidities, if the lab facilities, if the lab facilities is the lab facilities of the lab facilities in lab facilities is the lab facilities of the lab facilities in lab f	1	Pace on which contents were covered	2		^	J.	J	J
te the contents of the $\frac{2}{3}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{4}{4}$ $\frac{18}{2}$	15	Overall effectiveness	3	tr)			8	S
te lab facilities, if O 3 4 C O S A C A S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	य	How do you rate the contents of the curriculum?	3	3	3	3	w	<i>J</i>
(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below-Average)	5	How do you rate lab facilities, if applicable?	0	3	7	$\bigcirc$		
(Rating: 5-Excellent,	The state of the s	OF ENC.	8/	8)	24	S	25	ž
	SE ON		nt, 4-Very	300d, 3-Good	, 2- Average,	I-Below Averag	, (ož	

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below-Average)

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakara P.O.

KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564

	Any suggestion regarding library facility	Therefore the transfer of the state of the s
C-1	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	
8	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	Fritzall grand of readed, frequence
+	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	
8	Any other suggestions	



Name & Signature of the stude:



#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Name Bright Johnson

Academic year 1722 Semester 53 Branch. Chom for 1

00 3.85 LIFE SKIN POSTICLE 3.60 \* 714: 100 150007 G 14000 XXX Subject Name 3 31 1 T-30 ) 20% XX なると CPC 200 3.7 4 co-operation to solve individual problems Has the Teacher covered the portions as Has the teacher covered relevant topics Availability beyond normal classes and Pace on which contents were covered Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of prescribed by University? (Yes/No) How do you rate the contents of the How do you rate lab facilities, if Use of Non print teaching aids Course Contents beyond Syllabus (Yes/No) Description Communication skills Overall effectiveness **Technical** content curriculum? applicable? SI No F = 2 Come Lines Š -W.

(Rating: 5-Excellent 4- Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below-Average) COLLEGE OF ENGLE

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakara P.O. Director

KOTTAYAM - 686 584

KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 886 564

The second secon	e describer de distribuir de actività de la companya de mandancia de la companya della companya de la companya de la companya della companya	
****	Any suggestion regarding library facility	please shift He library from sistem
	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	
	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	
×t	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co-Curricular activity	
<b>v</b>	Any other suggestions	phoulde porters los a minimis

LEGE OF ENGINERAD

KOTTAYAM - 686 564

Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Mattakara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564

Name & Nighthar of the student Ray HE JOHNOG

#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Name Olivourgem -7

Academic year R 1.1. Semester 3

Branch, Chumalod)

SI No	Description			S	Subject Name		
2	Course Contents	CPC	0 0 6	5 5	Tachicl Tellundar	Cube decin	S. M. EDS
	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Yes/No)	500	765	SUF	2007	400	() × )
	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond. Syllabus (Yes/No)	02	62	92	S S	7	707
rs	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of						NO enteropy of the first own of the party of
in a	Technical content		6.7			E. A.	Security Constitution of the Constitution of t
=	Communication skills	-		2.5		The second secon	
Ξ	Use of Non print teaching aids	1	*	r.k.			
2	Availability beyond normal classes and co-operation to solve individual problems	5		~	m		5
*	Pace on which contents were covered	The state of the s		And the second s	Report of Contraction	1	
7	Overall effectiveness	17		Management was a little of the second of the	The second secon	54	K : 5
•	How do you rate the contents of the curriculum?		one de		The second secon	And the second s	
The state of the s	How do you rate lab facilities, if applicable?		all grant,				

(Catings-5-Excellent, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 4-Below Average)

1



	The second contract of	
	Any suggestion regarding library facility	educift the discases to A Block.
7	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	
	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	
4	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	2
٧)	Any other suggestions	
	TOWNS TOWNS TOWNS	Directof Directof Name & Signature of the studen Toms College OF ENONEERING Name & Signature of the studen Home College OF ENONEERING Name & Signature of the studen Home Repair Name & Signature of the student Name & Si

#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Асадение уман

Semester 3

Branch C 136 MILAL

a separation a			S	Subject Name		
Course Contrais	AN AND AND	*	A HAR CONTO	processing 1 Cornelle making	Hadaring	Libe swill
THE PERSON OF TH			(3)	400	100	40
The second of the second secon	3	27	1/0	2/0	No	100
Con investors of leaches in terms of		4	7		*	
	* C	54	200	7.0	titute en entre en	
Any lidgics beword mannal classes and		1	A	4	4	And the second s
a r. a. which contents were covered	25	*	*	•	15	1
	-	*	· >	×	K,	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
ow do you rate the contents of the	8	2 C	7	C C C	74	1
and the section of the salares, if			-60		The second of th	
		べつ	5	And the second s		X

(Rating: 5-Excellegit 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below Average)

MANTTAXARP

DAME AND STATE OF STA

And the state of t		
	Any suggestion regarding library facility	
7	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	
	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	coodest sports day and oths ady.
4	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co-Curricular activity	
V	Any other suggestions	
		Jay Ad

Name & Signature of the student

Director
Director
FRIGHE FRING
TOMS CONLECT OF SHORM

CONTINUES 606 584

### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Semester Academic year 2012

formore,

100000 10.10 Subject Name Contract. 2 Dales MODY A SA WE INCIVITUAL problems of control the patients as To be would normal classes and THE DOLL OF LETTER REFERRAL TOPICS Tang to the fact contents were covered こと しんかい はないこと cars of leader in forms of Rowletter with the contrast of the A STATE SCHOOLSEN BALLS t outset tonicals Large Pilleron STORY OF SECTION STATE OF THE PARTY TOTAL TOTAL

(Rating & Lycellent, 4- Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, I-Below Average)

1 公司以上

Any suggestion regarding library facility	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	Any other suggestions	
F	2	S.	4	5	

H.



Pad. Ai

Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Mattekara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 688 564

Son Un American Name & Signature of the student

#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Name AY AVIN d. S

Academic year 20 8-19 Semester. 55. Branch. Cham'ta

LAPSEL 11 Linear 57 Ex Cox 1 7 3 Se Mes D 1 5 Part cle Z Subject Name 3 J J 5 1 Flmid 5 7 27 7 M 5 5 2 PE 1 5 Z 7 3 J 2 5 1 7 1 co-operation to solve individual problems Has the Teacher covered the portions as Has the teacher covered relevant topics Availability beyond normal classes and Pace on which contents were covered Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of prescribed by University? (Yes/No) How do you rate the contents of the How do you rate lab facilities, if Course Contents Use of Non print teaching aids Description beyond Syllabus (Yes/No) Communication skills Overall effectiveness Technical content curriculum? SI. No 7 13  $\geq$ . do 4

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4- Very-Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below-Average)

33

0

3

3

3

233

24

applicable?



DIFECTOR ENGINEERING

DIFECTOR ENGINEERING

TOMS COLLEGE RATHER R

shift in word from Abock.	No interest aculty.	Programmes shald be unducked	Engranmen Street In Conductive		Name at Statement of the structure
1 Any suggestion regarding library fachity	2 Any suggestion regarding internet	3 Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	4 Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	5 Any other suggestions	

14.

### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Name Grebon

.......Academic year. 2014 ... Semester 2.3 .....Branch CHEMICAC

S. No.					A PARTY (PARTY) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	те ту поператория предоставующей поставующей предоставующей поставующей поставующе	
	Description			Sı	Subject Name		Management of the control of the con
( <del>Y</del> )							And the state of t
	Course Contents	CPC	Per Hicks	Chemistr	Me SKIE		
	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Yes/No)	Yes	727	757			1/60
c,	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	7/63	103	New York	100	
5	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of				0.7		
	Technical content	7	17	7.1	C	T	And the second s
=	Communication skills	1	1	7	EX	77	
E	Use of Non print teaching aids	1	I	7			
	Availability beyond normal classes and co-operation to solve individual problems	+	K	4	<u> </u>	and the contract of the contra	Marie a marie and increase and
٠	Pace on which contents were covered	3	/		2	2	
7	Overall effectiveness	4	41		7	The second secon	
4	How do you rate the contents of the curriculum?	17		17	S		7
2	How do you rate lab facilities, if applicable?	0	IJ	ru			



(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4- Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below Average)

Mattakora P.O. Director

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 688 564

The same of the same of the same of	Service and control of the control o	to applicate the state of the s	
STAN.	Ans suggestion regarding library		
	Ans suggestion regarding interner	A CHARLES THE PARTY AND THE	
e-1	Am suggestion regarding co-		
•	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co-		
M.	Any other suggestions	of the state of th	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ROTINYAM - 686 564 ST TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING MAITAN SARE STANDARD OF KOTTAYAM PENALA-CHU 64		Name & Signature of the student

#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

RESILINA BABU Name

SI. No	Description				Subject Name		
(A)	Course Contents	Lineag	[ [ [ sekil]	CPE	CPC	posticle aday	Sport of the state
_	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes	465	Yes	465	769
CI.	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
'n	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of						7
	Technical content	9	5	2	5	1 0	0
:=	Communication skills	7	5	5	21		1 4
:=	Use of Non print teaching aids	2	5	7	r		
ΙΛ	Availability beyond normal classes and co-operation to solve individual problems	6	Z	4	7		N .
^	Pace on which contents were covered	5	7	5	5	7	I
. IA	Overall effectiveness	.5	2	7	C		5
4	How do you rate the contents of the curriculum?	<i>f</i> c	5	7	4	4-	or
5	How do you rate lab facilities, if applicable?	1		4	•	4	
		36	00	30	29	すび	ج ک

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below-Average)



TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakara P.O. KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564 Director



	Any suggestion regarding library facility	No
N	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	No
n	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	
प	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	
(r)	Any other suggestions	
- Control of the Cont	MOTTATAM ORG SOL ST. TOMS COLLEGE MARK	Director  Director  Director  Mame & Signature of the student  Management  Management

#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Semester.... [] ..... Branch... Cherryical Name Ullega Risabambhasan Academic year

	Company of the State of						principal of						
	Fleing	Ves	20		1	19)	7	7	H	7	m		CO
	partele	× × ×	0 2		ব	9	•	7	7	7	*	X	
Subject Name	C PC	\ 8.27	2		D	Ŋ	N	7	10	k	(1)		00
Su	CPE	X	<u>s</u>		Ŋ	ω	5	2	6	6	4	7	
	Lifestull	Yes	Yes		9	4	Ŋ	لم	5	2	2		20
	Lucas	Yes	٧٩		M	Ŋ	9	10	5	10	5		000
Description	Course Contents	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Yes/No)	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of	Technical content	Communication skills	Use of Non print teaching aids	Availability beyond normal classes and co-operation to solve individual problems	Pace on which contents were covered	Overall effectiveness	How do you rate the contents of the curriculum?	How do you rate lab facilities, if applicable?	
Ž.		age of			Section and the section of the secti	17	State State State	Dr.		A	40	n	

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4- Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below-Average)

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 636 564 Mattakara PO Vad. A. Director

Any suggestion regarding library facility Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	N.	
Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	<b>√</b>	
and in a design of the residence of the contract of the contra		
Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	J.	
Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	6 J	
Any other suggestions	h. 6	

Day. Ai

Director TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakara P.O. KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564

Name & Signature of the student



#### LULINIS I LLUBACK FORM

Name Minoyem - T

Academic year R 19 Semester 3. Branch Chamilton

Ses Ses	Description			S	Subject Name		The second secon
3	. Course Contents	CPC	CPE	H U.B	pastici 1220audeži	מוזיאש שירות	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Yes/No)	Yes	765	S 0 7	ر ده ی	27	•
r.	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	07	200	2	500		
3	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of					THE STATE OF THE S	en e
	Technical content	ř	7	H			
	Communication skills	77	T				
iii	Use of Non print teaching aids	7	ጥ	4	ന	-	
à	Availability beyond normal classes and co-operation to solve individual problems	6	m	N	m	7.5	J
,	Pace on which contents were covered	4	5	M	2	ょう	* *
:5	Overall effectiveness	4	7	2		12.4	7.5
4	How do you rate the contents of the curriculum?	8	V	3	5.5	1	*
\$	How do you rate lab facilities, if applicable?		3				M. Marie and the second

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below-Average)

4

DNING THE ENING Director TOMS COLLEGE

		1		1.0
from Abbut				
roer .				or 10mms
Loud				Lab provided
11 241				mone (
Shift				
glease shift He liberies				phounde
Any suggestion regarding library facility	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	Any suggestion regarding Co- Curricular activity	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	Any other suggestions
	7	б.	4	S

Saight Johnson

And the student

Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
TABLISHAY P. 665 564
KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 665 564

#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Name Bright Johnson

Academic year, 17-21. Semester. 53. Branch. Chemitral

	M partick	5.64	714.					6.8.7	2 40	3.85	4.3	2.5	20.25
	UFFASE	9.45	713		4		7.1	<b>h</b>	. 63	06 (†)	4.8		70
Subject Name	Linear	XIG	713		4	5	8		4.4	7.1	8.6	Same 2	2.90
S	M.E	XXX	71.5		m	14	663	3.4	3.7	3.3	3	Anny Control of Contro	73
	C PE-1	Yes	XIIX		3	5	17	3.5	4	3.5	29:7	cr	>
	CPC	Xex	Yes		4	6	4	3.5	7	3.7	8		
Description	Course Contents	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Yes/No)	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of	Technical content	Communication skills	Use of Non print teaching aids	Availability beyond normal classes and	Pace on which contents were covered	Overall effectiveness	How do you rate the contents of the	curriculum?  How do you rate lab facilities, if	applicable?
Sl. No	(A)			0	•	1	ia	<b>.</b>	,	5	4	5	

(Ratings-5-Excellent, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below Average)





Name & Signature of the stude		
Complete the Constitution constitution	Any other suggestions	Marin Commence of the Commence
	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co-Curricular activity	
	An Suggestion regarding Co-	
	Any suggestion regarding internet	
	Any suggestion regarding library	

DIRECTO!
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

MATTO AND P.O. SUN SEA

#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Raysen Roy Name

Academic year Semester 5 Branch. Charles

				The state of the s	And in case of the		And the state of t
SI No	Description			Sul	Subject Name		
3	Course Contents	CPC	Pearch	Cheminy	Char	French	Brace
growt offer	Has the Teacher covered the portions as prescribed by University? (Yes/No)	~	7	W	<i>y</i>	J	
e1	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	8	90	J	7	J	J
(1)	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of		÷	8			
	Technical content	3	67	5	7	*	,
i med	Communication skills	ڻ:	N	٠	5		7
H	Use of Non print teaching aids	•	2	3	<i>s</i>	5	
.2	Availability beyond normal classes and co-operation to solve individual problems	3	3	2	5	J	,
	Pace on which contents were covered	2	3	7	5		7
.5	Overall effectiveness	2	2	حر ر	8	6	S
4	How do you rate the contents of the curriculum?	2	~	~	J	~	<b>,</b>
\ <u>`</u>	How do you rate lab facilities, if applicable?	0	3	7	0	0	5   2

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below Average)

V

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENDINEERING Mattoking 20 Director

KOTTAYAM, KERALA, 898 CE4

arding internet  egarding Co-  ding Extra Co-  Co-  Co-  Co-  Co-  Co-  Co-  Co-	The second secon	facility	
egarding Co-	The state of the s	Any suggestion regarding internet Facility	(25.7, 125. 3 contra) Elle 422 in
egarding Extra Co-		suggestion regarding cular activity	We count gering any con Commercial
		Any suggestion regarding Extra Co-Curricular activity	parts been of
	and the second s	Any other suggestions	ensu balle to ball please.

