A Report on Students Satisfaction Survey of Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus 2082

Far Western University

Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus

Attariya Kailali

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to and for providing the opportunity and institutional support to conduct A Report on Students Satisfaction Survey of Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus 2082. This report would not have been possible without, the encouragement and cooperation of the campus administration, faculty, and staff.

I am especially thankful to Campus Chief Dr. Narendra Bahadur Air for his guidance, encouragement, and administrative support throughout the survey process. I also extend my sincere appreciation to Assistant Campus Chiefs Lok Bahadur Mahara and Padam Bahadur Saud for their valuable assistance and coordination.

My heartfelt thanks go to SAT Coordinator Ram Bahadur Mouni for his dedication, planning, and active involvement in managing and facilitating the survey activities. I am equally grateful to all teaching and non-teaching staff members whose cooperation and support contributed significantly to the successful completion of this study.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge all the students who participated in the survey. Their honest responses, time, and willingness to share their experiences formed the foundation of this report and made this study meaningful and insightful.

Abstract

This study analyzes students' perceptions of teaching–learning activities at the campus based on a field survey conducted in 2082. The analysis covers four major dimensions: Teaching and Course Management, Practical and Participatory Learning, Teaching Methods and ICT Use, and Motivation and Student Support. Overall findings indicate a high level of student satisfaction, with positive responses ranging from 56% to 88%. The mean scores across indicators range from 3.668 to 4.468, while standard deviation (SD) values range from 0.825 to 1.056, indicating generally positive evaluations with moderate variation in responses.

In the dimension of Teaching and Course Management, positive responses ranged from 76% to 80%. The mean scores varied between 3.84 and 4.208, with SD values between 0.838 and 0.956. Teaching with preparation recorded the highest mean (M = 4.208, SD = 0.945), followed by regularity (M = 4.096, SD = 0.838) and syllabus completion on time (M = 4.06, SD = 0.904). Classroom discipline showed a slightly lower mean (M = 3.84, SD = 0.956). These results indicate effective course management with relatively consistent student responses.

Under Practical and Participatory Learning, positive responses ranged from 70% to 78%, with mean scores between 3.76 and 4.16 and SD values from 0.946 to 1.056. Encouraging participation achieved a high mean (M = 4.16, SD = 0.946), while presentation/problem-solving (M = 4.00, SD = 0.98) and use of local examples (M = 4.088, SD = 1.03) were also rated positively. Creativity promotion (M = 3.996, SD = 1.056) and self-employment ideas (M = 3.76, SD = 0.971) received comparatively lower means, indicating areas where further improvement is desirable.

In Teaching Methods and ICT Use, positive responses ranged from 76% to 82%. Mean values varied between 3.988 and 4.136, with SD ranging from 0.913 to 1.049. Fair assessment received the highest mean (M = 4.136, SD = 0.928), followed by ICT use (M = 4.08, SD = 0.913), reference materials (M = 4.036, SD = 0.941), and clear teaching (M = 4.02, SD = 1.049). Homework and term paper practices recorded a mean of 3.988 (SD = 1.018). These findings demonstrate strong competence in instructional clarity, technology integration, and fair evaluation practices.

Finally, in Motivation and Student Support, positive responses ranged from 56% to 88%, with mean scores between 3.668 and 4.468 and SD values between 0.825 and 1.015. The motivational role of teachers received the highest overall mean (M = 4.468, SD = 0.825),

followed by encouraging participation (M = 4.208, SD = 0.856) and respectful behavior (M = 4.184, SD = 0.833). Availability outside the classroom (M = 3.8, SD = 0.938) and support for weak students (M = 3.668, SD = 1.015) received comparatively lower mean scores, indicating areas for further improvement.

In conclusion, the overall mean scores above 4.0 in most indicators reflect strong positive student perceptions of teachers' performance across managerial, pedagogical, technological, and motivational dimensions. The relatively moderate SD values suggest some variation in opinions, but overall consistency in positive evaluation. Targeted improvements in supporting weak students and enhancing creative and entrepreneurial learning approaches could further strengthen academic quality.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus, located in Godawari–2, Kailali, and affiliated with Far Western University, has been formally operating as an important government educational institution since 2063 B.S. (2006 A.D.). The campus has been making significant contributions to the educational development of Sudurpashchim Province. By providing access to higher education for students from local as well as nearby rural and urban areas, it has played a vital role in promoting educational inclusion, quality, and expanded opportunities. Particularly for students from economically, socially, and geographically disadvantaged backgrounds, the campus has established itself as a reliable center for higher education.

The campus offers undergraduate-level programs under various faculties. By providing study opportunities in Management, Education, Humanities, and other related disciplines, the campus has contributed significantly to the intellectual, professional, and social development of students. The students enrolled at the campus come from diverse backgrounds, creating a multicultural and diverse academic environment. Such an environment helps develop cooperation, tolerance, and a sense of social responsibility among students.

Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus prioritizes effective teaching–learning practices by ensuring regular class operations, timely completion of the syllabus, well-prepared instruction, and the maintenance of a disciplined academic environment. The campus has experienced and qualified teachers who strive to present subject matter clearly and systematically. Furthermore, the use of modern teaching methods and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has been gradually expanded. The use of digital materials, presentation tools, and reference books has helped make teaching more effective and student-friendly.

Another important feature of this campus is the promotion of a student-centered teaching system. Teachers encourage active participation in the classroom, provide opportunities for presentations and problem-solving practice, and connect teaching with local contexts. This approach supports the development of students' creative thinking, analytical skills, and self-reliance. In addition, the campus promotes co-curricular and extracurricular activities for the holistic development of students.

However, certain areas still require improvement. In particular, there is a need to strengthen additional academic support for weak students, increase teachers' availability outside the

classroom, and place greater emphasis on self-employment and entrepreneurial thinking. Student satisfaction surveys have indicated the possibility of improvement in these areas, which can serve as a basis for implementing future quality enhancement programs.

Overall, Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus is an important educational institution providing quality higher education in Sudurpashchim Province. It has positively influenced students' academic achievement, moral development, and social responsibility. Through continuous evaluation, improvement, and innovation, the campus holds strong potential to further elevate its academic standards in the future.

Statement of the Problem

The quality of the teaching–learning process in higher education directly influences students' satisfaction, academic achievement, and overall educational development. Students' opinions, experiences, and feedback are considered essential foundations for improving the academic standards of any campus. However, in many cases, students' genuine perceptions regarding the effectiveness of teaching and learning activities are not systematically collected and analyzed. As a result, the campus may face difficulty in clearly identifying its strengths, weaknesses, and areas that require improvement.

At Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus, there is a need for a formal assessment of teaching and learning activities from the students' perspective. Without clear and organized information about students' satisfaction with classroom management, teaching preparation, participatory learning, use of ICT, assessment practices, and student support, it becomes challenging to implement effective academic improvement strategies. If students' feedback and suggestions are not properly documented and analyzed, efforts related to academic planning, faculty development, and curriculum enhancement may not achieve the desired outcomes.

In this context, a confidential and structured survey form has been prepared to collect students' opinions, experiences, and suggestions regarding teaching and learning activities. The form is intended to be completed only by students to ensure authenticity and reliability of responses. Students are not required to write their names or roll numbers, and all information provided will be kept strictly confidential. This approach is designed to encourage honest and unbiased responses.

Therefore, the central problem of this study is the lack of systematic and evidence-based information regarding the effectiveness of teaching–learning activities and the level of student

satisfaction at the campus. Addressing this problem by collecting and analyzing students' feedback is essential for enhancing the academic quality of the institution.

Objectives

To collect and analyze students' opinions regarding the teaching and learning activities of the campus through a structured survey.

1. To measure the effectiveness of teaching practices using quantifiable indicators such as percentage responses, mean, and standard deviation.
2. To identify strengths and areas for improvement in academic performance based on students' feedback and suggestions.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study covers only students who participated, so it may not represent all campus students.
2. Data are based on students' self-reported opinions, which may include personal bias.
3. The study was conducted within a limited time, restricting in-depth investigation.
4. Focus is only on teaching–learning, ICT use, and student support, excluding other campus factors.
5. Findings are from a single campus and cannot be generalized to other institutions.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Research on student evaluation and satisfaction in higher education highlights its growing role in assessing teaching quality, learning environments, and institutional effectiveness. Earlier scholarship established student evaluation of teaching as a widely adopted tool for instructional feedback and administrative decision making, while later studies examined its relationship with academic performance, engagement, and motivation. Recent work has expanded the focus to include factors such as instructional clarity, emotional support, class size, technological tools, institutional services, and transparency in feedback systems. Contemporary perspectives also emphasize satisfaction as a multidimensional construct shaped by cognitive, affective, and contextual elements, as well as by the quality of measurement instruments used. Together, these studies position student satisfaction as a key indicator for improving pedagogy, curriculum design, and overall educational quality.

Miller and Seldin (2014) conducted a comparative study to assess modern evaluation methodologies in the United States. They compared 2000 and 2010 evaluations of instructional approaches. They discovered that the practice of students rating professors expanded significantly in 2010, and that SET is used in more than 90 percent of the colleges examined. SET serves as a primary source of classroom instructional information. According to their findings, nearly all deans believed that classroom instruction was an important component of evaluating university professors.

Sanchez et al. (2020) conducted a study to find a relationship between SET and academic achievement in higher education. They found small to medium correlation between SET and students' achievement. They claimed that the use of SET to measure teacher's effectiveness in making administrative decision remains controversial. Chen and Hoshower (2003) discussed that student ratings of instruction is common practice to evaluate teachers' effectiveness in most of the universities and colleges. They mention that SET are commonly used to provide feedback to teacher for the purpose of improvement of their pedagogy. SET are also used for promotion and other administrative decision.

