DR. B. C. ROY ENGINEERING COLLEGE

Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering

Durgapur

ACTION TAKEN REPORT

Academic Year 2025-2026

ODD SEMESTER

Semester End Feedback | Feedback on Facilities | Program End Survey

Report code BCREC/ECE/ATR/2025-26/ODD

Prepared for Department Advisory Committee

Prepared on 4 November 2026

Purpose and Scope

This report presents the ECE feedback findings for Academic Year 2025-26 and sets out corrective measures, proposed implementation responsibilities and records for follow-up. It covers academic delivery, institutional facilities and graduating-student self-assessment of programme outcomes.

The Odd-semester evidence comprises the Semester I ECE survey. Academic delivery is rated favourably on most items, with ICT use and developmental mentoring requiring closer attention. Internet and canteen services are the main facility priorities. The annual Program End Survey is included as a separate programme-level review.

Scope of Review

Feedback instrument	Coverage
Semester End Feedback	Semester I, academic items 1-12; printed participant count 54.
Feedback on Facilities	Semester I, facility items 13-21; item response totals range from 48 to 58.
Program End Survey	Annual 2025-26 ECE return; five responses per survey item, reviewed against the 11 programme outcomes.

Basis for Departmental Review

The action response builds on the practical teaching, simulation support, assessment transparency and mentoring measures recorded in the 2024-25 ECE reports. The proposed measures are to be reviewed through the departmental process and closed against the supporting evidence specified in the action tables.

The Program End return is an annual ECE record common to both semester reports. Percentages use each item's displayed response counts. The action tables distinguish proposed work from documented completion.

Head
Dept. Electronics & Comm. Engg.
Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College
Durgapur

1 Semester End Feedback Analysis

1.1 Overview

The Semester I return covers syllabus completion, teaching, assessment, mentoring, outcome awareness and student engagement. The printed participant count is 54, while individual academic items contain 56-58 responses. Each item is therefore reported using its own response total.

1.2 Key feedback summary

Item	Parameter	Responses	Mean / 4	Top two options
1	Syllabus coverage	56	3.41	91.1%
2	Teacher preparation	58	3.38	98.3%
3	Teacher communication	58	3.59	87.9%
4	Learning environment	57	3.21	82.5%
5	Fairness of internal evaluation	58	3.53	93.1%
6	Discussion of assessment results	58	3.59	96.6%
7	Mentoring for overall development	58	3.14	79.3%
8	CO and PO awareness	57	3.46	91.2%
9	Mentor interaction	58	3.38	84.5%
10	Examples and student-centred learning	58	3.41	91.4%
11	Internships and co-curricular exposure	57	3.60	98.2%
12	ICT use in teaching	58	2.90	65.5%

Reading the table Mean = (4n4 + 3n3 + 2n2 + n1) / N. Top two options = 100 x (n4 + n3) / N. Item-specific response labels are retained in interpretation: for syllabus coverage these are 70-100% coverage; for ICT use they indicate at least 60% of teachers using ICT. The column is not a single overall satisfaction score.

1.3 Strengths and areas needing improvement

Strengths. Internship and co-curricular exposure has the highest mean (3.60/4), followed by teacher communication and discussion of assessment results (both 3.59/4). Evaluation fairness receives 93.1% in the top two options.

Priorities. ICT use is lowest at 2.90/4, with 20 of 58 responses indicating ICT use by fewer than 60% of teachers. Developmental mentoring is next at 3.14/4; 12 of 58 rate its contribution as moderate or marginal.

Source records O1 Semester I ECE survey, pp. 1-8.

Head
Dept. Electronics & Comm. Engg.
Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College
Durgapur

Semester End Feedback Action Response

1.4 Corrective actions and responsibilities

The measures below extend practices recorded in the previous ECE ATRs. Proposed leads identify the relevant departmental role; the listed records provide evidence for closure.