Name & Signature of the stud

Vishmu P Suba

Leap

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING MATGRATA P.O. KOTTAYAM, KERALA- 686 584

COTTAYAM - 686 5BH

#### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Name NYShnu To Subu

Branch Chemical

Semester 3 17 Semester 3.

SI No	Description	Rijas Mikara palajajajaji Mesengankan edipasji sa sepa ili		ns	Subject Name		
8		And the second s		307	De lien	- A-	13
	Course Contents			And the second s		constant funds sporters contacts of experiment of a community and associated	
	Has the Teacher covered the portions as				6	10.0	
74	Has the teacher covered relevant topics beyond Syllabus (Yes/No)	and the second s	Page				
1	Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of		And the second s			*	2
-	Technical content	7	5	7	7	-	4
=	Communication skills	3	4.5	1	5	7	3
iii	Use of Non print teaching aids	2	6	J			
.s	Availability beyond normal classes and	5	7	2	-	4	
۵	Pace on which contents were covered	r	s	60	7	7	7
T	Overall effectiveness	3	5		5	2	
-	How do you rate the contents of the		17	3		5	7
5	How do you rate lab facilities, if			-7	v	processing the company of the compan	4
	applicable?	www.committeedistantingscondered constraints among the con-	50	ā	200	<u>+</u>	-

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4- Very Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below Average)

	And Survey and the survey of t	
and a separation of the form of the separation o	Any suggestion regarding internet	
E P. S.	Any suggestion regarding Co-Curncular activity	
<b>v.†</b>	Any suggestion regarding Extra Co- Curricular activity	
	Any other suggestions	Z

Name & Signature of the student

Fay As

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Hattarian Perform 1006 555

Chimbanin anni R.

### STUDENTS FEEDBACK FORM

Name ... UNIKANNAN . R.V

Academic year 2018..... Semester.... S.3..... Branch..... C.H.

Mechania - r Phulo A X 4 1 4 3 4 4 Parket. Teeds. 4 4 4 4 4 5 4 4 3 Z Lines Algebra Subject Name ンとと 1 Ž S 4 V w Lake Studle 763 X. 5 5 M 50 4 W c pc 75 7 4 4 4 4 CPE-I Yes 76 4 4 1 4 4 S 4 co-operation to solve individual problems Availability beyond normal classes and Has the Teacher covered the portions as Has the teacher covered relevant topics Pace on which contents were covered How do you rate the contents of the Effectiveness of Teacher in terms of prescribed by University? (Yes/No) How do you rate lab facilities, if Use of Non print teaching aids Course Contents beyond Syllabus (Yes/No) Description Communication skills Overall effectiveness Technical content curriculum? applicable? SI. No 5 S Ξ **(Y**) .≥ > 4 :=

(Rating: 5-Excellent, 4- Very-Good, 3-Good, 2- Average, 1-Below-Average)

23

23

8

3

2x

25

Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Manakara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564

COTTANNA GARGES

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACULTY EVALUATION

S#	Faculty name	S2	S4	S6	S8
1	Shijina B(HOD CSE)		96.88%		89.09%
2	Alby alphonsa Joseph			89%	87%
3	Anaha Ashokan		96%	83.6%	
4	Vineetha .V	85.4%			
5.	Radhi S		81%	80%	
6	Safna Sainudeen		96.6%		85.75%

-Paul Aj

Director TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakara P.O. KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564



TOMS College of Engineering Mattakkara, Kerala			
Wattannara, Keraia	080304.		
Evaluation Name : CONSOLIDATED ST	UDENT FEEDBACK R	REPORT	
Staff Name : Ms ALBY ALPHONS Batch Name : CS	SA JOSEPH (TCE0149	9)	
Subject Name : COMPUTER GRAPHIC	S AND IMAGE PROC	ESSING	
Sl.no Questions			tes (V)
SECTION 1			
	Poor	2	0.00%
KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE	Fair Good	3	0.00%
1 SUBJECT	Excellent		100.00%
Points Gained :	Executiv		1 = 5.00
	Poor	2	0.00%
	Fair	3	0.00%
CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF	Good	4	100.00%
2 TEACHERS EXPLANATION	Excellent	5 1	0.00%
Points Gained :		4	/1 = 4.00
	Poor	2	0.00%
	Fair	3	0.00%
	Good	4	100.00%
3 Teacher's willingness to help	Excellent	5	0.00%
Points Gained :		4	4/1 = 4.00
	blank	0	0.00%
	>25%	3	0.00%
Approximate % of classes not engaged by	10-25%	4	0.00%
4 the teacher	<10%	5	100.00%
oints Gained :			5/1 = 5.00
Whether the teacher dictates notes only	No	4	100.009
5 without explanation	Yes	5	
oints Gained :			4/1 = 4.0
	inadequate	3	
	Satisfactory	4	-
6 Teacher's ability to organise lectures	Excellent	5	
ints Gained :			
	Too Slow	T .	5/1 = 5.0
	Too Fast		0.00
7 Speed of Presentation			4 0.0
ints Gained :	Just Right		5 100.0
- Samou .			5/1 = 5
	No		1 0.0
2 Daniel III	sometimes		4 0.0
8 Does the teacher encourage questioning	Yes		5 100.0
nts Gained :			5/1 = 5
SCOLLEGE OF ENGINE	Unpleasant		
COLLENGIA	on picasant		2 0.

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Mallakara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA-686 564



Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINE
Mattakara PO
KOTTAYAM, KERAL

			Points Gained:	11 Overall teaching effectiveness of the				Gained :	Points Carrity of the teacher	10 8		anied:	Points Gained	9 Behavion
Total F	Teaching Effectiveness Index		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		Sincere	Not Sincere	Not judgeble		Pleasant	Indifferent	
Total Percentage 94.55%	ness Index		5	4	3	2		5	3	1		5	4	
94.55%	52	5/1 = 5.00	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5/1 = 5.00	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5/1 = 5.00	100.00%	0.00%	

4 0.00% 5 100.00% 5/1 = 5.00 1 0.00% 4 100.00% 5 0.00% 4/1 = 4.00 2 0.00%	-	Unpleasant	8 Does the teacher encourage questioning points Gained:
10 5/1: 5/1: 4/1	-		8 Does the teacher encourage questioning
10 5/1:0 4 10			The same of the sa
10 5/1 10		Yes	
5/1	S	sometimes	
-		No	Points Gained:
			7 Speed of Presentation
$\vdash$		Just Right	
		Too Fast	
2 0.00%		Too Slow	Points Gained :
5/1 = 5.00			6 Teacherat Sability to Significant
5 100.00%		Excellent	Caractures of the capacity of the contract of
4 0.00%		Satisfactory	
3 0.00%		inadequate	Points Gained:
4/1 = 4.00			5 without explanation
5 0.00%		Yes	Whether the teacher dicidles living
4 100.00%		No	Points Gained :
5/1 = 5.00			4 the teacher
5 100.00%		<10%	Approximate % of classes flor eligaber 27
4 0.00%		10-25%	or a filter por not engaged by
3 0.00%		>25%	
0.00%		blank	Points Gained:
4/1 = 4.00		!	3 Teacher's willingness to rielp
5 0.00%		Fxcellent	
4 100.00%		Good	
	3	Fair	
$\overline{}$	2	Poor	Points Gained :
4/1 = 4.00			2 TEACHERS EXPLANATION
0.00%	5	Fxcellent	CLARITY AND UNDERSTAINDABILITY OF
100.00%	4	Good	
0.00%	w	Fair	
0.00%	2	Poor	Points Gained :
5/1 = 5.00	-	Excellent	1 SUBJECT
100.00%	2 4	Good	KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE
0.00%	<u>a</u>	Fair	
0.00%	2	Poor	
			SECTION 1
40(65 (4)	Point (P)	Quality	Sl.no Questions
Ottos (V)	_		Subject Name : COMPILER DESIGN
		19	Batch Name: CS2019
	9)	OSEPH (TCE014	Staff Name : Ms ALBY ALPHONSA JOSEPH (TCE0149)
	REPORT	ENT FEEDBACK	Fyaluation Name : CONSOLIDATED STUDENT FEEDBACK REPORT
		564.	Mattakkara, Kerala 686564.
		d Polytechnic	TOMS College of Engineering And Polytechnic

TOMO COLLECTE OF EN

TTAKARA

COLLEGE OF ENGUE COTTAYAM - 886 564

Direc TOMS COLLEGE S Matter KOTTAYAM.