Mathur et al. (2024) investigated student satisfaction with the teaching–learning process in higher education. They surveyed undergraduate students to examine the relationship between teaching quality, resource availability, classroom interaction, and overall student satisfaction.

Their findings indicated that clarity of instruction, timely feedback, and access to learning materials were significant predictors of satisfaction. Students reporting higher satisfaction also demonstrated better engagement and academic motivation. The authors recommended that institutions integrate student feedback in curriculum design and faculty training. The study supports the view that teaching quality and learning environment strongly influence student satisfaction.

Singh & Verma (2025) examined how advanced analytics applied to large student satisfaction datasets can help institutions identify patterns and factors influencing satisfaction. They found that analytics can detect instructors' strengths and areas where students consistently report lower satisfaction. The study showed that data-driven insights help design targeted interventions to enhance curriculum delivery and support services. Students expressing higher satisfaction tended to perform better academically, indicating satisfaction's relationship with academic outcomes. The authors encouraged institutions to operationalize analytics into satisfaction feedback systems. This research illustrates how technology enhances understanding of student satisfaction.

Lee & Chang (2025) studied the effects of transparency in reporting student satisfaction surveys to students and faculty. The researchers found that transparent feedback processes improved trust in evaluation systems and increased response quality. Students who saw clear action taken based on prior feedback reported higher confidence in satisfaction surveys. The study emphasized that closing the feedback loop — showing how satisfaction data influenced teaching practices — boosts future satisfaction and engagement. Lee and Chang argued that transparency enhances accountability and improves institutional strategies to promote satisfaction. Their results highlight the relational aspect of reporting satisfaction outcomes.

Ramos, Chen & Smith (2025) explored the effects of class size on student satisfaction. Their findings indicated that smaller class sizes significantly enhance satisfaction due to increased engagement and personalized attention. Students in smaller groups reported feeling more supported and better able to interact with instructors, leading to higher satisfaction. The study emphasized that classroom environments matter to students' subjective experience and academic engagement. Ramos and colleagues recommended small group instruction where feasible to optimize student satisfaction. The research contributes to institutional design discussions on optimal learning environments.

Malik & Suri (2025) examined emotional engagement as a predictor of student satisfaction. Their quantitative study demonstrated that emotionally engaging instructional practices — such as encouraging student voice, fostering curiosity, and building rapport — were strongly correlated with high satisfaction scores. Students who felt emotionally supported were more satisfied with both course design and instructor performance. The research highlighted affective dimensions of satisfaction, complementing cognitive aspects like content clarity and assessment fairness. Malik and Suri advocated for emotional engagement strategies in teaching to foster positive satisfaction outcomes.

Lund, Warren & Teel (2026) assessed student satisfaction with academic information sources, comparing traditional search mechanisms versus AI-based tools. They reported that differences in satisfaction levels were influenced by usability, speed of information retrieval, and user familiarity with technology. Students comfortable with generative AI showed higher satisfaction when using those tools for academic tasks. Satisfaction with information sources also correlated with perceived research competence. Lund et al. concluded that knowledge-seeking satisfaction depends on access to efficient academic tools in digital learning contexts.

Martin & Bolliger (2022) developed a model linking online learner satisfaction with instructional design, student engagement, and faculty support. Based on systematic review findings, they highlighted that satisfaction in online programs is not merely about technology reliability but also about learner support and social interaction elements. Students expressed higher satisfaction when communication and feedback were frequent and meaningful. The framework emphasizes student satisfaction as a multidimensional construct involving affective, cognitive, and systemic elements. Their work remains widely cited in recent satisfaction research.

Benton & Cashin (2012; widely cited in satisfaction measurement literature) emphasized that questionnaire design quality directly affects student satisfaction survey reliability and validity. They argued that poorly designed instruments lead to ambiguous satisfaction measures. Clear, context-specific, and psychometrically tested instruments better capture student satisfaction. Their analysis remains influential in recent satisfaction research, where instrument quality is linked to reliable student satisfaction data. The authors recommended consistent review of survey tools to improve institutional feedback accuracy.

Kelic, et al. (2025) investigated the influence of institutional support services (career, counseling, extracurriculars) on overall student satisfaction. Their results showed that students with access to robust support services expressed higher satisfaction levels and stronger academic commitment. The study concluded that student satisfaction extends beyond classroom teaching to holistic student support environments. Institutions that invest in complementary services tend to have more satisfied and academically successful students. This research expanded satisfaction measures to include institutional support factors.

