

**A Report on Stakeholders 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 Stakeholders 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 stakeholders 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 focused on assessing the satisfaction levels of various stakeholders (parents, teachers, and employers) at Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus. A total of 50 respondents were included in the survey, of which 80% were male and 20% female. The majority of participants were parents (64%), followed by teachers (20%) and employers (16%). This composition gives greater weight to parental perspectives while employer representation is comparatively low.

Based on the Likert scale analysis, stakeholders expressed high satisfaction with campus leadership and transparency in decision-making. Eighty percent of respondents were satisfied with campus leadership (Mean=4.3, SD=0.78), and 90% were satisfied with the transparency of decision-making processes (Mean=4.3, SD=0.64). However, stakeholder participation in governance was perceived as weak (Mean=2.86, SD=0.9).

Stakeholders were generally satisfied with academic programs and teaching-learning processes, with 74–80% expressing positive feedback. However, the employment orientation of the curriculum received lower satisfaction (Mean=3.18, SD=1.22), indicating the need for improvement. Faculty qualifications, professional development, and teacher-student relationships received high satisfaction (Mean=3.98–4.4).

Regarding student support and skill development, stakeholders expressed moderate to high satisfaction. Graduates' employability received 86% positive feedback. Infrastructure, digital resources, and campus safety were also rated highly (Mean=4.28–4.36). Community engagement and employability initiatives were moderately to highly<sup>a</sup> satisfactory (68–80% positive responses).

Stakeholders perceived the campus positively regarding continuous improvement and overall performance, with positive responses ranging from 80–90% (Mean=3.9–4.3). The study indicates that the campus performs well in leadership, academic quality, infrastructure, and continuous improvement. However, employment-oriented curriculum, student counseling, and stakeholder participation need further enhancement.



## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Objectives.....	2
Limitations.....	2
Chapter 2 Literature Review.....	3
Chapter 3: Research Methodology.....	6
Chapter 4: Data Presentation and Analysis.....	8
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations.....	18
Reference.....	19
Annexes.....	20





## Chapter 1: Introduction

### Background

A stakeholder satisfaction survey is an important tool for assessing the perception of key participants in an educational institution regarding its functioning, services, and academic environment. This survey was conducted at Durgalaxmi multiple campus, affiliated with Sudurpashchim University, to gather insights from parents, teachers, and employers regarding various aspects of campus operations and academic programs.

The survey included a total of 50 respondents, with 40 males (80%) and 10 females (20%), highlighting a higher participation of male stakeholders. Stakeholder composition consisted of 32 parents (64%), 10 teachers (20%), and 8 employers (16%), showing that parental feedback was dominant, supplemented by academic insights from teachers and external employability feedback from employers.

The survey examined several dimensions: Governance & Leadership, Academic Programs & Teaching–Learning, Faculty & Human Resource Management, Students Support & Development, Infrastructure & Learning Resources, Community Engagement & Employability, and Continuous Improvement & Overall Satisfaction. Responses were collected using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Dissatisfied, 5 = Strongly Satisfied).

Analysis of the data reveals stakeholders' positive perception of leadership effectiveness, teaching quality, faculty competence, student skill development, and infrastructure adequacy. However, areas such as stakeholder participation in governance, library/ICT resources, and student counseling systems require improvement. Overall, the study provides actionable insights for enhancing academic quality, student support, infrastructure, and community engagement at the campus. By considering these findings, the campus can strengthen decision-making, promote employment-oriented education, and ensure inclusive and participatory governance.

### Statement of the Problem

Educational institutions are increasingly accountable to multiple stakeholders, including parents, teachers, and employers, for their performance in delivering quality education, effective governance, and relevant skills to students. At Durgalaxmi multiple campus, there is limited systematic evidence about how stakeholders perceive the campus performance in these areas. Previous anecdotal feedback suggests a gap between stakeholder expectations and institutional delivery, particularly regarding stakeholder participation, student support systems, and employment-focused curriculum alignment.

This study aims to identify the satisfaction levels of various stakeholders concerning:



- Campus governance and transparency in decision-making.
- Quality and employment orientation of academic programs.
- Faculty qualifications, professional development, and teacher–student interactions.
- Student support, skill development, and employability outcomes.
- Adequacy of infrastructure, digital resources, and safe academic environments.
- Community engagement and continuous improvement practices.

The problem lies in understanding whether stakeholders perceive the campus as meeting their expectations, and in identifying areas that require institutional improvement. By systematically assessing these dimensions, the campus can bridge gaps in quality assurance, optimize teaching and learning processes, and enhance stakeholder satisfaction, thereby contributing to sustainable academic growth and improved graduate employability.

#### **Objectives**

1. To measure the satisfaction level of campus stakeholders regarding governance, leadership, and decision-making processes within a defined time frame.
2. To evaluate stakeholders' perceptions of academic programs, teaching–learning effectiveness, and curriculum employment orientation for quality enhancement.
3. To assess faculty qualifications, professional development, and teacher–student relationships to identify areas for academic and human resource improvement.
4. To determine the adequacy of student support, skill development initiatives, and graduates' employability to strengthen student-centered services.
5. To examine infrastructure, digital resources, community engagement, and continuous improvement practices to enhance overall campus satisfaction.