				Points Gained :	11 Overall teach.				gained :	Points Control of the teach	10 Sin.			Foints Gained. To the Teacher	9 Behavio	
Total Percentage 92 739/	Teaching Effectiveness in 1	5	her Excellent 4	Good	2		5	Sincere	Not Sincere	Not judgeble		Pleasant	Indifferent			
97 72%	5/1 = 5.00		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5/1 = 5.00	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5/1 = 5.00	5 100.00%	4 0.00%				

	TOMS College of Engineering And Polytechnic	And Polytechnic	other and market place and a supplementary of the s	
	Mattakkara, Kerala 686564.	86564.		
	Evaluation Name : CONSOLIDATED STUDENT EFEDRACK REPORT	DENT EFFORACK	REPORT	
	Staff Name : Ms ALBY ALPHONSA JOSEPH (TCE0149)	A JOSEPH (TCE014	9)	
	Batch Name : CS2019	2019		
	Subjec	RKING LAB		
	Sl.no Questions	Y	Point (P) Votes (V)	3
	SECTION 1			
	0.001.014	Poor	2 0.0	0.00%
		Fair		0.00%
	KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE	Good		0.00%
	1 SUBJECT	Excellent	5 100.00%	%0%
	Points Gained :		5/1 = 5.00	.00
		Poor	2 0.	0.00%
		Fair	3 0.	0.00%
	CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF	Good	1	100.00%
	Points Gained .	excellent	5 0	0.00%
		Poor	4/1 = 4.00	4.00
		Fair	1	100.00%
		Good		0.00%
	3 Teacher's willingness to help	Excellent		0.00%
	Points Gained :		3/1 = 3.00	3.00
		blank	0 100	100.00%
		>25%	3 (	0.00%
	Approximate % of classes not engaged by	10-25%	4 (	0.00%
	4 the teacher	<10%	5 (	0.00%
	Points Gained :		0/1=	0/1 = 0.00
ų.	Whether the teacher dictates notes only	No	4 100	100.00%
	5 without explanation	Yes	5	0.00%
	Points Gained:		4/1 =	4/1 = 4.00
		inadequate	3	0.00%
	6 Took sêrm skiir	Satisfactory	4	0.00%
	Cint Coincid.	Excellent	5 10	100.00%
	Folits Gained:		5/1	5/1 = 5.00
		Too Slow	2	0.00%
	7 Speed of Description	Too Fast	4	0.00%
-	/Jopeed of Presentation	Just Right	5 10	100.00%
1-	Points Gained:		5/1	5/1 = 5.00
		No	1	0.00%
	Does the topped	sometimes	4 10	100.00%
0	Points Gained :	Yes	5	0.00%
1	. EGE OF		4/1	= 4.00
-	COLLEGE	Unpleasant	2	0.00%



Poor

11 Overall teaching effectiveness of the teacher | Excellent

Points Gained : 10 Sincerity of the teacher Points Gained : 9 Behaviour of the Teacher Points Gained : Teaching Effectiveness Index
Total Percentage 80% Not judgeble Not Sincere Sincere Indifferent Pleasant \$ 100.00% \$ 100.00% \$ 5/1 = 5.00 1 0.00% 3 100.00% \$ 100.00% \$ 5/1 = 5.00 0.00% \$ 0.00% 4/1 = 4.00100.00%

