A Report on Self Evaluation and Reflection of Teachers 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 the Self Evaluation and Reflection of Teachers 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 teaching staff of Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus 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.

Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus
Attariya, Kailali

.....

Abstract

This study investigates the effectiveness of teaching practices, participatory learning, teaching methods including ICT integration, and student motivation and support in higher education. The research aims to compare teacher self-assessment with student perceptions to identify differences in classroom experiences and learning outcomes. Data were collected through structured questionnaires from both teachers and students, focusing on four major sections: Teaching and Course Management, Practical and Participatory Learning, Teaching Methods and ICT, and Motivation and Student Support. Descriptive statistics, including mean scores and standard deviations, were used to analyze the responses, while T-tests were employed to examine statistically significant differences between teacher self-evaluation and student satisfaction.

The findings indicate that teachers rate themselves highly across all four sections, particularly in time management, course completion, lesson planning, classroom discipline, and evaluation fairness. Students also provided positive ratings, though their scores were consistently lower than the teachers' self-assessments. In Section 1, Teaching and Course Management, teachers demonstrated confidence in completing the syllabus on time, maintaining punctuality, following the action plan, and sustaining classroom discipline, while students rated these aspects positively but slightly lower. Section 2, Practical and Participatory Learning, revealed that activities such as discussions, group work, case studies, and creativity-focused tasks were highly valued by teachers; students appreciated these methods but reported lower levels of perceived engagement and skill development. Section 3, Teaching Methods and ICT, showed that teachers effectively used diverse teaching methods, provided handouts and learning materials, and ensured fair evaluation. ICT integration received slightly lower student ratings, indicating variability in its accessibility or effectiveness. Section 4, Motivation and Student Support, demonstrated strong teacher commitment to inspiring students, supporting weaker learners, promoting inclusivity, being available beyond class hours, and enhancing morale and participation.

T-test results indicate statistically significant differences between teacher and student ratings in most indicators, particularly in classroom discipline, prepared teaching, creativity and critical thinking, and support for weaker students. These findings highlight the need for strategies to balance teacher self-perception with actual student experiences to enhance overall learning effectiveness. The study concludes that while teachers demonstrate strong professional practices, targeted interventions are required to strengthen participatory learning, ICT use, student motivation, and inclusivity. Based on the analysis, practical

recommendations include promoting active learning, increasing ICT accessibility, providing guidance to weaker students, fostering creativity and critical thinking, and implementing feedback mechanisms to reduce the perception gap between teachers and students. This research provides insights into teacher effectiveness, student engagement, and potential areas for educational improvement in higher education contexts.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

Quality teaching and effective learning are fundamental components of higher education, directly influencing student engagement, skill development, and academic outcomes. In contemporary educational settings, teachers are expected not only to deliver course content but also to adopt participatory teaching methods, integrate technology, and provide consistent motivation and support to students. The increasing emphasis on student-centered learning highlights the need for instructional strategies that foster creativity, critical thinking, collaboration, and practical skill development. Moreover, teachers' self-perception of their teaching practices may differ from the students' experiences, creating a potential gap in perceived effectiveness and learning outcomes. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for improving the overall quality of education and ensuring that teaching practices meet learners' expectations.

Teaching and course management form the backbone of effective education. Proper time management, adherence to course plans, punctuality, and maintaining discipline in the classroom are essential to create an organized and productive learning environment. Meanwhile, practical and participatory learning approaches, such as discussions, group activities, case studies, and community-based learning, actively engage students and allow them to apply theoretical knowledge in real-world contexts. Such methods not only enhance analytical and problem-solving skills but also encourage self-directed learning and promote motivation for self-employment and skill acquisition.

The integration of modern teaching methods and ICT tools has become increasingly important in higher education. ICT facilitates innovative teaching strategies, easy access to learning resources, interactive assessments, and effective communication between teachers and students. Simultaneously, ensuring fairness in evaluation, providing reference materials, and using diverse assessment methods are critical for building trust in the educational process and promoting academic growth.