#### **Limitations**

1. The survey included only 50 respondents, which may limit the generalizability of findings across all stakeholders.
2. The study relies on self-reported perceptions, which may introduce subjective bias.
3. The survey focused on specific dimensions of campus operations and did not cover other areas such as financial management, alumni engagement, or extracurricular activities.



## Chapter 2 Literature Review

Recent studies on higher education quality consistently highlights stakeholder satisfaction as a key indicator of institutional effectiveness. Studies across diverse contexts show that perceptions of students, faculty, parents, administrators, and employers provide valuable evidence for improving governance, teaching, curriculum, infrastructure, and support services. Researchers commonly use structured surveys, often with Likert-scale measures, to capture these perspectives and generate data that inform planning, policy decisions, and resource allocation. The literature also identifies core determinants of satisfaction such as teaching competence, professional development opportunities, administrative transparency, campus facilities, and career support. Taken together, prior research establishes that systematic, multi-stakeholder feedback is essential for evaluating campus performance and guiding continuous institutional improvement, forming a strong foundation for the present investigation.

Pan, F., Liu, L., & Wang, Z. (2022). This study developed a validated stakeholder satisfaction scale to assess student, faculty, and staff perspectives in a Chinese university. The authors emphasized measuring satisfaction across governance, teaching, infrastructure, and community engagement. Their results highlighted how stakeholder feedback can guide institutional quality improvement. They also used a Likert scale similar to the current study to capture satisfaction levels. This study supports using systematic surveys to strengthen decision-making in campus management.

Kanwar, A., & Sanjeeva, M. (2022). Kanwar and Sanjeeva examined how student satisfaction surveys are essential tools for institutional quality enhancement. They highlighted the importance of incorporating feedback from multiple stakeholders, including students, teachers, and administrators. Their study revealed that satisfaction data can guide curriculum design, resource allocation, and teaching improvement. This research shows that systematic assessment of stakeholder satisfaction leads to better planning and service delivery in universities. Their approach aligns closely with the methodology used in the current campus survey.

Singh, A., & Singla, L. (2021). Singh and Singla investigated the satisfaction of students, parents, and other stakeholders in management education. They reported that stakeholder satisfaction is influenced by faculty competence, infrastructure, curriculum relevance, and administrative transparency. The study also emphasized the importance of engaging parents and employers for holistic evaluation. Results indicated that incorporating



multi-stakeholder feedback can improve the strategic planning of campuses. This study mirrors the current research context, where parents, teachers, and employers are surveyed.

Zulfikar, M. U. S., Padlee, S. F., & Mohamed, W. N. (2020). The authors conducted an empirical study to identify key determinants of student satisfaction in Pakistani higher education institutions. They found that teaching quality, curriculum relevance, campus resources, and career services strongly influenced satisfaction levels. The study demonstrated the use of quantitative surveys and Likert-scale items to measure perceptions. Findings support the idea that universities should address both academic and infrastructural needs of students. This work strengthens the theoretical basis for analyzing satisfaction in the current campus study.

Baniya, K. B. (2025). Baniya analyzed teachers' satisfaction with their teaching profession in a community campus context. The study revealed that faculty competence, professional development, and administrative support are major determinants of satisfaction. He emphasized the importance of teachers' perspectives in evaluating institutional performance. This research underlines that faculty satisfaction directly impacts student outcomes and campus quality. The findings justify including faculty evaluation in stakeholder satisfaction surveys.

Khanal, D. (2022). Khanal explored stakeholders' perceptions of factors influencing teacher professional development. He reported that stakeholders often observe gaps in training, mentorship, and career growth opportunities. The study highlights the importance of professional development in stakeholder satisfaction. It provides evidence that improving teacher skills can enhance overall academic quality. These findings are relevant for assessing faculty and human resource management in the current campus survey.

Ghimire, स. S. (2023). Ghimire examined teachers' satisfaction and its impact on academic quality. Results indicated that effective teacher-student relationships, administrative support, and professional recognition improve satisfaction levels. The study emphasizes measuring both faculty and student perspectives to understand campus quality. It supports the inclusion of teaching-learning and faculty satisfaction indicators in stakeholder surveys. The research provides Nepal-specific evidence relevant to the current study.

Dhakal, K. R., Sherpa, D., & Ghimire, S. (2024). This study explored teaching-learning effectiveness in Nepali campuses, with focus on stakeholder feedback. Authors highlighted that stakeholder perceptions are crucial for improving curriculum, pedagogy, and student support. Their findings show that regular assessment of student satisfaction informs



policy and teaching practices. It supports the methodology of using Likert-scale surveys to capture multi-dimensional satisfaction. This research aligns with the current study's emphasis on teaching-learning and student support evaluation.