Director
TOMS COLLEGE COMMANDAMENTAL AND TO TAYAM

to w. As

COLLEGE OF ENGINEES

(KOTTAYAM - 686 564 ) S

(MATTAKARA

Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Y AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF ERS EXPLANATION  :  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Fair Good Slow Too Slow Too Fast Just Right  No	Subject Name : CSZC Subject Name : GRAPH Questions  SECTION 1  FILEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE RS EXPLANATION :  mate % of classes not engaged by her r the teacher dictates notes only explanation  Presentation  Presentation  Presentation
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Y AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF Excellent :  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Poor Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Food  Scood Excellent :  Poor Fair Fair Food Good Excellent :  Poor Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Food Sher Sher Sher Sher Sher Sher Sher Sher	Subject Name : CRAPH THEORY Questions  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair YAND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF ERS EXPLANATION  I:  Poor Fair Good Excellent Excellent  Fair Food Excellent  Sood Excellent  Sood Excellent Inadequate Satisfactory Excellent Excellent  Just Right
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  Quality  Quality  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Fair Good Excellent :  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Foo od Excellent :  Foo od Excellent :  Foo od Excellent :  Foo od Excellent Excellent :  Foo od Excellent :  Fair Good Excellent Excellent :  Fair Foo od Excellent :  Fair Foo od Excellent :  Fair Foo od Excellent  Fair Foo od Excellent  Fair Foo od Fair Foo od Excellent  Fair Foo od  Fair Foo Slow Too Fast	Stair Name : SMIJINA B (INCENSE)  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good RS EXPLANATION RS EXPLANATION  The teacher dictates notes only her splanation  The teacher dictates notes only her splanation  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Datisfactory Yes  Inadequate Satisfactory Excellent  Secure and Poor Fair Good Excellent  Secure and Poor Fair Good Excellent  Satisfactory Too Slow Too Fast
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair  Good  SECHENS willingness to help  The teacher dictates notes only explanation  SECHAS ability to organise lectures  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good Excellent Fair Good Excellent Fair Good Fair Fair Good Fair Fair Good Fair Fair Good Fair Good Fair Fair Good Fair Fair Good Sechent Fair Good Fair Good Fair Fair Good Scher Fair Good Fair Fair Good Scher Fair Good Schelent Excellent Excellent Excellent Excellent Excellent Excellent Excellent Excellent	Stair Name : SMIJINA B (INCENSE)  Batch Name : CS2020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Fair Fair FAND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF RS EXPLANATION  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Serms willingness to help Fair Good Excellent  Serms willingness not engaged by For the teacher dictates notes only her  Inadequate Satisfactory Excellent Excellent  Excellent  Excellent
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF Excellent: :  Poor Fair Good Excellent: :  Sexplanation  No explanation  No Excellent Excellent Satisfactory Excellent	Stair Name : SNIJINA B (INCRUST)  Batch Name : CS2020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF RS EXPLANATION  SECTION  SECTION  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Excellent  Second  Excellent  Second  Fair  Good  Fair  Fair  Foor Fair  Foor Fair  Food  Food  Excellent  Second  Food  F
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF RS EXPLANATION  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good RS EXPLANATION  Excellent  Secollent Se	Stair Name : SMIJINA B (INCENSE)  Batch Name : CSZ020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF RS EXPLANATION  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good Excellent:  Secullent Se
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF EXCellent: :  Poor Fair Good Excellent:  Excellent:  Excellent:  Secure of classes not engaged by explanation  The teacher dictates notes only Ves  Secure of Classes of the light of the teacher dictates notes only  No  Secure of Classes of the light of the teacher dictates notes only Ves  Secure of Classes of the light of the teacher dictates notes only Ves  Secure of Classes of the light of the teacher dictates notes only Ves	Stair Name : SNIJINA B (INCOUST)  Batch Name : CSZ0200  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Foor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF RS EXPLANATION  Poor Fair Good RS EXPLANATION  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  1  Poor Fair Good Excellent 1  Second Excellent 1  Foor Fair Food Food Foor Food Food Food Food Foo
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF Excellent  EXECPLANATION  EXCELLENT  SEXPLANATION  Excellent  Excellent  Excellent  Excellent  Second Excellent  Excellent  Fair  Good Excellent  Fair  Foor Fair  Fair  Food  Food  Excellent  Second Excellent  Excellent  Second Excel	Staff Name : CSZ020)  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF RS EXPLANATION  EXCEllent  SEXPLANATION  Fair Good RS EXPLANATION  Excellent  Excellent  Excellent  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Fair Food Fair Food Food Excellent  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Fair Food Food Food Food Food Food Food Foo
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF EXCellent SEXPLANATION  EXCELLENT EXCELLENT  SEXPLANATION  EXCELLENT  Fair Good Excellent Excellent  Excellent  Excellent  Excellent  Foor Fair Good Excellent  Foor Fair Food  Foo	Staff Name : SMIJINA B (INCOUST)  Batch Name : CSZ020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  Excellent  SEXPLANATION  Fair Good Excellent  Excellent  Excellent  Excellent  Blank  >25%  ner  Door Fair  Fair  Good  Excellent  10-25%  The teacher dictates notes only  No  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Fair Good Excellent  No
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF EXCEllent :  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  Excellent :  Poor Fair Good Excellent :  10-25%  Plank Poor Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fai	Staff Marine : SMIJINA B (INCRUSE)  Batch Name : CSZ020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF RS EXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  Poor Fair Good Excellent Excellent  Excellent  Bach Second Excellent  Second Excellent Excellent  Bach Second Excellent  Bach Second Excellent  Bach Second Excellent  Second Excellent Excellent  Bach Second Excellent  Bach Second Excellent Second Excellent Excellent  Bach Second Excellent Excellent Excellent Excellent
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good TEACHERS EXPLANATION  Gained:  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Gained:  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Fair Good  Fair Good Excellent  Fair Good  Fair Good Excellent  Fair Good	Staff Manne: ShriJina b (1 CE0037)  Batch Name: CS2020  Subject Name: GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF Gained:  Gained:  Fair Good Excellent  Gained:  Fair Good Excellent  Fair Good Excellent  Fair Good  Excellent  Fair Good
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good  Excellent  Gained:  Gained:  Poor Fair Good  Excellent  Fair Good  Fair Good  Excellent  Fair Good  Fair Good  Fair Fair Good	Staff Manne: Snijina b (1 CE0037)  Batch Name: GRAPH THEORY  Subject Name: GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  Fair  Good  Excellent  Gained:  Gained:  Gained:  Fair  Good  Excellent  Gained:  Fair  Good  Excellent  Fair  Good  Fair  Fair  Good  Fair  Fair  Good  Fair  Fair  Fair  Good  Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF TEACHERS EXPLANATION  Gained:  Gained:  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Good Excellent  Good Excellent  Good Excellent  Bair  Good Excellent  Fair  Good Excellent  Bair  Fair	Staff Mame: Snijina b (1 CE003)  Batch Name: GRAPH THEORY  Subject Name: GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  Fair  CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF Excellent  Gained:  Gained:  Gained:  Fair  Foor  Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF TEACHERS EXPLANATION  Gained:  Gained:  Gained:  Poor Fair Good Excellent  Good Excellent  Fair Good Excellent  Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fai	Staff Manne: Shijina b (1 CE0033)  Batch Name: GRAPH THEORY  Subject Name: GRAPH THEORY  Quality  SECTION 1  Fair  CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF Excellent  Gained:  Gained:  Fair  Fair  Good  Excellent  Fair  Good  Excellent  Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  SECTION 1  Fair  CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF Gained:  Gained:  Fair  Fair  Fair  Food  Excellent  Fair  Good  Excellent  Fair	Staff Manne: Shijing by (CE0033)  Subject Name: GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  SUBJECT  KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE  Gained:  CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF TEACHERS EXPLANATION  Gained:  Poor Fair Fair Facherå&"s willingness to help  Excellent  Excellent  Poor Fair Excellent  Poor Fair Excellent  Excellent  Poor Fair Excellent
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF EXCEllent SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  Poor Fair Good Excellent Fair Good Fair Good	Staff Name : CSD200  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF EXCEllent SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  Poor Fair Good Excellent Fair Good Good Fair Good Fair Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  SUBJECT NAME : GRAPH THEORY  Poor Fair Excellent Excellent Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair	Staff Name : SMJINA B (ICEDOS)  Batch Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  Poor Fair  Poor Fair  Poor Fair  Poor Fair  Poor Fair  Poor Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  SUBJECT NAME : GRAPH THEORY  AUGUST   Poor Fair Good Excellent Excellent Excellent  Poor	Staff Name : SMJING B (ICEDOS)  Batch Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  Poor Fair  Good Excellent  Excellent  Poor Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  SEXPLANATION  Quality Poor Fair Fair Excellent Excellent Excellent	Staff Name : SMJINA B (ICEOUS)  Batch Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  Batch Name : GRAPH THEORY  Quality  Poor Fair  Fair  Good Excellent  Excellent  Excellent
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  SUBJECT NAME : GRAPH THEORY Quality  Poor Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Facellent  Excellent	Start Name : CSZOZO  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF SEXPLANATION  Batch Name : GRAPH THEORY Quality  Quality  Poor Fair Fair  Good Excellent  Excellent  Excellent
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions    Quality     Poor     Fair     Poor     Excellent     Poor     Fair     AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF     Good     Fair     Good     Fair	Staff Name : CS2020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  DGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE Excellent  AND UNDERSTANDABILITY OF  Batch Name : GRAPH THEORY Quality  Quality  Poor Fair Fair  Good  Poor Fair Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  Poor Excellent  Poor Fair  Poor Fair	Staff Name : CS2020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  DGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE Excellent  Poor Fair  Poor Fair  Poor Fair Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality  Quality  SECTION 1  Poor  Fair  Good  Excellent  Poor	Staff Name : CS2020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  DGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE Excellent  Poor  Excellent
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality  SECTION 1  Poor Fair Good Excellent	Staff Name : CS2020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  DGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE  Excellent
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality  SECTION 1  Poor Fair  KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE Good  Good For The TEACHER IN THE Good For THE TEACHER IN THE	Start Name : Stripina & (NEXOUS)  Batch Name : GRAPH THEORY  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  SECTION 1  Fair  KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE  Good  FOR THE TEACHER IN THE
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality  SECTION 1 Fair	Start warne: Strijina & (VECOUS)  Batch Name: CSC2020  Subject Name: GRAPH THEORY Questions  SECTION 1  Poor Fair
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality  SECTION 1 Poor	Start warne: Strijina & (VECOUS)  Batch Name: CSC2020  Subject Name: GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality  SECTION 1  Poor
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality  SECTION 1	Start warne: Strijina & (VECOUS)  Batch Name: CS2020  Subject Name: GRAPH THEORY  Questions  Quality  SECTION 1
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY Questions Quality	Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY  Questions  Quality
Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY	Statt Name : Strijina b (1 CE0033)  Batch Name : CS2020  Subject Name : GRAPH THEORY
	Batch Name : CS2020