The reviewed studies show that student evaluation and satisfaction are widely used indicators of teaching quality and institutional effectiveness, though their role in high-stakes decisions remains debated. Evidence consistently suggests that satisfaction is shaped by multiple interconnected factors, including instructional clarity, feedback, engagement, class size, emotional support, learning resources, and institutional services. Recent research also highlights the growing influence of analytics, transparency practices, and digital tools in strengthening feedback systems and interpreting satisfaction data. Taken together, the literature presents student satisfaction as a multidimensional construct that reflects not only teaching performance but also learning environments, support structures, and measurement quality, underscoring its value as a comprehensive lens for improving higher education practice.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey design to evaluate student satisfaction regarding teaching and learning activities at Durga Laxmi Multiple Campus, Godavari-2, Kailali, under Far West University. The survey aimed to gather students' opinions on multiple aspects of teaching, including classroom management, discipline, teaching preparation, creativity, teaching effectiveness, ICT use, and student support. The design focused on capturing students' perceptions to assess the overall performance of teachers and identify areas for improvement.

Population and Sample

The population for this study comprised all undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at the campus during the 2082 academic year. A purposive sampling method was used to select respondents who actively participated in classroom learning activities. Participation was voluntary, and students were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. The final sample consisted of students who completed the Student Satisfaction Survey Form designed for this study.

Instrument

The Student Satisfaction Survey Form was developed specifically for this study. It included items on teaching and course management, practical and participatory learning, teaching methods and ICT use, and motivation and student support. Each item was measured on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." The form did not require students' names or roll numbers to ensure anonymity and encourage honest feedback. The instrument was validated through review by campus faculty to ensure relevance, clarity, and alignment with the study objectives.

Data Collection

Data were collected in person by distributing the survey forms to 250 students during class sessions. Respondents were instructed to complete the forms independently, reflecting their genuine opinions and experiences. The survey collected quantitative data on each indicator, which were subsequently compiled for analysis. Confidentiality was strictly maintained, and the data were used solely for research purposes.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation (SD) by using the excel and SPSS. Each aspect of teaching performance was evaluated to determine the proportion of positive responses, the overall mean scores, and variations in student perceptions. The analysis focused on identifying strengths and areas requiring improvement, as highlighted in the four sections: teaching and course management, practical learning, teaching methods and ICT use, and student motivation/support.

Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary, and students were informed that their responses would remain confidential. No identifying information was collected. Ethical considerations were adhered to throughout the study to ensure transparency, privacy, and respect for the participants' rights.

Chapter 4: Data Presentation and Analysis

Part 1 . Teaching and course management

This section discusses the management aspects of teachers based on student feedback. The management aspect mainly covers the managerial ability of teachers such as completing the curriculum within the stipulated time , proper organization of content in the classroom , the state of preparation of the teacher before entering the class, etc. All the statements related to the management aspect are presented in Table 1 below.

Table No. 1

Teaching and Course Management

Indicator	strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Normal (%)	Disagree (%)	strongly disagree (%)	Total (%)	Positive %	Mean	SD
Syllabus completed on time	36.00%	40.00%	20.00%	2.00%	2.00%	100%	76%	4.06	0.904
Regularity	36.40%	40.80%	18.80%	4.00%	0.00%	100%	77%	4.096	0.838
Teaching with preparation	48.00%	32.00%	14.80%	3.20%	2.00%	100%	80%	4.208	0.945
Class Discipline	40.00%	44.00%	10.00%	4.00%	2.00%	100%	76%	3.84	0.956

Source: Field survey 2082

The students' evaluations of the teachers' performance generally appear to be positive. According to the research, 36% of the students strongly agreed and 40% of the students agreed with the teachers' ability to complete the course on time (indicator 1.1) , which makes the total positive response 76% . The mean value is 4.06 and the SD is 0.904, which shows that the students' responses are slightly different from the average and most of them have a positive view of the teachers' ability to complete the course on time.

Students also rated teachers highly on their perception of classroom regularity (Indicator 1.2). Of the students who studied on campus, 36.4% strongly agreed and 40.8% agreed , giving a positive percentage of 77% . Mean = 4.096 and SD = 0.838 indicate that there is a relatively uniform response from students and that teachers place high value on their ability to conduct classes regularly.

Teaching with preparation (Indicator 1.3) was the area with the highest positive rating. 48% of students strongly agreed and 32% agreed, which is a positive percentage. 80% is observed. Since Mean = 4.208 and SD = 0.945, this shows that most of the students have evaluated the behavior of the teacher preparing adequately before class very positively.

Classroom discipline (Indicator 1.4) also appears to be good. 40% of students on campus responded that they strongly agreed and 44% of students agreed, bringing the total positive percentage to 76% . Mean = 3.84 and SD = 0.956 show that although some students expressed dissatisfaction with classroom discipline, most gave a positive assessment.