Hidayatullah et al. (2024). developed a stakeholder satisfaction system model to evaluate service and education quality in higher education. Their model incorporated academic programs, faculty, infrastructure, employability, and continuous improvement. The study highlights the importance of systematic measurement of stakeholder satisfaction for institutional development. Their findings demonstrate that regular surveys can enhance policy-making, curriculum development, and campus management strategies. This provides a clear framework for applying a similar survey methodology in the current campus study.

In sum, the reviewed studies consistently show that stakeholder satisfaction is a key indicator of institutional quality and effectiveness in higher education. Across different contexts, findings confirm that factors such as teaching quality, curriculum relevance, infrastructure, professional development, and administrative support strongly influence satisfaction levels. The literature also highlights the value of systematic, multi-stakeholder surveys, often using Likert-scale instruments, to generate reliable data for planning, policy improvement, and resource management. Taken together, these insights provide a solid conceptual and methodological foundation for the present study, supporting its focus on comprehensive stakeholder feedback as a basis for campus quality enhancement.



## Chapter 3: Research Methodology

### Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey design within a quantitative research framework. The design was selected because it allows systematic collection and analysis of numerical data to describe stakeholders' perceptions of campus performance. A descriptive approach is appropriate for studies that aim to measure opinions, attitudes, and levels of satisfaction without manipulating variables. It enabled the researcher to obtain a clear picture of how different stakeholder groups evaluate various aspects of campus functioning and quality.

### Population and Sample

The target population comprised key stakeholders associated with the campus, specifically parents, teachers, and employers who have direct or indirect involvement with academic and institutional activities. These groups were chosen because they represent important external and internal perspectives on campus effectiveness. From this population, a sample of 50 stakeholders was selected using convenience sampling. This technique was adopted due to accessibility and time considerations, allowing the researcher to gather data from respondents who were readily available and willing to participate. Although non-probability based, the sample provided diverse viewpoints sufficient for descriptive analysis.

### Data Collection Tools

Data were collected through a structured questionnaire designed to measure stakeholder satisfaction across multiple institutional dimensions. The instrument consisted of closed-ended items rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Dissatisfied) to 5 (Strongly Satisfied). The questionnaire covered seven major dimensions of campus performance:

1. Governance and Leadership
2. Academic Programs and Teaching-Learning
3. Faculty and Human Resource Management
4. Student Support and Development
5. Infrastructure and Learning Resources
6. Community Engagement and Employability
7. Continuous Improvement and Overall Satisfaction

Each dimension included several indicators to ensure comprehensive assessment. The structured format ensured uniformity of responses, facilitated quantitative analysis, and minimized ambiguity in interpretation.



### **Data Collection Procedure**

The questionnaire was administered directly to respondents after explaining the purpose of the study and assuring confidentiality. Participants were requested to provide honest responses based on their experiences and perceptions. Completed questionnaires were checked for completeness before data entry.

### **Data Analysis**

Collected data were coded and analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques. Frequency counts and percentages were used to summarize response patterns, while mean and standard deviation were calculated to determine the overall level and variability of satisfaction for each item and dimension. Results were presented in tables and charts to enhance clarity and facilitate comparison across indicators. Each dimension was interpreted critically by examining central tendency values and distribution patterns, allowing the researcher to identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas requiring improvement within the campus.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the academic purpose of the study. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout data handling and reporting to ensure ethical research practice.



## Chapter 4: Data Presentation and Analysis

### Analysis of Sex Distribution

Sex	Male	Female	Total
	40	10	50

The table shows that out of a total of 50 respondents, 40 (80%) are male and 10 (20%) are female. This indicates that male respondents form the majority of the sample, while female participation is comparatively lower. The gender imbalance may influence the overall findings of the study, as the opinions are largely represented by male stakeholders.

### Analysis of Stakeholder Types

Stakeholder	Types		
	Parent	Teacher	Employer
	32	10	8

The table shows the distribution of stakeholders involved in the survey. Out of a total of 50 respondents, 32 (64%) are parents, 10 (20%) are teachers, and 8 (16%) are employers. The data indicates that parents constitute the majority of stakeholders, suggesting that their perspectives play a dominant role in the survey findings. Teachers represent a moderate proportion, contributing professional and academic insights, while employers form the smallest group, providing external feedback related to graduate performance and employability. Overall, the stakeholder composition reflects a stronger emphasis on parental feedback, with comparatively less representation from employers.

### Relationship Duration on Campus by Gender

Relationship in Campus in year	Male	Female	Total
Below 1 year	5	2	7
2 – 3 years	10	4	14
Above 4 years	25	4	29
<b>Total</b>	40	10	50

The table shows that out of 50 respondents (40 males and 10 females), the majority, 29 students (58%), have relationships lasting above 4 years. Meanwhile, 14 students (28%) have relationships of 2–3 years, and only 7 students (14%) have relationships below 1 year. Male respondents are dominant in all categories. Overall, the data indicates that long-term relationships are more common on campus.