5.00%

5.00

O.00%

O.00%

OTHER COLLEGE OF P.O. 986 984

TOMS COLLEGE OF P.O. 986 984

TOMS COLLEGE OF P.O. 986 984



Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF E:
Mattakara P
KOTTAYAM, KERALA 188894

	ieach	Took	Exercise Ex	Points Gained:	11 Overall took.					of the to				r of the Ton-
Total Percentage	reaching Effectiveness Index		cellent	od		Poor		oincere	Since Sincere	Not Judgeble	2	Treasant	Planerent	ndist.
ntage	Index		5	4	3	2		LT.	L					
%04.7P	53.57	35/7 = 5.00	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	35/7 = 5.00	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	35/7 = 5.00	100.00%	0.00%	
										_				

ant S 4 2	blank 3 28.   blank 3 28.   >25% 4 71   10-25% 5 71   10-25% 5 71   < 10% 31/7 =	71. 71. 72. 33/7 = 1 0 0 0 14 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 5 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	FEEDBACK REPORT  FEEDBACK REPORT  POINT (P) Votted (P)
E E E E			



Points Gained: 10 Sincerity of the teacher Points Gained : 9 Behaviour of the Teacher 11 Overall teaching effectiveness of the teacher Excellent Teaching Effectiveness Index Fair Good Not judgeble Not Sincere Sincere Indifferent Pleasant Total Percentage 96.36% 1 0.00% 100.00% 35/7 = 5.00 35/7 = 5.00 35/7 = 5.00100.00% 100.00% 53 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%

TOMS COLLEGE OF THE REPRING

Mait PROPRING

KOTTAYAM, ALFERINA 1888 564

2022	11.20	

2022, 11:29	TO A TO A TO A TO		er eedi	DD A CV	DED(	) NT	Bato	h Nam	ne: CS2	020	54	
Evaluat	tion Name: CONSOLIDATE Subject Name		(I FEEI	CSL	SI 20	CSI	CST	CST	IUT20	1AT N 2	2	
	Faculty Name No of student attend			TCE02	7 7	FCEOU 7	7 Z	7	7	7	7	
Sl.no	Questions	Quality	Point (P)		-	1	Votes		200 040	00 041	000.000	,
1)	Overall teaching effectiveness of the teacher	Excellent Good Fair Poor	5 4 3 2	14.29 0.00% 0.00%	14.299 0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	14.29% 0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	0.00%0 0.00%0 0.00%0	).00%( ).00%( ).00%	₩000.0	P
	*Points	Gained (Sco	re)	4.86	4.86	5.00	4.86	5.00	5.00	5.00		0
2)	Sincerity of the teacher	Sincere Not Sin Not jud	5 3 1	0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	
	*Points	Gained (Sco	ore)	5.00	5.00	5.00		11	11		5.00	
3)	Behaviour of the Teacher	Pleasant Indiffe Unpleas	5 4 2	14.29 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00%	0
	*Points	Gained (Sco	ore)	4.86	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	4.86	ent E
4)	Does the teacher encourage questioning	Yes sometimes No	1	0.00%	0.00	28.57 0.009	7 164.29 10.009	0.009	90.00% 40.00%	0.00° 0.00°	00%.43 28.57 0.00% 0.4.71	0
	*Points	Gained (Sc	ore)	5.00	4.86	4.71		4.80	5.00	3.QC	4.71	1
	A			1	(		AS COLLEGE Adallah KOTTAYAM, K	171 P.O.	Washington Wild			1/3

14:29	0.004 %00.0	%00.0	%00.0	04.00:m	6711.0			1-92 688 - N			estantifologica y sina yana yanagin gan
								ENCINES	Sxcellent Sood	NDERSTANDABILITY C	េ
	003	00.5	00 5	100.2	∥ 00.c	4.80	1/.4	(0	Stained (Score		
7000 0		1%00 O	1400°0	№00°0	<b>%</b> 00.0	2/00:0	0/00:0		Poor	*	
7000 0	%00.0 %00.0	1000 U	<b>1</b> 60000	M/200.0	<b>%</b> 00.0	<b>₿</b> ⁄₄∩∩:∩	¢⁄~no∵ol	J C	Fair	ус <sub>ј</sub> р	
0.001	00.001	0.001	0.004	00.0040	)0.00A	17.28	54.17	t c	Excellent Good		(6
	4.43			£4.43	A COMPANY OF THE PARTY OF THE P	す[す	-		Gained (Scor		
	%00.0							0	рј <del>в</del> ик >72%	teacher	
%00.0	%00.0	%00.0	%00.0	%00.0	%00.0	%00.0	%00.0	1 11	10-25% <10%	Approximate % of classes not engaged by the	(8
	62.4 62.15			62.4		1	Parameter and Pa	(97	Gained (Scor	sinioq*	_
82.88 854.18	972.85 954.15	741.7¢	7-1.7-6	954.15	E4.15	71.72	SE4.17	<i>t</i> / <i>S</i>	Yes	Whether the teacher without explanation	(1
								(ə)	Gained (Scor	stnioq*	_
	%00.0	%00.0	%00.0		%00.0 %00.0	%00.0 %00.0	%00.0 %00.0		Excellent Satisfa inadequ	Teacher's ability to	(9
								(5)	Gained (Scor		_
00.8	00.0 00.2	00.2	00.5	00.0	00.0	%00.0	%00°0	7	iA 1821 Too Fast Wol2 ooT	Speed of Presentation	(6

29	EXPLANATION	Fair Poor Gained (Sco	2 re)		0.00% 4.86	0.00% 4.86	0.00% 5.00	0.00% 5.00	0.00% 5.00	0.00% 5.00	0.00% 4.86
	TEACHER IN THE SUBJECT	Excellent Good Fair Poor Gained (Sco	4 3 2	71.439 28.579 0.00% 0.00% 4.71	28.57 0.00%	28.579 0.00%	28.579 0.00%	28.579 0.00%	14.29° 0.00%	14.29° 0.00%	85.71% 44.29% 0.00% 0.00% 4.86
	Teaching Effec	tiveness Inc	lex	52.57	52.71	53.00	53.14	53.43	53.71	53.57	52.86
	Students Suggest	ions/Feedba	ack	-	(	(,	(,	_			




Director
TONS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Mattakara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 584

0.0% 00.0% 0	00.5 00			5.00	P 92 989 - MA	Sained (Score	Points C Overall teaching effectiveness of the	(2)
		).8 0	0.4 C	00'9	(a		) stnioq*	
0.0%00.0%0	0.6%00.0	Parameter and the second secon	Approximation of the control of the		1			Personal Contract of the Contr
Lancas de la company de la com	0,000	0%00	)° <b>0</b> %00	),0	2	Роог		
0.0%00.0%0	0.0%00.0	<b>%</b> 0C	).0%00	0.0	8	Tair		
0.0%00.0%0	0.0%08%	00.0	01%00	0.0	7	booə	SUBJECT	
300 G000	00000	<b>1</b> %0 <b>0</b>	<b>200</b> 00	01	g	Excellent	KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE	(1
(V) i	sətoV	зане остроне в стем се	рационення, дочась дочась анавлей	makana nyumina kuri kani kitan sa Sireka	inio9 (9)	Quality	Questions	on.l2
The state of the s	THAN JUNIOR THE NAME HAD REPORTED THE REPORT OF THE	es interministration control control for the c		Language de anti-de constitución de constitución de constitución de de anti-de constitución de de anti-de constitución de cons	о свянити на жалова на зававанит пена истанов			gurgacoga) kega sarressen vast u.s.a-stransveren
					90	(S) be	-	
						5		
AND	(V) 3	3 3 3	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 0 00%0 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	TCE0YCE01CE0YCE0YCE07CE07CE 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	(a) TCE0XCE0TCE0XCE0XCE0TCE  A 1 1 1 1 1  Cood 4 0.00%00.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0	Faculty Name   Haculty Name   Accorded (S)   Acco