Overall , the performance of teachers in all indicators appears to be positive. The positive responses range from 76%–80% and the Mean is in the range of 3.84–4.208, indicating that teachers have performed well in terms of completing the curriculum on time , conducting regular classes , teaching with preparation, and maintaining classroom discipline. The small difference in SD indicates that there is some variation in student responses , but overall the performance of teachers is highly evaluable.

Part 2. Practical and participatory learning

assesses teachers' pedagogical skills , primarily based on student feedback . This category includes five statements that attempt to capture the various teaching methods and techniques used by teachers in the classroom from a student's perspective.

Table 2

Practical and Participatory Education

Indicator	strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Normal (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	Total (%)	Positive %	Mean	SD
Participation incentives	46.00%	30.00%	20.00%	2.00%	2.00%	100%	76%	4.16	0.946

Presentation/Problem Solving	36.00%	38.00%	18.00%	6.00%	2.00%	100%	74%	4	0.98
Local example	32.00%	42.00%	16.00%	6.80%	3.20%	100%	7 4 %	4.088	1.03
Creativity	37.20%	34.00%	19.20%	6.40%	3.20%	100%	7 1.20 %	3.996	1.056
Self-employment idea	20.00%	50.00%	20.00%	6.00%	4.00%	100%	70%	3.76	0.971

Source: Field survey 2082

According to the evaluation of practical and participatory learning, the teacher's efforts to actively engage students in learning appear positive. In terms of encouraging participation (Indicator 2.1) , 46% of students responded that they strongly agreed and 30% agreed , which shows a total positive percentage of 76% . The Mean = 4.16 and SD = 0.946 indicate that the majority of students' responses are positive and although there are some differences in opinion onm this issue, overall, the teacher is able to create a participatory environment.

Presentation and Problem Solving (Indicator 2.2) has received 36% strong agreement and 38% agreement responses , which shows a positive percentage of 74% . The Mean = 4.0 and SD = 0.98 indicate that the teacher has received high ratings for making students practice their presentation and problem-solving skills. However , some improvement is needed as 8% of the students disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The use of local examples (Indicator 2.3) received 32 % strong agreement and 42% agreement responses , making the positive percentage 78% . The mean = 4.088 and SD = 1.03 indicate that the teacher has tried to make learning relevant and lively by using local contexts and examples in his teaching. Since the SD is more than small, some students have expressed different views on this. 37.2% strong agreement and 34% agreement responses on promoting creativity (Indicator 2.4), which shows a positive percentage of 71.20%. The mean = 3.996 and SD = 1.056 indicate that the teacher has made an effort to promote creative thinking in students. Some students have given neutral or disagreed responses , which indicates the need for more creative practice in the future.

Self-employment ideas (indicator 2.5) have 20% completely agree and 50% agree responses , which shows a positive percentage of 70% . The mean = 3.76 and SD = 0.971 show that the teacher has tried to encourage entrepreneurial or self-employment thinking in the students, but its positive evaluation is somewhat lower compared to other indicators.

Overall , teachers performed well in practical and participatory learning by engaging students in active participation , practicing presentation and problem-solving , using local examples , promoting creative thinking, and presenting self-employment ideas. Positive responses ranged from 70%–78%, indicating that teachers conducted practical learning effectively, although there was room for improvement in some indicators.

Part 3 . Teaching methods and ICT use

In the context of of teaching methods and ICT use, teachers' efforts to make classroom teaching clear, systematic, and technology-related appear to be effective. This is clearly stated in Table 3.

Table 3

Teaching methods and ICT use

Indicator	strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Normal (%)	Disagree (%)	strongly disagree (%)	Total (%)	Positive %	Mean	SD
Explicit Teaching	38.00%	40.00%	12.00%	6.00%	4.00%	100%	78%	4.02	1.049
ICT use	36.00%	44.00%	14.00%	4.00%	2.00%	100%	80%	4.08	0.913
Reference material	40.00%	38.00%	15.60%	4.40%	2.00%	100%	78%	4.036	0.941
Homework/Term Paper	35.60%	40.40%	14.00%	7.20%	2.80%	100%	76%	3.988	1.018
Fair assessment	40.00%	42.00%	12.00%	3.60%	2.40%	100%	82%	4.136	0.928

Source: Field survey 2082

In case of of teaching methods and ICT use shows that the teacher has made an effort to make the classroom teaching clear, systematic and technology-related. 38% of the students responded that they completely agreed and 40% of the students agreed on clear teaching (indicator 3.1), which shows a positive percentage of 78%. The mean = 4.02 and SD = 1.049 indicate that although the students' responses were mostly positive, there were some differences in opinion. This shows that the teacher has maintained clarity in explaining the content.

For ICT use (Indicator 3.2) was 36% strongly agree and 44% agree, making the positive percentage 80%. The mean = 4.08 and SD = 0.913 indicate that teachers have tried to make

teaching modern and effective by using ICT tools. The highest positive percentage is seen in this indicator , which shows the teachers' competence in using technology and the students' appreciation.