**Measurement Scale:** 5 = Strongly Satisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Dissatisfied, 1 = Strongly Dissatisfied. This table presents stakeholders' satisfaction levels regarding **Governance & Leadership** of the campus based on the Likert Scale.

**Governance & Leadership)**

S.N.	A. Governance & Leadership	5 Strongly satisfied %	4 Satisfied %	3 Normal %	2 Strongly dissatisfaction %	1 Dissatisfaction %	Total %	Mean	Standard Deviation
i.	Campus Leadership is Effective	50	30	20	0	0	100	4.3	0.78
ii.	Decision-Making Process is Transparent	40	50	10	0	0	100	4.3	0.64
iii.	Stakeholder Participation is Ensured	6	14	50	20	10	100	2.86	0.9

**i. Campus Leadership is Effective:** A majority of respondents expressed positive satisfaction with campus leadership. Specifically, 50% strongly satisfied and 30% satisfied, making a total of 80% positive responses. Meanwhile, 20% remained Normal, and no respondents expressed dissatisfaction. The Mean score is 4.3, which indicates a high level of satisfaction, and the Standard Deviation (SD) is 0.78, suggesting relatively low variation in responses. This implies that most stakeholders consistently perceive the campus leadership as effective and capable.

**ii. Decision-Making Process is Transparent:** Stakeholders showed strong agreement regarding transparency in decision-making. 40% strongly satisfied and 50% satisfied, resulting in 90% positive responses, while only 10% were neutral, and none expressed dissatisfaction. The Mean score of 4.3 further confirms high satisfaction, and the **SD of 0.64** indicates very low variability among responses. This suggests strong consensus that the campus maintains transparency in its governance processes.

**iii. Stakeholder Participation is Ensured:** In contrast, responses regarding stakeholder participation show a different trend. Only 6% strongly satisfied and 14% satisfied (total 20%



positive), while 50% remained neutral, 20% dissatisfied, and 10% strongly dissatisfied. The Mean score is 2.86, which is below the satisfaction level (below 3), indicating comparatively low satisfaction. The SD of 0.9 shows moderate variation in opinions. This suggests that many stakeholders feel their participation in governance and leadership processes is limited or insufficient.

**Overall Interpretation:** The overall findings indicate that stakeholders are highly satisfied with leadership effectiveness and transparency in decision-making, as reflected by high mean scores (4.3) and low standard deviations. However, stakeholder participation in governance appears to be a weak area, with a lower mean (2.86) and noticeable dissatisfaction. Therefore, while governance and leadership are perceived as strong and transparent, the campus should focus on enhancing inclusive participation mechanisms to improve overall stakeholder satisfaction.

**Academic Programs & Teaching–Learning:** This table presents stakeholders' satisfaction regarding **Academic Programs & Teaching–Learning** based on the Likert scale.

B. Academic Programs & Teaching–Learning		5 Strongly	4 Satisfied %	3 Normal %	2 Strongly	1 Dissatisfaction	Total %	Mean	Standard
iv	Academic Programs are Quality-Oriented	30	50	10	10	0	100	3.9	0.8
v	Curriculum is Employment-Oriented	14	40	10	22	14	100	3.1	1.2
vi	Teaching–Learning Process is Effective	20	54	16	10	0	100	3.7	0.9

In the above table iv. **Academic Programs are Quality-Oriented** A large proportion of respondents expressed satisfaction with the quality of academic programs. 30% strongly satisfied and 50% satisfied, resulting in 80% positive responses. Meanwhile, 10% were neutral and 10% dissatisfied, with no strong dissatisfaction reported. The Mean score of 3.9 indicates a generally high level of satisfaction. The Standard Deviation (SD) of 0.83 suggests relatively low variation in responses, meaning most stakeholders share a similar positive perception regarding program quality.

**v. Curriculum is Employment-Oriented:** Responses regarding the employment orientation of the curriculum are comparatively moderate. Only 14% strongly satisfied and 40% satisfied



(total 54% positive responses), while 10% were neutral, 22% dissatisfied, and 14% strongly dissatisfied. The Mean score of 3.18 indicates moderate satisfaction, slightly above the neutral point. The SD of 1.22 is relatively high, showing greater variability in responses. This suggests mixed opinions among stakeholders and highlights that the employment relevance of the curriculum requires further improvement.

**vi. Teaching–Learning Process is Effective:** For the effectiveness of the teaching–learning process, 20% strongly satisfied and 54% satisfied, making 74% positive responses. Additionally, 16% were neutral and 10% dissatisfied, with no strong dissatisfaction reported. The Mean score of 3.74 reflects a good level of satisfaction, and the SD of 0.92 indicates moderate consistency in responses. This shows that most stakeholders believe the teaching–learning process is effective, although some improvements can still be made.

**Overall Interpretation:** The analysis indicates that stakeholders are generally satisfied with the quality of academic programs and the effectiveness of teaching–learning processes, as reflected by mean scores close to 4. However, the employment-oriented nature of the curriculum received comparatively lower ratings and higher variability, suggesting the need for curriculum revision to better align with job market demands.