TOMS College of Engineering And Polytechnic

- Alle contract Septidiplication	teacher	Good	4	0.00%100.00%20%0.00%0.00%0.00%100.00%00.
transación de majoritation de servicios de seguina de s		Fair	3	0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%
Who all the through providing the formula called		Poor	2	0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%
September 18 met oor 3, met op met de september 18 met oor 18 met	*Points (	Gained (Score	<b>&gt;)</b>	5.00 4.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.00 4.00
3)	Sincerity of the teacher	Sincere	5	100.0000.0000.0000.0000.0000.0000.0000.0
White Shall be and a second ship		Not	3	0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%
v Charlis Krantor, knop nagosi		Sin		0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%
erich Stellen selbsten eine erstellt gestellt er erstellt.		Not jud		-Pa-J Aż
				TOMS COLUE OF THE THEERING
prilate in the second of the second	Marie San Mangari mang minang didagan ini mang menuntuk menuntuk menuntuk mengan dan didagan menuntuk			<b>KO</b> TTA:
WATTE !	*Points G	Sained (Score	<del>)</del>	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00



TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakara P.O. KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564

	Printer and a state of the stat	4	0.00%00.0%00%00.0%00%00.0%00%00.0%
	Fast	S and a second	0.00%00.0%00%00%00%000%000%000%000%
	Too Slow		
*Points G	*Points Gained (Score)		5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
) Teacher's ability to organise lectures	Excellent	2	
COLLEGE OF ENGL	Satisfa	4	0.00%000%000%000%000%000%0000
(O) KOTTAYAM - 686 564 ) = 5	inadequ	8	0.00%00.0%00.0%000%000%000%000%000%000%
MATTAKARA			
		PANIANTÉ ANTIQUE NE PANIANTÉ ANTIQUE NO LA MAI DE SANA, AS	KOTTALAN A
*Points Ga	*Points Gained (Score)		5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.00
	entral entral des respectos des des des des des des des des des de	nomination de la company de la	



KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564

*Points Gained (Score)  *Points Gaine (Score)  *Points Gained (Score)  *Points Gained (Score)  *Points
--



Powered by Linways Technologies Pvt. Ltd. (http://linways.com/)

**Product Version :3.4.0 ENTERPRISE** 

TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Mattakara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564 Director



Evaluation Name: CONSOLIDATED STUDENT FEEDBACK REPORT Batch Name: CS2018

KEPO	Batch Name: CS201	18	VI FEE	DBACK S
	Subject Name	e		
	Faculty Nam.			CS4BT363403404540 TC40000020000000
	No of student attend	ded (S)		3 3 3 3 3 3
Sl.no	Questions	Quality	Point (P)	
1)	Overall teaching effectiveness of the teacher	Excellent Good Fair Poor	5 4 3	66.6790 009 89:233/33 33.30.90000066.66%67 0.00000000000000000000000000000000000
	*Points	Gained (Scor		0.00%00%00%00%00%
2)	Sincerity of the teacher	Sincere Not Sin Not jud	5 3 1	4.6 5.005.004.334.33 100 <b>000 000 000 000</b> 0 0.000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000
		Gained (Scor	re)	5.005.005.005.00
3)	Behaviour of the Teacher	Pleasant Indiffe Unpleas	5	0.009\(\delta\)0\(\del
		Gained (Scor	d I	5.005.005.005.00
4)	Does the teacher	Yes sometimes No	5 4 1	100 009400940694799 0 0.0094009400943.309409 0.0094009400940094009
to the second se	*Points	Gained (Scor	re)	5.005.005.004.675.00
5)	Speed of Presentation	Just Ri Too Fast Too Slow	5 4 2	0.000\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
	*Points (	Gained (Scor	re)	5.005.005.005.00
6)	Teacher's ability to	Excellent Satisfa inadequ	5 4 3	66.66666100 66966667 33.33369999363339633 0.0006060000000000000
	*Points (	Gained (Scor	re)	4.674.675.004.674.67
7)	dictates notes only without explanation	Yes, v. roj No	5- 4	0.009/2009/2009/2009/200 100 D009/2009/2009/2009/2009/2009/2009/2009/
	Direct Points C	Jained (Sco	re)	4.004.004.004.004.00
8)	TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING  Mattaxara P.O.  COLTAYAM, NERALA - 686 564	<10%	5	33.30.900000000093.3

	1	1	1	1	1	Students Suggestions/Feedback
	48.33	46.33	48.00	46.67	48.6	Teaching Effectiveness Index
	4.6	4.3.4.334.674.674.6	4.6	4.33	4.3	*Points Gained (Score) 4
0	cost has been	0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	000	000	0.00	2
(0		000000000000000000000000000000000000000	966	00/0	0.00	THE Fair 3
W	33/3	66.666/639/339/339/3	33%	668%	66.	KNOWLEDGE OF THE Good 4
/	1686	33.333/368/668/668/67	368%	33%	33.	Excellent   5
ì	4.6	4.6 4.335.004.6 4.6	35.0	74.3	4.6	*Points Gained (Score)
P	C CO	0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	8	80	0.0	EXPLANATION Poor 2
0 (	000	0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	000	600	0.0	OF TEACHERS Fair 3
0		33.368/60:20036.35	25.00%	368	33.	10) UNDERSTANDABILITY Good 4
2	2000	66.633/3300.00.3000	63 BOX	633	66	CLARITY AND Excellent 5
7		4.0 4.0.4.0.4	1	1	1	*Points Gained (Score)
w	34.3	4	2		1	
0	00%	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	200%		5 9	
	30.90	000000000033.30.30	200%	200	0 9	help
-	000.	33.368/468/46.30000.	V666	600	u u	9) Teacher's willingness to Good 4
7 0	2000	66.633/339/368/33	V233	5.6373	66	Excellent 5
٥		.670.000.000.001.0	00:	670.	1.	*Points Gained (Score)
بالد		66.6700,000,000	20	5.6170	60	blank 0
3	200	0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	200%	2000	0	are engaged by the >25% 3
		0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	% ob 0%	.0 <b>0</b> 0.	0	Approximate % of classes 10-25% 4
=						

Director			N. C.	
0.00%	2	Unpleasant	Points Gallieu .	
15/3 = 5.00			Does the teacher elic	
100.00%	5	Yes		
0.00%	4	sometimes		
0.00%	1	No	Points Gained:	
15/3 = 5.00			7 Speed of Presentation	
100.00%	5	Just Right		
0.00%	4	Too Fast		
0.00%	2	Too Slow	Points Gained:	
14/3 = 4.67			€ 'ms ability to organise	
66.67%	5	Excellent		
33.33%	4	Satisfactory		
0.00%	3	inadequate	Points Gained:	
12/3 = 4.00			5 without explanation	0
0.00%	5	Yes	L dictates notes	
100.00%	4	No	-	
5/3 = 1.67			4 the teacher	
33.33%	5	<10%	Approximate % of Classes librariages - 7	
0.00%	4	10-25%		
0.00%	3	>25%		
66.67%	0	blank	Points Gained:	
14/3 = 4.67			3 Teacher's Willingness to lieip	
66.67%	5	Excellent		
33.33%	4	Good		
0.00%	3	Fair		
0.00%	2	Poor	Points Gained:	
14/3 = 4.67			2 TEACHERS EXPLAINATION	
66.67%	5	Excellent	_	
33.33%	4	Good	OF AND LINDERSTANDARII ITY OF	
0.00%	3	Fair		
0.00%	2	Poor	Points Gained:	
13/3 = 4.33				
33.33%	5	Excellent	000	
66.67%	4	Good		
0.00%	3	Fair		
0.00%	2	Poor		
			SECTION 1	
	. 0	Quality	Sl.no Questions	
Votes (V)	Point (P)	- Constitution	Subject Name : rioject	
		raiect	Batch Name: Cozoro	
		2018	Stall Name:	
	CA ACT	R (TCF0035)	DATED	
	CK REPORT	TOTAL FEEDRA		
		686564.	Mattakkara, Kerala	
	ic	g And Polytechnic	TOMS College of Engineering And Polytec	