Focus area	Corrective measure	Proposed lead	Follow-up evidence
ICT-supported teaching	Use circuit visualisations, signal plots and brief simulation demonstrations in topics where students struggle. Place the demonstration files and a related practice problem in the course repository.	Course teachers	Lesson plans, shared learning material and student feedback on access and clarity.
Developmental mentoring	Hold an initial individual discussion and a mid-semester follow-up. Record the academic difficulty, agreed support and subsequent progress; refer personal concerns through the student support process.	Mentors and year coordinator	Mentor logs and closure of the agreed support actions.
Learning environment	Add short problem-solving sessions, peer explanation and question time to foundation classes. Check whether students can attempt an application task after the explanation.	Course teachers	Tutorial work, participation records and review of common errors.
Assessment transparency	Continue sharing marking criteria before internal tests and laboratory assessment. Discuss evaluated work and arrange a clear route for resolving marking queries.	Course and assessment coordinators	Published criteria, assessed samples and a record of resolved queries.
Outcome awareness and application	Explain relevant COs at the start of each unit and link assignments to the COs and POs they address. Use familiar electronics and communication examples.	Course teachers	Course handouts, mapped assignments and student explanation of the learning purpose.
Student engagement	Retain the positively rated workshop and co-curricular opportunities. Connect first-year participation with a small demonstration, reflection or team presentation.	Year and activity coordinators	Participation records and the resulting student work.

1.5 Semester Specific implementation focus

For Semester I, use introductory ECE demonstrations to explain the purpose of foundation subjects. Pair each demonstration with a brief student task. Mentoring should address adjustment to the programme, study habits and early academic difficulties. Participation in technical activities should lead to a visible student output.

1.6 Review and recommendations

Review the action register at the next departmental review and before the next survey. Use teaching records and student follow-up to confirm closure. Retain effective assessment discussion and co-curricular provision.

Head
Dept. Electronics & Comm. Engg
Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College
Durgapur

2 Feedback on Facilities Analysis

2.1 Overview

Facility feedback is drawn from items 13-21 of the ECE Semester End Survey. The scale is 4 Excellent, 3 Very Good, 2 Good and 1 Poor. The top-two percentage refers to Excellent or Very Good; a Good response is not counted as a negative response.

2.2 Key feedback summary

Item	Parameter	Responses	Mean / 4	Top two options
13	Classroom	58	3.03	72.4%
14	Laboratory	58	3.21	82.8%
15	Library	58	3.26	79.3%
16	Hostel	48	2.85	66.7%
17	Sports	54	3.04	66.7%
18	Water	54	3.00	70.4%
19	Cleanliness and hygiene	58	2.90	67.2%
20	Canteen	55	2.76	56.4%
21	Internet	54	2.43	40.7%

2.3 Strengths and areas needing improvement

Better-rated facilities. Library has the highest mean at 3.26/4; laboratory follows at 3.21/4. Laboratory feedback has 48 of 58 responses in Excellent or Very Good. These services should retain their access and support practices while addressing specific requests.

Priority concerns. Internet is lowest at 2.43/4: 13 of 54 responses are Poor and 19 are Good. Canteen follows at 2.76/4, with eight of 55 Poor responses. Hostel has six Poor ratings among 48 responses; cleanliness and hygiene has seven among 58.

Priority	Evidence to guide the response
Internet connectivity	Only 22 of 54 responses are Excellent or Very Good. Diagnose coverage and access problems before deciding on equipment changes.
Canteen and hostel	Check the locations and services behind the lower ratings through student representatives and the responsible administrative units.
Cleanliness and water	Use routine service checks and record completion of reported faults. The survey identifies rating gaps, not their technical causes.

Mean scores are weighted by the response counts displayed for the item. Rating differences indicate where to investigate; they do not establish a verified cause, completed repair or change from the previous academic year.

Source records O1 Semester I ECE survey, pp. 1-8.

Head
Dept. Electronics & Comm. Engg
Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College
Durgapur

Feedback on Facilities Action Response

2.4 Corrective actions and responsibilities

Collect ECE student concerns and refer shared-campus issues to the relevant unit. Diagnose the service problem, record the correction and check the outcome with students.