Overall, Academic Programs & Teaching–Learning are positively rated, but strengthening career-focused components could further enhance stakeholder satisfaction.

**Faculty & Human Resource Management:** This table presents stakeholders' satisfaction regarding Faculty & Human Resource Management.

**C. Faculty & Human Resource Management**

	5 Strongly satisfied %	4 Satisfied %	3 Normal %	2 Strongly dissatisfaction %	1 Dissatisfaction %	Total %	Mean	Standard Deviation
vii Teachers' Qualification and Competence are Satisfactory	36	50	14	0	0	100	4.22	0.68
viii Attention is Given to Professional Development of Teachers:	30	44	20	6	0	100	3.98	0.89
ix Teacher–Student Relationship is Positive	50	40	10	0	0	100	4.4	0.67



**vii. Teachers' Qualification and Competence are Satisfactory:** A strong majority of respondents expressed positive satisfaction with teachers' qualifications and competence. 36% strongly satisfied and 50% satisfied, resulting in 86% positive responses, while 14% remained neutral and none expressed dissatisfaction. The Mean score of 4.22 indicates a high level of satisfaction, and the Standard Deviation (SD) of 0.68 shows low variability in responses. This suggests that stakeholders generally have a consistent and favorable perception of teachers' professional competence.

**viii. Attention is Given to Professional Development of Teachers:** Regarding professional development, 30% strongly satisfied and 44% satisfied, making 74% positive responses. Meanwhile, 20% were neutral and 6% dissatisfied, with no strong dissatisfaction reported. The Mean score of 3.98 reflects a good level of satisfaction, though slightly lower than other indicators in this category. The SD of 0.89 indicates moderate variation in responses. This suggests that while professional development efforts are recognized, there may still be room for further strengthening.

**ix. Teacher-Student Relationship is Positive:** This indicator received the highest satisfaction level in this section. 50% strongly satisfied and 40% satisfied, resulting in 90% positive responses, while 10% were neutral and none were dissatisfied. The Mean score of 4.4 is the highest among the three indicators, showing very strong satisfaction. The SD of 0.67 indicates high consistency in responses. This demonstrates that stakeholders perceive teacher-student relationships as highly positive and supportive.

**Overall Interpretation:** The overall findings show that Faculty & Human Resource Management is highly satisfactory. Mean scores range from 3.98 to 4.4, indicating strong positive perceptions. The relatively low standard deviations (0.67-0.89) suggest consistent agreement among respondents.

Among the indicators, teacher-student relationships received the highest satisfaction, followed by teacher competence, while professional development showed slightly lower but still positive ratings. Overall, this dimension reflects a strong academic and human resource environment within the campus.



**Students Support & Development:** This table presents stakeholders' satisfaction regarding **Students Support & Development**.

D. Students Support & Development		Strongly dissatisfaction %					Total %	Mean	Standard Deviation
		5 Strongly satisfied %	4 Satisfied %	3 Normal %	2 Strongly dissatisfaction %	1 Dissatisfaction %			
x	Student Counseling and Support System is Effective	32	34	14	16	4	100	3.74	1.07
xi	Campus Contributes to Students' Skill Development	36	46	10	4	4	100	4.06	0.94
xii	Graduates are Competent for Employment	40	46	10	6	0	100	4.2	0.83

In the above table, **x. Student Counseling and Support System is Effective:** A total of 32% strongly satisfied and 34% satisfied, resulting in 66% positive responses. Meanwhile, 14% were neutral, 16% dissatisfied, and 4% strongly dissatisfied. The Mean score is 3.74, which indicates moderate to good satisfaction. However, the Standard Deviation (SD) of 1.07 is relatively high, suggesting greater variation in responses. This implies that while many stakeholders view the counseling and support system positively, a noticeable proportion feel improvements are needed.

**xi. Campus Contributes to Students' Skill Development:** This indicator received strong positive feedback. 36% strongly satisfied and 46% satisfied, making a total of 82% positive responses. Only 10% were neutral, and 8% expressed dissatisfaction. The Mean score of 4.06 indicates a high level of satisfaction, and the SD of 0.94 shows moderate consistency in responses. This suggests that stakeholders recognize the campus's meaningful contribution to students' skill enhancement.

**xii. Graduates are Competent for Employment:** The highest satisfaction in this category is observed here. 40% strongly satisfied and 46% satisfied, resulting in 86% positive responses, while 10% were neutral and only 6% dissatisfied. The Mean score of 4.2 reflects strong satisfaction, and the SD of 0.83 indicates relatively low variation. This demonstrates that stakeholders believe graduates are well-prepared and competent for employment.



**Overall Interpretation:** The overall findings indicate positive perceptions regarding Students Support & Development, with mean scores ranging from 3.74 to 4.2. Stakeholders are particularly satisfied with graduates' employability and skill development initiatives. However, the student counseling and support system received comparatively lower ratings and higher variability, suggesting the need for further strengthening in this area.

Overall, this dimension reflects a supportive academic environment, with room for improvement in counseling and personalized student assistance services.