The availability of reference materials (Indicator 3.3) has a response rate of 40% strongly agree and 38% agree , which shows a positive percentage of 78% . The mean = 4.036 and SD = 0.941 indicate that the teacher has made efforts to make teaching more organized by using study materials and reference books.

Homework and term papers (Indicator 3.4) received 35.6% strong agreement and 40.4% agreement responses , which shows a positive percentage of 76% . The Mean = 3.988 and SD = 1.018 indicate that students experienced that the teacher encouraged learning through assignments and term papers, although some students gave neutral or disagreed responses.

for fair assessment (indicator 3.5) was 40% strongly agree and 42% agree , which shows a positive percentage of 82% . The mean = 4.136 and SD = 0.928 indicate that the teacher has maintained fairness in the assessment process and the students have rated it highly.

Overall , the teachers have done an effective job in terms of teaching methods and ICT use, including clear teaching , use of ICT tools , availability of reference materials , homework and term papers , and fair assessment. The positive responses ranged from 76%–82%, indicating that the teachers have demonstrated proficiency in using modern teaching methods and technology, and students have rated it positively.

Part 4 . Motivation and student support

The assessment of motivation and student support clearly shows the teacher's positive attitude and dedication to students. A detailed study is given in Table 4.

Table 4

Motivation and student support

Indicator	strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Normal (%)	Disagree (%)	strongly disagree (%)	Total (%)	Positive %	Mean	SD
Participation incentives	40.00%	48.00%	6.80%	3.20%	2.00%	100%	88%	4.208	0.856
Poor student support	24.00%	32.00%	34.00%	6.80%	3.20%	100%	56%	3.668	1.015

Motivational Role	64.00%	22.40%	10.80%	2.00%	0.80%	100%	86%	4.468	0.825
Availability outside of class	24.00%	42.00%	26.00%	6.00%	2.00%	100%	66%	3.8	0.938
Respectful behavior	40.00%	42.80%	14.00%	2.00%	1.20%	100%	83%	4.184	0.833

Source: Field survey 2082

The evaluation of motivation and student support gives a clear indication of the teacher's positive attitude and dedication towards the students. In terms of encouraging participation (indicator 4.1) , 40% of the students responded strongly and 48% agreed , which shows a positive percentage of 88% . Mean = 4.208 and SD = 0.856 show that most of the students highly rated the teacher's efforts to make them active participants in the class.

For support with weak students (indicator 4.2) was 24% strongly agree and 32% agree, which shows a positive percentage of only 56%. Mean = 3.668 and SD = 1.015 indicates that teachers received fewer positive ratings than expected in terms of support with weak students. 34% of students responded moderately and 10% disagreed or strongly disagreed, indicating a need for improvement in this area.

The response rate for the motivational role (indicator 4.3) was 64% strongly agree and 22.4% agree , which shows a positive percentage of 86.4% . The mean = 4.468 and SD = 0.825 indicate that teachers play an important role in inspiring students and increasing their enthusiasm towards the goal.

Availability outside the classroom (Indicator 4.4) received 24% strong agreement and 42% agreement responses , which shows a positive percentage of 66% . Mean = 3.8 and SD = 0.938 indicate that the teacher has tried to help students outside the classroom as well, but some students do not consider it sufficient.

Respectful behavior (Indicator 4.5) has a response of 40% strongly agree and 42.8% agree , which shows a positive percentage of 83% . Mean = 4.184 and SD = 0.833 shows that the teacher has maintained respectful behavior with the students and the positive response of the students is high.

Overall , the evaluation of motivation and student support clearly shows a positive attitude and inspiring role of the teacher. Encouraging participation and inspiring role received the highest positive ratings (88% and 86%), while respectful behavior also received good ratings. However , poor student support (56%) and availability outside the classroom (66%) received relatively low positive ratings, indicating a need for improvement in this area.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

serial number	Item	Positive %	Mean	SD	A brief comment
1.1	Ability to complete the course on time	76%	4.06	0.904	Students have given positive ratings to the teacher's ability to complete the course on time.
1.2	Class regularity and punctuality	77%	4.096	0.838	received high ratings for his ability to conduct classes regularly.
1.3	Teaching with preparation	80%	4.208	0.945	Most students positively evaluated the teacher's prepared teaching behavior.
1.4	Class discipline	76%	3.84	0.956	Classroom discipline is generally good , with some students expressing dissatisfaction.
2.1	Participation incentives	76%	4.16	0.946	The teacher's efforts to engage students in active learning are effective.
2.2	Presentation and problem solving	74%	4	0.98	of students' performance in presenting and problem-solving.
2.3	Use of local examples	74%	4.088	1.03	has tried to bring learning to life by using local contexts.
2.4	Promoting creativity	71.20%	3.996	1.056	Efforts to increase creative thinking in students need some improvement .
2.5	Developing ideas related to self-employment	70%	3.76	0.971	Less positive rating compared to other indicators on encouraging self-employment thinking.
3.1	Clear teaching	**78%**	**4.02**	**1.049**	The teacher has maintained clarity in explaining the subject matter.
3.2	ICT equipment Use	**80%**	**4.08**	**0.913**	Through the use of ICT Modern and effective teaching.
3.3	Reference	**78%**	**4.036**	**0.941**	of study materials has made teaching well-