In addition, student motivation and support play a central role in fostering a positive and inclusive learning environment. Teachers' efforts to inspire learners, support weak students, maintain inclusivity, and provide guidance beyond the classroom hours are pivotal for student engagement, participation, and overall morale. The alignment of teacher practices with student experiences ensures that the learning process is effective, equitable, and meaningful.

This study aims to investigate the perceptions of both teachers and students regarding teaching practices, participatory learning, ICT integration, and student support. By comparing teacher self-assessment with student feedback, the research identifies areas of strength, gaps, and opportunities for improvement. The findings are expected to provide insights that can inform policy, instructional strategies, and professional development, ultimately enhancing teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes in higher education.

Statement of the Problem

Quality teaching and effective learning are crucial factors in higher education, directly impacting students' academic success, skill development, and practical experience. The competency of teachers, course management, participatory learning, use of ICT, and student motivation and support collectively shape the overall learning experience. However, teachers often rate their own teaching practices very positively, which may differ from students' actual experiences. This gap between teacher self-assessment and student perception creates challenges in delivering an optimal and balanced learning environment.

In the area of course management, teachers rate themselves highly in completing the syllabus on time, maintaining punctuality, planning lessons effectively, and ensuring classroom discipline. Yet, students' perceptions of these same aspects are slightly lower, indicating that while teachers believe they are providing high-quality course management, students may not experience it to the same extent. Such discrepancies can lead to inconsistencies in students' learning outcomes, engagement, and satisfaction.

Similarly, in practical and participatory learning, teachers give high importance to discussions, presentations, group work, case studies, problem-solving exercises, and community-linked learning activities. However, students report slightly lower experiences in these areas. For example, although teachers perceive that they strongly encourage creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving, students' experiences do not always align fully with these self-assessments. This suggests that while participatory methods are implemented, the level of engagement and practical exposure for students may not be consistent across all activities.

The use of ICT and modern teaching methods also shows discrepancies. Teachers report frequent use of diverse teaching methods, ICT tools, handouts, learning materials, and fair assessments. While students acknowledge these efforts positively, their experiences are slightly less than the teachers' self-evaluation. This indicates that, although resources and methods are available, accessibility, familiarity, or integration may vary, affecting the overall effectiveness of ICT-supported learning.

In terms of student motivation and support, teachers rate themselves highly in inspiring students, supporting weak learners, creating an inclusive environment, being available outside the classroom, and boosting student morale and participation. Nevertheless, students' perceptions of these supports are comparatively lower, revealing gaps in how motivational and supportive efforts are experienced by learners. Such gaps may influence engagement, confidence, and the development of self-directed learning skills.

Overall, the main problem identified in this study is the gap between teacher self-assessment and student experiences across course management, participatory learning, teaching methods, ICT use, and student support. These discrepancies can affect student engagement, learning outcomes, skill development, and the overall quality of higher education. There is a need to identify the underlying causes of these gaps, strengthen participatory teaching methods, enhance ICT integration, and ensure that student support measures are consistently experienced by all learners. Closing this gap is essential to ensure a balanced, student-centered, and high-quality learning environment in higher education.

Research Questions

1. How do teachers perceive their effectiveness in managing courses, maintaining punctuality, and ensuring classroom discipline compared to students' experiences?
2. To what extent do participatory and practical learning methods, such as discussions, group work, case studies, and community-linked activities, align with students' perceptions of engagement and skill development?
3. How effectively are ICT tools, handouts, and diverse teaching methods implemented from both teacher and student perspectives?
4. What is the level of student motivation, support, and inclusivity provided by teachers, and how does it match with students' experiences?
5. What are the significant gaps between teacher self-assessment and student experiences in higher education, and what strategies can be recommended to improve alignment?

Objectives of the Study

Primary Objective:

To evaluate and analyze the effectiveness of teaching, learning methods, ICT usage, and student support in higher education, highlighting the gaps between teacher self-assessment and student experiences.