Service	Corrective measure	Proposed lead	Follow-up evidence
Internet	Record affected rooms, times and applications; check connectivity at those locations. Review access-point coverage and load, correct identified faults and verify service with students.	IT services with ECE coordinator	Location-wise test results, service tickets and user confirmation after correction.
Hostel	Collect room- or block-specific concerns. Inspect reported maintenance and amenity issues with the hostel administration, assign repair tasks and confirm their resolution.	Hostel administration	Inspection notes, work orders and resident confirmation.
Water	Inspect drinking-water points for availability, dispenser condition and maintenance needs. Route quality concerns through the institute water-testing and maintenance process.	Administration and maintenance	Inspection and service records, with water-test records where applicable.
Canteen	Review food quality, hygiene, service and menu concerns with student representatives and the operator. Record agreed corrections and check the service again.	Administration and canteen committee	Inspection record, operator response and student follow-up.
Cleanliness	Identify areas requiring additional attention, align cleaning rounds with use and record routine checks. Follow up repeated complaints at the same location.	Housekeeping supervisor	Cleaning checklist, inspection record and closure of repeat complaints.
Laboratory and classroom	Check working instruments, seating, ventilation and teaching aids. Maintain a fault list, plan repairs and arrange practical batches around the available working equipment.	Laboratory in-charges and maintenance	Equipment status, maintenance records and revised access or batch schedules.
Library and sports	Retain the services that students rate favourably. Review access times, resource requests and sports participation barriers, then communicate the resulting arrangements.	Librarian and sports coordinator	Access schedules, resource requests and participation or use records.

2.5 Recommendations and monitoring

Give internet and canteen the first service review. Keep a facilities register of issues, responsible units, responses and closure evidence. Base equipment purchases on a documented fault or capacity assessment.

Check resolution at the next student-representative interaction. Review repeat complaints and refer unresolved shared-service issues to the institute administration. Check survey coverage before comparing later feedback.

Head
Dept. Electronics & Comm. Engg
Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College
Durgapur

3 Program End Survey Analysis

3.1 Overview

The annual 2025-26 ECE Program End Survey has five responses per outcome. It is a graduating-student self-assessment. The same annual result appears in both ATR volumes for programme-level follow-up.

3.2 Programme outcome summary

Outcome	Parameter	Strongly Agree	Agree	Mean / 4	Positive
PO1	Engineering knowledge	0	5	3.00	100.0%
PO2	Problem analysis	0	5	3.00	100.0%
PO3	Design and development of solutions	0	5	3.00	100.0%
PO4	Investigation of complex problems	0	5	3.00	100.0%
PO5	Modern tool usage	0	5	3.00	100.0%
PO6	The engineer and the world	0	5	3.00	100.0%
PO7	Ethics	0	5	3.00	100.0%
PO8	Individual and team work	1	4	3.20	100.0%
PO9	Communication	1	4	3.20	100.0%
PO10	Project management and finance	1	4	3.20	100.0%
PO11	Lifelong learning	1	4	3.20	100.0%

Scale Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1. Positive = Agree plus Strongly Agree. Each reported item has N = 5, with no Disagree or Strongly Disagree responses. The earlier survey items on society and environment both scored 3.00 and are considered together under the revised PO6; this does not represent a new combined survey response.

3.3 Key findings

Favourable responses. The survey items corresponding to revised PO8-PO11 each have one Strongly Agree and four Agree responses, giving 3.20/4. Items corresponding to PO1-PO7 each have five Agree responses and no Strongly Agree response, giving 3.00/4.

3.4 Interpretation for action

Strengthen independent application, design, investigation and modern-tool practice through exercises and project reviews. Retain teamwork, presentations, planning and independent learning. The mean of the 11 displayed outcome values is 3.07/4, an indicative indirect survey measure rather than a direct attainment score. PO6 reflects two earlier survey items with the same mean.

One response changes an outcome percentage by 20 points. Check this small-sample finding against course assessment and project evidence before making department-wide attainment claims.