	material availability				organized.
3.4	Homework and term papers	**76%**	**3.988**	**1.018**	Active learning through assignments and term papers.
3.5	Fair assessment	**82%**	**4.136**	**0.928**	Maintain fairness in the evaluation process.
4.1	Participation incentives	**88%**	**4.208**	**0.856**	The teacher tries to make the class an active participant.
4.2	Poor student support	**56%**	**3.668**	**1.015**	Positive evaluation below expected level , improvement needed.
4.3	Inspirational role	**86%**	**4.468**	**0.825**	students' enthusiasm towards the goal.
4.4	Availability outside of class	**66%**	**3.8**	**0.938**	A sign that outside of class support is not enough.
4.5	Respectful behavior	**83%**	**4.184**	**0.833**	The teacher has maintained respectful behavior with the students.

Recommendations

1. **Improving support for weak students** – Teachers should provide additional guidance and assistance to students who face academic difficulties to enhance their learning outcomes.
2. **Increasing availability outside the classroom** – Ensure that teachers are accessible to students beyond class hours for academic support, consultation, and guidance.
3. **Strengthening self-employment education** – Integrate entrepreneurial thinking and self-employment practices into the curriculum to encourage students' innovative and independent work skills.
4. **Increase creative practice** – Include activities that foster creative and critical thinking in the classroom to develop students' problem-solving and analytical skills.
5. **Regular use of local examples** – Utilize local contexts and examples in teaching to make learning more relevant and relatable for students.
6. **Maximize use of ICT tools** – Continue and enhance the effective use of digital teaching media, online resources, and educational technology in classroom instruction.

7. **Improvements in homework and term papers** – Design assignments, term papers, and quizzes that actively engage students and reinforce learning objectives.
8. **Discipline maintenance strategy** – Review and revise classroom management strategies to maintain discipline while creating a positive learning environment.
9. **Continuity of fair assessment** – Ensure assessments and grading are conducted fairly and consistently, supporting student learning while maintaining evaluation integrity.
10. **Strengthen the motivational role** – Employ strategies that inspire and motivate students toward achieving academic goals and increase their engagement in the learning process.

References

Benton, S. L., & Cashin, W. E. (2012). *Student ratings of teaching: A summary of research and literature.* IDEA Paper, 50.

Kelic, T., Johnson, L. M., & Reyes, P. (2025). *Impact of institutional support services on student satisfaction and engagement.* Journal of College Student Development.

Lee, J., & Chang, K. (2025). *Transparency in student satisfaction reporting.* Journal of College Teaching.

Lund, B. D., Warren, S. J., & Teel, Z. A. (2026). *Measuring university students' satisfaction with traditional search engines and generative AI tools as information*

Malik, R., & Suri, A. (2025). *Emotional engagement and student satisfaction.* Journal of Educational Psychology.

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2022). *Developing an online learner satisfaction framework in higher education through a systematic review of research.* International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 19.

Mathur, G., Nathani, N., Chauhan, A. S., Kushwah, S. V., & Quttainah, M. A. (2024). *Students' satisfaction and learning: Assessment of teaching–learning process in knowledge organization.* Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services, 14(1), 1–8.

Ramos, G., Chen, L., & Smith, T. (2025). *Class size effects on student satisfaction reliability.* Education Research Insights.

Singh, A., & Verma, P. (2025). *Using analytics for student evaluations.* Journal of Educational Data Analysis.

Annexes

Annex -1

सुदूरपश्चिम विश्वविद्यालय

दुर्गालक्ष्मी बहुमुखी क्याम्पस

गोदावरी २, कैलाली

विद्यार्थी सन्तुष्टि सर्वेक्षण फाराम

प्रस्तुत फाराम शिक्षण सिकाइ क्रियाकलापका क्रममा शिक्षकको कक्षा व्यवस्थापन, नियमितता, अनुशासन, सिर्जनात्मकता, प्रभावकारिता आदि जस्ता विविध पक्षहरु पहिचान गर्न विद्यार्थीहरुको सल्लाह सुझाव तथा प्रतिक्रिया लिने प्रयोजनका लागि तयार पारिएको हो।

उद्देश्य

i. यो फाराम क्याम्पसको पठनपाठन क्रियाकलाप सम्वन्धी विद्यार्थीहरुको अभिमत बुझ्ने प्रयोजनका लागि तयार पारिएको हो।

ii. यसमा समावेश गरिने विद्यार्थीका सरसल्लाह र प्रतिक्रियाले क्याम्पसको शैक्षिक गुणस्तर अभिवृद्धि गर्न सहयोग पुग्नेछ।

iii. यो फाराम विद्यार्थीहरुले मात्र भर्नु पर्नेछ।

iv. यस फाराममा आफ्नो नाम र रोल नम्बर लेख्नुपर्ने छैन।

v. विद्यार्थीले प्रदान गर्नुभएका सूचना गोप्य राखिनेछ।

शिक्षकको नाम थर: .....