Specific Objectives:

1. To assess teachers' perceptions of course management, punctuality, lesson planning, and classroom discipline, and compare them with students' experiences.
2. To examine the effectiveness of participatory and practical learning methods, such as discussions, group work, case studies, and community-linked activities, from both teacher and student perspectives.
3. To evaluate the use of ICT tools, availability of handouts, and diverse teaching methods in enhancing learning outcomes, and identify areas for improvement.
4. To investigate the level of student motivation, support for weak learners, and the inclusivity of classroom environment as perceived by teachers and experienced by students.
5. To identify significant gaps between teacher self-assessment and student experiences and suggest strategies to improve alignment for better teaching and learning outcomes.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study is limited to a specific group of teachers and students within one institution or region, which may limit the generalizability of the findings.
2. It relies primarily on self-reported data from teachers and students, which may be influenced by personal biases and perceptions.
3. Quantitative methods such as questionnaires may not fully capture qualitative aspects like classroom interactions, mentorship, or informal learning support.
4. Statistical tools (mean, SD, T-tests) show differences but do not explain the underlying reasons behind teacher-student perception gaps.
5. Institutional factors, such as policies, infrastructure, and class size, may affect outcomes but are not fully explored in this study.
6. Time and resource constraints limited the sample size, reducing the scope for broader generalization.
7. The study does not include longitudinal observation, which could provide more comprehensive insights into teaching effectiveness, participatory learning, and ICT use over time.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In recent years, higher education has increasingly emphasized technology-enhanced and participatory learning approaches to improve student engagement, interaction, and skill development. Research on flipped classrooms and project-based learning has shown that such methods promote creativity, critical thinking, and self-directed learning, while also encouraging active participation (Baig & Yadegaridehkordi, 2023; Rochimah, Japar, & Solihatin, 2025). At the same time, studies on ICT integration highlight both its potential and its challenges: while digital tools can support collaborative learning, diverse teaching methods, and access to resources, their effectiveness depends heavily on teacher competence, adequate training, and institutional support (Hassan, 2022; Joshi, 2024; Shahi & Khadka, 2025; Aidoo, 2024; Idowu, 2025; Nhlanhla, 2025). These insights underline the importance of examining how participatory teaching methods and ICT use interact to enhance learning outcomes, forming the foundation for the current study.

Baig & Yadegaridehkordi (2023) conducted a systematic review on the flipped classroom model in higher education. Their study highlighted that flipped classrooms enhance student engagement, interaction, and self-directed learning. The research also identified challenges such as teacher preparation and technological limitations. The study emphasizes that planning and active participation are critical for achieving learning outcomes. This aligns with the current study's focus on participatory and practical learning methods.

Hassan (2022) explored teachers' perceptions of technology integration in teaching. Findings revealed that teachers generally value ICT for enhancing student understanding but face barriers like lack of training and infrastructure. The study suggested that effective ICT integration requires continuous professional development and institutional support. This supports the importance of assessing ICT tools and teaching methods in the present study.

Sibagariang et al. (2023) provided both theoretical and empirical insights into ICT in education. They emphasized that ICT supports diverse learning methods, including collaborative and problem-solving activities. The study highlighted that students' digital literacy and teacher competence significantly influence outcomes. This literature informs the current research by linking ICT use with participatory learning and skill development.

Rochimah, Japar, & Solihatin (2025) examined technology-assisted project-based learning for English language learners. The review found that project-based approaches increase motivation, creativity, and critical thinking. It also stressed that integration of

technology can improve practical skill acquisition. These findings relate directly to the indicators of creativity, problem-solving, and skill development in this study.

Joshi (2024) analyzed barriers to ICT integration in Nepalese higher education. The study identified limited access to resources, insufficient training, and resistance to change as major challenges. It suggested that addressing these barriers improves student engagement and learning outcomes. This is relevant for evaluating the ICT integration component in the current research.

Nhlanhla (2025) conducted a systematic review on ICT integration in teaching and learning. The research highlighted that ICT enhances interaction, participation, and access to learning materials. However, disparities in ICT access may create unequal learning experiences. This aligns with the current study's aim to compare teacher practices and student perceptions regarding ICT usage.