Mattakara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA-

2017PYPM . 686 56A

Director

KOTTAYAM - 686 564

88.48%	Total Percentage	Total Pe	
48.67	ess Index	Teaching Effectiveness Index	
14/3 = 4.67			
66.67%	5	ner Excellent	Points Gained:
33.33%	4	Good	11 Overall teaching effectiveness of the
0.00%	3	Fair	
0.00%	2	Poor	
15/3 = 5.00			
100.00%	5	Sincere	Gained :
0.00%	3	Not Sincere	Points C: Points of the teacher
0.00%	1	Not judgeble	10 (5)
15/3 = 5.00			
100.00%	5	Pleasant	. Daille
0.00%	4	Indifferent	Points Gained
			Clophavia

Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGREERING
Marrow P.D.
KOTTAYAM, REDUCK - 656 554

KOTTAYAM - 688 564 Z

2   0.00%   3   0.00%   3   0.00%   3   0.00%   15/3 = 5.0   0.00%   15/3 = 5.0   0.00%   13/3 = 4.3   0.00   0.00%   0.00   0.00%	Approximate % of classes not engaged by 4 the teacher  Points Gained: Whether the teacher dictates notes only Whithout explanation  Points Gained:  Foints Gained:  Points Gained:  Points Gained:  Points Gained:    Too   Too   Too
2   3   4   4   4   5   15/3   3   4   4   4   4   4   4   4   4	nate % of classes not engaged by lorer  The teacher dictates notes only explanation  If Presentation  If Presentation  If Presentation  If the teacher encourage questioning loss and the presentation loss are teacher encourage questioning loss and the presentation loss are teacher encourage questioning loss are teacher encourage encourage questioning loss are teacher encourage encou
2   0,00%   3   0,00%   3   0,00%   3   0,00%   3   0,00%   15/3 = 5.0   100,00%   13/3 = 4.3   0,00   13/3 = 4.3   0,00   100,00   13/3 = 4.3   0,00   10	nate % of classes not engaged by loner  the teacher dictates notes only explanation    Interpolation   Interpo
2   0,00%   3   0,00%   3   0,00%   3   0,00%   15/3 = 5.0   100,00%   15/3 = 5.0   100,00%   13/3 = 4.3   0,00   100,00%   13/3 = 4.3   0,00   100,00%	nate % of classes not engaged by lover  The teacher dictates notes only explanation  Agerws ability to organise lectures ef Presentation  For the teacher dictates notes only explanation
2   0.00%   3   0.00%   3   0.00%   3   0.00%   3   0.00%   3   0.00%   15/3 = 5.0   0.00%   15/3 = 5.0   0.00%   13/3 = 4.3   0.00%   13/3 = 4.3   0.00%   100.00%	nate % of classes not engaged by er  The teacher dictates notes only explanation  aems ability to organise lectures  f Presentation  f Presentation
2   3   4   4   4   5   15/3   3   4   4   4   4   4   4   4   4	rate % of classes not engaged by explanation  at ms ability to organise lectures  f Presentation
2   0,0   3   0,0   4   0,0   5   100,0   15/3 = 5   0,1   7   2   0,1   3   0,0   4   66,4   4   66,4   5   33   9,0   100   0,3 = 1   0,3 = 1	the teacher dictates notes only explanation
2   0,0   3   0,0   4   0,0   4   0,0   15/3 = 5   100,0   15/3 = 5   0,0   0   100   0   100   13/3 = 1   0   100   13/3 = 1   13	nate % of classes not engaged by ner  the teacher dictates notes only explanation  explanation  ⣙s ability to organise lectures
2   0.000   3   0.000   3   0.000   3   0.000   15/3 = 5.0   0.000	nate % of classes not engaged by er  the teacher dictates notes only explanation  age ** sability to organise lectures  :
2   0,00     3   0,00     4   0,00     15/3 = 5,     15/3 = 5,     15/3 = 5,     15/3 = 5,     15/3 = 5,     15/3 = 5,     10,00     1	rate % of classes not engaged by explanation
2   3   4   4   4   15   15   16   17   17   17   17   17   17   17	the teacher dictates notes only explanation
2   0,   3   0   15/3 =   13/3   3   0   15/3 =   13/3   3   0   10   10   10   10   10   10	nate % of classes not engaged by 1 ner the teacher dictates notes only explanation
2   0.00   3   0.00   3   0.00   3   0.00   15/3 = 5   0.00   15/3 = 5   0.00   15/3 = 5   0.00   10/3 =	nate % of classes not engaged by ner  the teacher dictates notes only explanation
2   0,0   3   0,0   4   0,0   15/3 = 5   100,0   15/3 = 5   100,0   15/3 = 5   100,0   100,0	nate % of classes not engaged by ler the teacher dictates notes only explanation
2 0,0   3 0,0   4 0,0   15/3 = 100,1   15/3 = 100,1   15/3 = 100,1   15/3 = 100,1   10/3 = 100,1   13/3 = 100,1   10/3 = 100	nate % of classes not engaged by ner the teacher dictates notes only
2   3   4   4   15/3   16/14   5   16/14   15/3   16/14   13/2   13/2   16/14   13/2   15/3   16/14   15/3   13/2   15/3   16/14   15/3   15/3   16/14   15/3   16/14   15/3   16/14   15/3   16/14	nate % of classes not engaged by
2   3   4   4   15/3   16/4   15/3   16/4   15/3   16/4	Approximate % of classes not engaged by the teacher
2   0.0   3   0.1   4   0.1   15/3 =   15/3 =   0.0   15/3 =   0.0   15/3 =   0.0   10/3 =   0	
2   0.   3	_
2   0   3   0   3   0   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	0,072
2   3   4   4   15/3   15/3   1   15/3   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	
2   3   4   4   15/3   15/3   1   15/3   1   15/3   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	Gained:
2   3   4   4	3 Teacher's willingness to help
2 3 4 4 1 1191 1197 1197 1197 1197 1197 119	
2   3   4   4     15/3     15/3     1   15/3     1   15/3     1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	Cool
2 3 4 4 1lent 5 10 15/3	Fair
3 3 4 4 Ilent 5	Points Gained :
3 3 4 5	2 TEACHERS EXPLANATION
3 2	NDABILITY OF
3	
2	
77/0	
14/	1 SUBJECT Excellent
od 4 33.33%	KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHER IN THE Good
T	Fair
	Poor
1	SECTION 1
	Sl.no Questions
Quality Point (P) Votes (V)	ciples of information
Society(Flective 4)	Batch Name : CS2018
PH (ICEUI49)	Staff Name: Ms ALBY ALPHONSA JOSEPH (I CEU149)
FEEDBACK KETON	Evaluation Name : CONSOLIDATED STUDENT FEEDBACK REPORT
SEEDBACK REPORT	TOTAL CONTROL OF THE

Director
TOMS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Mattakara P.O.
KOTTAYAM, KERALA - 686 564

ő

COLLEGE OF ENGINGED STATES OF ENGINEERS OF E

Director
Toms courses of exert

Total Percentage	Suc redC	Points Gained . Good Good	Poor	Gincere Sincere	of the teacher	Points Gained: Indifferent Pleasant
fectiveness Index Total Percentage				cere	geble	rent
s Index entage	5	4ω,		5 W	1	5 4
48 87.27%	100.00%	0.00%	15/3 = 5.00	0.00%	15/3 = 5.00	0.00%