Source records P1 Annual ECE Program End Survey, pp. 1-5.

Head
Dept. Electronics & Comm. Engg.
Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College
Durgapur

Program End Survey Action Response

3.5 Corrective actions and recommendations

The survey gives no adverse rating. Focus on independent competence while retaining teamwork, communication and independent-learning opportunities.

Outcomes	Corrective or sustaining measure	Proposed lead	Review evidence
PO1 and PO2	Use ECE problem-formulation clinics: define the requirement, state assumptions, select an analytical method and compare the result with a measurement or calculation.	Course and project teachers	Problem statements, worked analysis and feedback on reasoning.
PO3 and PO4	Use a design-review sequence covering requirements, alternatives, prototype or model, testing and interpretation. Require an explanation of why the selected design meets its constraints.	Project coordinator and supervisors	Design notes, test plans, measured results and review rubrics.
PO5	Build guided practice with SPICE, Python-based signal analysis and hardware-design tools appropriate to the course. Require students to explain tool assumptions and validate outputs.	Laboratory and course teachers	Model or code files, validation results and a short limitations statement.
PO6 and PO7	Include safety, social context, environmental impact and ethical choices in design reviews. Use ECE examples such as electrical safety, e-waste and responsible handling of communication data.	Course and project teachers	Case responses and the relevant sections of project reports.
PO8, PO9 and PO10	Retain team projects with defined roles, progress reviews, technical presentations and a basic resource or cost plan. Assess individual contribution alongside the team output.	Project and seminar coordinators	Team plans, individual contribution records, presentations and project budgets.
PO11	Ask students to complete an independent technical learning task and demonstrate what they learned through a small implementation, reading review or seminar.	Mentors and project supervisors	Learning logs, demonstrations and reflective technical summaries.

3.6 Follow Up and closure

The OBE coordinator should link actions to CO and PO evidence for departmental review. Use student work and assessment records to confirm closure. Compare survey results when another graduating-cohort return is available.

3.7 Continuity with the departmental reference reports

The 2024-25 ECE ATRs record practical examples, simulation support, transparent evaluation and structured mentoring. This response links those directions to the 2025-26 findings; it does not count historical actions as new completed work.

Reference documents ATR_2024-2025_ODD.pdf and ATR_2024-2025_EVEN.pdf, ECE Department, supplied departmental records.

Head
Dept. Electronics & Comm. Engg.
Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College
Durgapur

4 Departmental Review and Endorsement

4.1 Review Procedure

The feedback findings and proposed corrective measures are submitted for departmental review. Implementation records should identify the measure taken, the responsible unit and the evidence used to confirm closure. Matters relating to shared facilities should be referred to the appropriate institute authority.

Review stage	Departmental procedure
Academic review	Course teachers and year coordinators review the academic priorities, maintain the action register and check student follow-up.
Facilities review	The departmental coordinator forwards service concerns to the responsible administrative unit and records the response received.
Programme outcome review	The OBE coordinator relates the annual survey findings to course, laboratory and project assessment evidence.
Closure review	The Department Advisory Committee reviews progress and supporting records through the normal departmental review process.

4.2 Supporting Records

Retain the survey returns, item-wise calculations, teaching and mentoring records, maintenance responses and relevant student work with the departmental feedback file. Meeting decisions and completion status should be recorded when the review and implementation take place.

4.3 Source Records

O1 Semester I ECE Semester End Survey

https://srv15-bcrec.in/vc/Feedback/AQAR/2025-26/student/semester-end-analysis/ENGINEERING/odd/first/ece-first.pdf

P1 ECE Program End Survey Analysis

https://srv15-bcrec.in/vc/Feedback/AQAR/2025-26/student/program-end-analysis/ENGINEERING/ECE/program-end-analysis.pdf

4.4 Departmental Endorsement

For review and endorsement by the designated departmental signatories.

Feedback Coordinator
Department of ECE

Head of the Department
Department of ECE

Head
Dept. Electronics & Comm. Engg.
Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College
Durgapur