Aidoo (2024) investigated ICT adoption in teacher education programs. The study concluded that ICT can improve instructional methods, support participatory learning, and enhance professional development for teachers. It also emphasized the importance of teacher preparedness for effective ICT implementation. These insights support the study's focus on teaching methods, ICT tools, and participatory learning.

Idowu (2025) examined the impact of ICT on teaching and learning in higher education institutions. Results showed that ICT improves communication, assessment, and engagement but requires consistent technical support. The study highlighted the need for both teacher and student competence in ICT. This directly connects to the indicators of teaching methods, ICT use, and evaluation fairness in the current study.

Shahi & Khadka (2025) explored English teachers' perceptions toward ICT integration in EFL classrooms in Nepal. They found that teachers are generally positive about ICT, but challenges include inadequate training and lack of digital resources. Students' experiences were reported to be less consistent than teacher perceptions, which mirrors the teacher-student perception gaps in the current study.

In summary, the reviewed literature consistently highlights that ICT and innovative teaching approaches, such as flipped classrooms and project-based learning, enhance student engagement, participation, and skill development in higher education. However, successful integration depends on teacher preparedness, continuous professional development, access to resources, and institutional support. These studies collectively underscore the importance of aligning teaching methods, technology use, and participatory practices to improve learning outcomes, which directly informs the focus and indicators of the present research.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive and comparative research design to examine the effectiveness of teaching, participatory learning, ICT integration, and student support at Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus. The design allows for a systematic comparison between teacher self-assessment and student experiences. A mixed-methods approach was used, combining quantitative data collected through structured questionnaires with qualitative data from semi-structured interviews and classroom observations. This approach ensures a comprehensive understanding of the teaching and learning environment.

Population and Sample

The target population includes all teachers and students enrolled at Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus during the 2025 academic session. A purposive sampling method was applied for teachers, focusing on those actively involved in classroom teaching, while students were selected using stratified random sampling to ensure representation across different programs and levels. A total of 30 teachers and 250 students participated in the study, providing comprehensive perspectives on teaching practices, course management, and learning experiences.

Data Collection Tools

Data were collected using a **structured questionnaire** with five main sections corresponding to the study objectives:

a. Teaching and Course Management – course completion, punctuality, lesson planning, and classroom discipline.

b. Practical and Participatory Learning – discussion, group work, case studies, community-linked activities, creativity, and skill development.

c. Teaching Methods and ICT – use of diverse teaching methods, ICT tools, handouts, quizzes, and fairness in evaluation.

d. Motivation and Student Support – encouragement, support for weak learners, inclusivity, availability outside class, and respectful classroom environment.

e. Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Completely Disagree) to 5 (Completely Agree).

Validity and Reliability

The questionnaire was validated by campus faculty and subject experts. A pilot **test** with 5 teachers and 15 students. Feedback from the pilot also helped refine the wording of questions to ensure clarity and relevance.

Data Collection Procedure

- Permission was obtained from the **campus administration** prior to data collection.
- Questionnaires were distributed **in person** to all selected participants and collected after completion.
- Semi-structured interviews were conducted in a **semi-formal setting**, ensuring participants felt comfortable sharing experiences.
- Classroom observations were carried out **unobtrusively** to record teaching practices, ICT use, and student engagement.

Data Analysis Techniques

- **Quantitative data** from questionnaires were analyzed using **SPSS software**. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution) were calculated for each indicator.
- **Comparative analysis** using **T-tests** assessed the significance of differences between teacher self-assessments and student perceptions.
- **Qualitative data** from interviews and observations were analyzed thematically to explain, complement, and contextualize quantitative results.

Ethical Considerations

The study strictly adhered to ethical principles throughout the research process. Participation was entirely voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents before data collection began. To protect the privacy of participants, confidentiality and anonymity were maintained at every stage of the study. Furthermore, the collected data were used exclusively for research purposes and were reported only in aggregate form, ensuring that individual responses could not be traced back to any participant. These ethical measures ensured the integrity of the study and the protection of all participants involved.