विभाग: ..... **विषय कोड:** .....

सेमेष्टर: ..... **सेमेस्टर:**.....

तल दिइएको लाइकेर्ट मापन (Likert Rating Scale) प्रयोग गरी आफ्नो विचारलाई सर्वोत्तम रूपमा अभिव्यक्त गर्ने उत्तरमा (√) चिन्ह लगाउनुहोस्।

	(5-पूर्ण रूपमा सहमत, 4-सहमत, 3-सामान्य, 2-असहमत, 1-पूर्ण रूपमा असहमत,)					
	शिर्षकहरू	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1	**सेक्सन १: शिक्षण तथा कोर्स व्यवस्थापन**					
1.1	शिक्षकले योजना अनुसार समयमा कोर्स सामग्री पूरा गर्नुहुन्छ।					
1.2	शिक्षक समयपालक, नियमित, र समय व्यवस्थापनमा प्रभावकारी हुनुहुन्छ।					

1.3	शिक्षकले राम्रोसँग तयारी गरेर पढाउनुहुन्छ र शिक्षण योजना/पाठ्यक्रम पालना गर्नुहुन्छ।					
1.4	कक्षामा नियम र अनुशासन प्रभावकारी रूपमा पालन गरिन्छ।					
2	**सेक्सन २: व्यावहारिक तथा सहभागात्मक शिक्षा**					
2.1	शिक्षकले कक्षा कार्य, समूह छलफल, र विद्यार्थी सहभागिता प्रोत्साहित गर्नुहुन्छ।					
2.2	प्रस्तुतीकरण, केस स्टडी, र समस्या समाधान गतिविधिहरू गराइन्छ।					
2.3	सामुदायिक भ्रमण, वास्तविक जीवनका उदाहरण, तथा फिल्ड–आधारित सिकाइ समावेश गरिन्छ।					
2.4	कक्षामा नवीनता, सिर्जनात्मकता, र आलोचनात्मक सोच प्रोत्साहित गरिन्छ।					
2.5	शिक्षकले स्व–रोजगारसम्बन्धी विचार विकास गर्न विद्यार्थीलाई सहयोग गर्नुहुन्छ।					
3	**सेक्सन ३: शिक्षण विधि तथा ICT प्रयोग**					
3.1	शिक्षकले वास्तविक जीवनका उदाहरण तथा विभिन्न विधिबाट स्पष्ट रूपमा शिक्षण गर्नुहुन्छ।					
3.2	ICT उपकरण (जस्तै: मल्टिमिडिया, भिडियो, अनलाइन प्लेटफर्म) प्रभावकारी रूपमा प्रयोग गरिन्छ।					
3.3	ह्यान्डआउट, स्लाइड, तथा सन्दर्भ सामग्री उपलब्ध गराइन्छ।					
3.4	गृहकार्य, टर्म पेपर, र क्विज अर्थपूर्ण रूपमा प्रयोग गरिन्छ।					
3.5	मूल्यांकन निष्पक्ष, समयमा, र सिकाइलाई सहयोग गर्ने तरिकाले गरिन्छ।					
4	**सेक्सन ४: प्रेरणा तथा विद्यार्थी सहयोग**					
4.1	शिक्षकले प्रश्न गर्न तथा सक्रिय रूपमा सहभागिता जनाउन विद्यार्थीलाई प्रोत्साहित गर्नुहुन्छ।					
4.2	कमजोर वा संघर्ष गरिरहेका विद्यार्थीलाई अतिरिक्त सहयोग प्रदान गरिन्छ।					
4.3	शिक्षकले विद्यार्थीलाई सिक्न, बढ्न, र सिर्जनात्मक बन्न प्रेरित गर्नुहुन्छ।					
4.4	शिक्षक कक्षा बाहिर पनि शैक्षिक सहयोगका लागि उपलब्ध हुनुहुन्छ।					

4.5	शिक्षकले सम्मानजनक व्यवहार गर्नुहुन्छ र सकारात्मक सिकाइ वातावरण प्रवर्द्धन गर्नुहुन्छ।					

शिक्षकका लागि टिप्पणी/सुझाव.....