**Infrastructure & Learning Resources**

E. Infrastructure & Learning Resources		5 Strongly satisfied %	4 Satisfied %	3 Normal %	2 Strongly dissatisfaction %	1 Dissatisfaction %	Total %	Mean	Standard Deviation
xiii	Campus Physical Infrastructure is Adequate	42	44	14	0	0	100	4.28	0.72
xiv	Library, ICT, and Digital Resources are Adequate	28	36	16	14	6	100	3.66	1.08
xv	Academic Environment is Safe and Friendly	40	56	4	0	0	100	4.36	0.56

This table presents stakeholders' satisfaction regarding Infrastructure & Learning Resources of the campus. **xiii. Campus Physical Infrastructure is Adequate:** A strong majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with the physical infrastructure. 42% strongly satisfied and 44% satisfied, resulting in 86% positive responses, while 14% were neutral and none expressed dissatisfaction. The Mean score of 4.28 indicates a high level of satisfaction, and the Standard Deviation (SD) of 0.72 shows low variability in responses. This suggests that stakeholders consistently perceive the campus infrastructure as sufficient and well-managed.

**xiv. Library, ICT, and Digital Resources are Adequate:** In this indicator, 28% strongly satisfied and 36% satisfied, making 64% positive responses. Meanwhile, 16% were neutral, 14% dissatisfied, and 6% strongly dissatisfied. The Mean score of 3.66 reflects moderate satisfaction, which is lower compared to other indicators in this category. The SD of 1.08 is relatively high, indicating noticeable variation in responses. This suggests mixed opinions



and highlights the need for improvement in library facilities, ICT, services, and digital resources.

xv. Academic Environment is Safe and Friendly: This indicator received the highest positive response in this section. 40% strongly satisfied and 56% satisfied, resulting in 96% positive responses, with only 4% neutral and no dissatisfaction reported.

The Mean score of 4.36 is the highest among the three indicators, indicating very strong satisfaction. The SD of 0.56 is the lowest, showing high consistency among respondents. This demonstrates that stakeholders strongly agree that the campus provides a safe and friendly academic environment.

**Overall Interpretation:** The findings show that stakeholders are highly satisfied with the physical infrastructure and especially the safe and friendly academic environment of the campus. However, library, ICT, and digital resources received comparatively lower ratings and higher variability, indicating an area that requires further enhancement.

Overall, the Infrastructure & Learning Resources dimension reflects strong institutional performance, with specific improvements needed in digital and library facilities to further increase stakeholder satisfaction.

**Community Engagement & Employability:** This table presents stakeholders' satisfaction regarding Community Engagement & Employability of the campus.

F. Community Engagement & Employability		Strongly dissatisfaction %					Total %	Mean	Standard Deviation
		5 Strongly satisfied %	4 Satisfied %	3 Normal %	2 Strongly dissatisfaction %	1 Dissatisfaction %			
xvi	Good Relationship Between Campus and Community/Industry	32	36	20	12	0	10	3.88	0.98
xvi	Graduates Meet Workplace Requirements:	20	60	12	6	2	10	3.9	0.88
							0		

In the above, **xvi. Good Relationship Between Campus and Community/Industry:** For the indicator of campus–community/industry relationship, 32% of respondents strongly satisfied and 36% satisfied, giving 68% positive responses. 20% were neutral, and 12% expressed dissatisfaction, with no respondents strongly dissatisfied. The Mean score of 3.88 reflects moderately high satisfaction. The SD of 0.98 indicates moderate variability in responses,



suggesting that while many stakeholders recognize good engagement, some perceive gaps in the campus' connection with the community or industry.

**xvii. Graduates Meet Workplace Requirements:** Regarding graduates' employability and alignment with workplace needs, 20% strongly satisfied and 60% satisfied, yielding 80% positive responses. 12% were neutral, and only 8% expressed dissatisfaction (6% dissatisfied, 2% strongly dissatisfied). The Mean score of 3.9 demonstrates a high level of satisfaction with graduates' employability. The SD of 0.88 shows relatively consistent perceptions among stakeholders. This suggests that the campus generally equips graduates with skills relevant to the labor market, though there is minor room for improvement.

**Overall Interpretation:** Stakeholders are moderately to highly satisfied with community engagement and employability initiatives. The strongest positive perception is regarding graduates' alignment with workplace needs, while the relationship with community/industry shows slightly lower satisfaction and higher variability.

This indicates that while the campus is effective in preparing employable graduates, enhancing collaborations with community and industry partners could further improve stakeholder satisfaction.

#### Continuous Improvement & Overall Satisfaction

G. Continuous Improvement & Overall Satisfaction		5 Strongly satisfied %	4 Satisfied %	3 Normal %	2 Strongly dissatisfaction %	1 Dissatisfaction %	Total %	Mean	Standard Deviation
xviii	Campus Focus on Continuous Improvement	40	50	10	0	0	100	3.9	0.88
xix	Overall Satisfaction with Campus Performance	20	60	16	4	0	100	4.3	0.67
xx	Recommendation to Others	24	58	14	4	0	100	3.96	0.86

This table reflects stakeholders' perceptions regarding Continuous Improvement and Overall Satisfaction at the campus.