Integration with Study Objectives

This methodology directly addresses the study's objectives:

1. **Assessing teacher perceptions** of course management, punctuality, and discipline versus student experiences.
2. **Examining participatory learning methods** and their effectiveness from both teacher and student perspectives.

3. **Evaluating ICT tools and teaching methods** to identify gaps and areas for improvement.
4. **Investigating student motivation, support, and inclusivity**, comparing teacher intention and student experience.
5. **Identifying gaps between teacher self-assessment and student perceptions** and recommending strategies for better alignment and improved teaching-learning outcomes.

This methodological framework ensures that the study provides **robust, reliable, and actionable findings** about teaching and learning effectiveness at **Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus**.

Table 1

Teaching and Course Management

Section 1: Teaching and Course Management									
Serial No.	**Question**	5- Completely agree (%)	4- Agreed (%)	3- General (%)	2- Disagree (%)	1- Completely disagree (%)	Total	Mean	SD
1.1	Within the stipulated time I will complete the course.	**90%**	10%	0%	0%	0%	100%	**4.9**	0.3
1.2	Punctuality and timing Management	**86.67%**	13.33%	0%	0%	0%	100%	**4.87**	0.34
1.3	Action plan and Follow the course	**93.33%**	6.67%	0%	0%	0%	100%	**4.93**	0.25
1.4	Discipline in the classroom Permanent	**100%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	**5**	0

Section 1 evaluates teaching and course management, focusing on time management, planning, and classroom discipline. The first indicator, **completion of the course within the stipulated time (1.1)**, received very strong positive responses, with 90% of respondents completely agreeing and 10% agreeing. The mean score of 4.9 and a standard deviation of 0.3 indicate almost unanimous agreement, reflecting that the course is consistently completed on schedule with minimal variation in perception among respondents.

The second indicator, **punctuality and timing management (1.2)**, was also highly rated, with 86.67% completely agreeing and 13.33% agreeing. A mean of 4.87 and SD of 0.34 show that respondents perceive time management practices very positively. This suggests that classes are conducted punctually and efficiently, contributing to effective teaching and learning.

The third indicator, **action plan and adherence to the course (1.3)**, received 93.33% complete agreement and 6.67% agreement, resulting in a mean of 4.93 and SD of 0.25. This demonstrates strong consensus that the course follows a structured plan and that teaching is well-organized, allowing learners to experience systematic progression through the curriculum.

Finally, the indicator **discipline in the classroom (1.4)** received perfect agreement, with 100% of respondents completely agreeing. The mean score of 5 and SD of 0 reflect absolute consensus, indicating that classroom discipline is maintained consistently and effectively. Overall, the indicators in Section 1 show extremely positive perceptions. High mean scores across all items, ranging from 4.87 to 5, and very low standard deviations highlight **strong uniformity and satisfaction** with teaching and course management. Time management, planning, and discipline are perceived as major strengths, indicating that the course is conducted in a structured, well-organized, and highly disciplined manner.

Table 2

Practical and Participatory Learning

Section 2: Practical and Participatory Learning	5- Completely agree (%)	4- Agreed (%)	3- General (%)	2- Disagree (%)	1- Completely disagree (%)	Total	Mean	SD
Question Discussion , presentation , group work	**66.67%**	33.33%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4.67	0.47
Case study , problem Solution	**63.33%**	36.67%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4.63	0.48
Learning with the	23.33%	**76.67%**	0%	0%	0%	100%	4.23	0.42

community								
Connecting								
Creativity and	**83.33%**	16.67%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4.83	0.37
Critical thinking								
Self-employment	36.67%	**63.33%**	0%	0%	0%	100%	4.37	0.48
and Skill								
development								
motivation								

Section 2 focuses on practical and participatory learning, examining various teaching and learning activities that promote active engagement, critical thinking, and skill development. The first indicator, **discussion, presentation, and group work**, received very positive responses, with 66.67% of participants completely agreeing and 33.33% agreeing. The mean score of 4.67 and standard deviation of 0.47 indicate that most respondents found these collaborative activities highly effective, while the low SD shows consistency in responses. These activities appear to encourage interaction, knowledge sharing, and cooperative learning among students.

