PRODUCT PARTY PART

CENTER FOR WATER RESOURCES

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 025

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

	Name of the Faculty with designation: E. ARUN BABU, ASST. PROF								
	Degree: M·E	IWRM	R2015						
	The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.								
	OStrongly Agree	ØAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
1.	The course was we of changes etc)	ll organized	(e.g. teaching h	ours, content flo	ow, access to materials, notifications				
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	Ø Neutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
2.	The syllabus was n onmodem/advanced		mphasis was on	fundamentals a	s well as				
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
3.	Was there a balance	e between the	eory and practic	al?					
	OStrongly Agree		O Neutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
4.	Is the course well-s resources, tutorials,	tructured to a	ichieve the learn	ning outcomes (U	Usage of learning				
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	O Neutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
5.	The overall environ	ment in the c	lass was condu	cive to learning.					
	OStrongly Agree	O Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
5.	Are the prescribed books relevant?								
•	OStrongly Agree	O Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
7.	Were the Labs bette								
	Ostrongly Agree	O Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
8	Did the course contribute to skill enhancement and better career opportunities?								
	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OstronglyDisagree				
	Were the assessment	s conducted	on time with pro	oper coverage of					
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OstronglyDisagree				
	9				*11				

PROFESSOR & DIRECTOR
CENTRE FOR WATER RESOURCES
ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI-25

Signature of the Faculty

CENTER FÖR WATER RESOURCES COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 606 025

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum

	Name of the Faculty with designation:							
	Degree: M. A.	ZWR	λ	719 02	(41.			
The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.								
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONcutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
١,	The course was well organized (e.g. teaching hours, content flow, access to materials, notifications of changes etc)							
	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONcutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
V	The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as onmodem/advancedtopics.							
	Strongly Agree	OAgree	ONcutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
3.	Was there a balance between theory and practical?							
		OAgree	ONcutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicalete)?								
	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
5.	The overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.							
	Ostrongly Agree	(DAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
6.	Are the prescribed b	ooks relevan	t?					
٠	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
7.	Were the Labs bette	r equipped?						
	Ostrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
3	Did the course contr	ibute to skill	enhancement ar	nd better career	opportunities?			
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
).	Were the assessment	s conducted	on time with pro	oper coverage of	f syllahus?			
	OStrongly Agree	OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree			
					A 100.			

PROFESSOR & DIRECTOR CENTRE FOR WATER RESOURCES **ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI-25**

Signature of the Faculty

7.

8.

9.

CENTER FOR WATER RESOURCES

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GUINDY, CHENNAI 600 025

Feedback on Syllabus/Curriculum 2015 (ME IWRM)

Name of the Faculty with des	ignation: CAR	OLIN ARUL,	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR				
Degree: M.E. Integra							
The course objectives were clear and reflected in the syllabus.							
Ostrongly Agree OAgree		ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
 The course was well organized of changes etc) 	l (e.g. teaching h	ours, content flo	w, access to materials, notifications				
Ostrongly Agree WAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
The syllabus was need based. Emphasis was on fundamentals as well as onmodem/advancedtopics.							
OStrongly Agree OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
3. Was there a batance between the	neory and practic	al?					
Ostrongly Agree WAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
4. Is the course well-structured to achieve the learning outcomes (Usage of learning resources, tutorials, practicalete)?							
OStrongly Agree OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
5. The overall environment in the	class was conduc	cive to learning					
Ostrongly Agree OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
6. Are the prescribed books relevan	nt?						
Strongly Agree OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OstronglyDisagree				
7. Were the Labs better equipped?							
OStrongly Agree "OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OstronglyDisagree				
OStrongly Agree 100 Agree							
o strongly Agree Do Agree	ONeutral	ODisagree	OStronglyDisagree				
Were the assessments conducted on time with proper appearance.							
OStrongly Agree , OAgree	ONeutral	ODisagree	ostronglyDisagree				
			The state of the s				

PROFESSOR & DIRECTOR CENTRE FOR WATER RESOURCES ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI-25