**xviii. Campus Focus on Continuous Improvement:** For the indicator of campus attention to continuous improvement, 40% of respondents strongly satisfied and 50% satisfied, giving a total 90% positive responses. 10% were neutral, with no dissatisfaction reported. The Mean score of 3.9 indicates that stakeholders perceive the campus as actively engaged in improvement initiatives. The SD of 0.88 shows moderate consistency in opinions, suggesting most stakeholders agree that the campus emphasizes continual development.

**xix. Overall Satisfaction with Campus Performance:** Regarding overall satisfaction with campus performance, 20% strongly satisfied and 60% satisfied, giving 80% positive responses. 16% were neutral, and only 4% were dissatisfied, with none strongly dissatisfied. The Mean score of 4.3 indicates a high level of overall satisfaction. The SD of 0.67 suggests relatively uniform responses among stakeholders, showing strong confidence in the campus' overall functioning.

**xx. Recommendation to Others:** For stakeholders' willingness to recommend the campus, 24% strongly satisfied and 58% satisfied, yielding 82% positive responses. 14% were neutral and 4% dissatisfied, with no strong dissatisfaction. The Mean score of 3.96 indicates generally high satisfaction and confidence in recommending the campus. The SD of 0.86 shows moderate agreement among respondents.

**Overall Interpretation:** Stakeholders perceive the campus positively in terms of continuous improvement, overall performance, and recommendation to others. Positive responses range from 80% to 90%, and mean scores range from 3.9 to 4.3, indicating strong satisfaction. The relatively low standard deviations suggest most stakeholders share similar positive perceptions, reflecting trust in the campus' commitment to quality, improvement, and stakeholder engagement.



## Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

### Conclusions

The study concludes that Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus demonstrates effective leadership, transparent decision-making, positive teacher–student relationships, and adequate and safe infrastructure. Mean scores indicate a high level of overall stakeholder satisfaction. However, some areas require improvement. The employment orientation of the curriculum was moderate (Mean=3.18), student counseling and support systems were moderately satisfactory (Mean=3.74), and stakeholder participation in governance was low (Mean=2.86). This suggests that while the campus excels in leadership and infrastructure, improvements are needed in employment-focused education, student support systems, and participatory governance.

Overall, the study shows a positive impact on academic quality, leadership effectiveness, teaching–learning processes, and continuous improvement. Nevertheless, enhancing curriculum relevance to the job market, strengthening student support, and ensuring stakeholder participation could further improve skill development and employability outcomes.

### Recommendations

1. Strengthen student counseling and support systems.
2. Conduct regular professional development programs for faculty.
3. Increase stakeholder participation in governance and decision-making processes.
4. Improve ICT, library, and digital resources to create an effective learning environment.
5. Maintain a safe, welcoming, and inclusive academic environment.
6. Implement industry–campus collaboration programs for skill development.
7. Provide career guidance and employment-focused training to ensure graduate employability.
8. Introduce regular evaluation and feedback systems for continuous quality improvement.
9. Strengthen teacher–student relationships through structured and social programs.
10. Enhance collaboration with the community and industry to fulfill the campus's social responsibility.
11. Use focus groups, surveys, and stakeholder feedback regularly to monitor satisfaction and guide improvements.



## Reference

- Baniya, K. B. (2025). शिक्षण पेशाप्रति शिक्षक प्राध्यापकहरूको सन्तुष्टि. *Okhaldhunga Journal*, 2(3), 11–18.
- Dhakal, K. R., Sherpa, D., & Ghimire, S. (2024). माध्यमिक तहको नेपाली विषय शिक्षण सिकाइ प्रक्रिया. *Perspectives on Higher Education*, 14(1), 203–214.
- Ghimire, S. S. (2023). शिक्षण पेसामा सन्तुष्टि र शैक्षिक गुणस्तरको विश्लेषण. *विकासको निम्ति शिक्षा*, 25(1), 220–241.
- Hidayatullah, D., Munir, A., Sobandi, & Furqon, C. (2024). Development of a stakeholder satisfaction system model for service and education quality. *JTP – Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, 26(3), 1181–1192. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jtp.26.3.1181>
- Kanwar, A., & Sanjeeva, M. (2022). Student satisfaction survey: A key for quality improvement in the higher education institution. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 11, 27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-022-00202-8>
- Pan, F., Liu, L., & Wang, Z. (2022). The Chinese university stakeholder satisfaction survey: Developing a customer centered self assessment tool for higher education quality management. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1043417. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1043417>
- Singh, A., & Singla, L. (2021). Stakeholders satisfaction regarding service quality in higher management education. *International Journal of Management Studies*, X, 45–57.
- Zulfikar, M. U. S., Padlee, S. F., & Mohamed, W. N. (2020). Determinants of students' satisfaction in higher education institutions of Pakistan: An empirical investigation. *Studies of Applied Economics*, 38(2), 89–105.
- Khanal, D. (2022). शिक्षकको पेसागत विकासको प्रभावकहरूका सम्बन्धमा सरोकारवालाहरूको अवधारणा. *विकासको निम्ति शिक्षा*, 26(1), 107–118.



Annexes

Annex-1

Stakeholders Satisfaction Survey Form

सुदूरपश्चिम विश्वविद्यालय

दुर्गालक्ष्मी बहुमुखी क्याम्पस,

गोदावरी ०२ अत्तरीया, कैलाली

1. परिचय (Introduction)

यो फारम Quality Assurance Accreditation (QAA) संग मेल खाने गरी तयार गरिएको हो। यसको उद्देश्य क्याम्पसको शैक्षिक गुणस्तर, प्रशासनिक प्रभावकारिता, पूर्वाधार, विद्यार्थीको सीप तथा रोजगार बजारसंगको सम्बन्धबारे Stakeholders को सन्तुष्टि मापन गर्नु हो।

2. उत्तरदाताको प्रोफाइल (Stakeholder Profile)

1. Stakeholder को नाम:

2. Stakeholder को प्रकार:  अभिभावक (Parent)  शिक्षक (Teacher)  रोजगारदाता (Employer)

3. लिङ्ग:  पुरुष  महिला  अन्य

4. क्याम्पससँगको सम्बन्धको अवधि:  १ वर्ष  २-३ वर्ष  ४ वर्ष भन्दा बढी

5. सम्बन्धित कार्यक्रम/पद: \_\_\_\_\_

3. मापन स्केल (Measurement Scale): Likert Scale अनुसार: 1 = Strongly Dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied 3 = Neutral, 4 = Satisfied, 5 = Strongly Satisfied

क्र.सं.	A. प्रशासन र नेतृत्व (Governance & Leadership)	1	2	3	4	5
1	क्याम्पसको नेतृत्व प्रभावकारी छ					
2	निर्णय प्रक्रिया पारदर्शी छ					
3	Stakeholders को सहभागिता सुनिश्चित गरिएको छ					
<b>B. शैक्षिक कार्यक्रम र शिक्षण-सिकाइ</b>						
4	शैक्षिक कार्यक्रम गुणस्तरीय छन्					
5	पाठ्यक्रम रोजगारमुखी छन्					
6	शिक्षण-सिकाइ प्रक्रिया प्रभावकारी छ					
<b>C. संकाय र मानव संसाधन व्यवस्थापन (Faculty &amp; Human Resource Management)</b>						
7	शिक्षकहरूको योग्यता र दक्षता सन्तोषजनक छ					



8	शिक्षकहरूको पेशागत विकासमा ध्यान दिइन्छ								
9	शिक्षक-विद्यार्थी सम्बन्ध सकारात्मक छ								
<b>D. विद्यार्थी सहयोग र विकास (Students Support &amp; Development)</b>									
10	विद्यार्थी परामर्श तथा सहयोग प्रणाली प्रभावकारी छ								
11	विद्यार्थीको सीप विकासमा क्याम्पसको योगदान छ								
12	स्नातक विद्यार्थी रोजगारका लागि सक्षम छन्								
<b>E. पूर्वाधार र सिकाइ स्रोतहरू (Infrastructure &amp; Learning Resources)</b>									
13	क्याम्पसको भौतिक पूर्वाधार पर्याप्त छ								
14	पुस्तकालय, ICT र डिजिटल स्रोत पर्याप्त छन्								
15	शैक्षिक वातावरण सुरक्षित र मैत्रीपूर्ण छ								
<b>F. सामुदायिक संलग्नता र रोजगारी (Community Engagement &amp; Employability)</b>									
16	क्याम्पस र समाज/उद्योगबीच राम्रो सम्बन्ध छ								
17	स्नातकहरू कार्यस्थलको आवश्यकता अनुसार छन्								
<b>G. निरन्तर सुधार र समग्र सन्तुष्टि (Continuous Improvement &amp; Overall Satisfaction)</b>									
18	क्याम्पसले निरन्तर सुधारमा ध्यान दिएको छ								
19	म क्याम्पसको समग्र कार्यसम्पादनप्रति सन्तुष्ट छु								
20	म यो क्याम्पस राम्रो छ भनि अरूलाई सिफारिस गर्छु								

**4. खुला प्रश्न (Qualitative Feedback – QAA Requirement)**

1. क्याम्पसको सबैभन्दा सबल पक्ष हरू के के हुन्?

.....  
 .....

2. सुधार गर्नुपर्ने प्रमुख क्षेत्रहरू के-के हुन्?

.....  
 .....

3. QAA मापदण्ड अनुसार गुणस्तर सुधारका लागि तपाईंको सुझाव:

.....  
 .....



गोपनीयता र प्रयोग (Confidentiality & Use)

यो फारामबाट प्राप्त जानकारी Institutional Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) तथा शैक्षिक सुधारका लागि मात्र प्रयोग गरिनेछ।