The second indicator, **case study and problem-solving exercises**, was similarly well-received, with 63.33% completely agreeing and 36.67% agreeing, producing a mean of 4.63 and SD of 0.48. This suggests that learners perceive case studies and problem-solving as valuable for developing analytical skills and applying theoretical knowledge in practical contexts. These methods help students enhance critical thinking while bridging the gap between theory and practice.

The third indicator, **learning connected with the community**, received slightly lower but still positive feedback, with 23.33% completely agreeing and 76.67% agreeing. The mean of 4.23 and SD of 0.42 indicate overall agreement but with some variation in perception. This suggests that while students recognize the value of community engagement in learning, such activities may be less frequent or more limited in scope compared to classroom-based participatory activities. Nevertheless, connecting learning with real-world community contexts provides practical exposure and enhances social awareness.

The fourth indicator, **creativity and critical thinking**, received the highest positive response, with 83.33% completely agreeing and 16.67% agreeing. The mean score of 4.83 and SD of 0.37 reflect strong consensus that the learning environment effectively promotes innovative and critical thought. These activities likely challenge students to think independently, generate new ideas, and approach problems with a reflective mindset.

Finally, the indicator **self-employment and skill development motivation** was also rated positively, with 36.67% completely agreeing and 63.33% agreeing. The mean of 4.37 and SD of 0.48 indicate a high level of agreement, though slightly lower than other indicators. This suggests that while practical learning encourages motivation for entrepreneurship and skill acquisition, it may not yet be as strongly emphasized or integrated as other participatory methods. Overall, Section 2 demonstrates that participatory and practical learning strategies are effectively implemented, with creativity, critical thinking, and collaborative methods being the most strongly perceived, and community-based learning and skill development offering opportunities for further enhancement.

Table 3

Teaching Methods and ICT

Section 3: Teaching Methods and ICT		5- Completely agree (%)	4- Agreed (%)	3- General (%)	2- Disagree (%)	1- Completely disagree (%)	Total	Mean	SD
Serial No.	**Question**								
3.1	Different teaching method used	46.67%	**53.33%**	0%	0%	0%	100%	4.47	0.5
3.2	ICT tools	46.67%	36.67%	**16.67%**	0%	0%	100%	4.3	0.74
3.3	Handouts and Material availability	**53.33%**	46.67%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4.53	0.5
3.4	Quizzes , homework , term papers	**50%**	43.33%	6.67%	0%	0%	100%	4.43	0.62
3.5	In evaluation Fairness	**80%**	20%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4.8	0.4

Section 3, which focuses on teaching methods and the use of ICT, reveals generally positive perceptions among respondents, with some variation across individual indicators. Regarding the use of different teaching methods (3.1), 46.67% of respondents completely agreed and 53.33% agreed, resulting in a mean score of 4.47 and a standard deviation of 0.5. This indicates that diverse teaching strategies are widely recognized as effective, with responses showing moderate consistency and no disagreement. The use of ICT tools (3.2) received slightly more varied feedback, with 46.67% completely agreeing, 36.67% agreeing, and 16.67% selecting a neutral response. A mean of 4.3 and a higher SD of 0.74 suggest that while ICT is generally valued, there are differences in accessibility, familiarity, or effectiveness in its application.

The availability of handouts and learning materials (3.3) was highly appreciated, with 53.33% completely agreeing and 46.67% agreeing. The mean score of 4.53 and SD of 0.5 indicate strong agreement and uniform perception, suggesting that resources adequately support learning. Assessment activities such as quizzes, homework, and term papers (3.4) were positively rated as well, with 50% completely agreeing, 43.33% agreeing, and 6.67% neutral. A mean of 4.43 and SD of 0.62 reflect high satisfaction, though the presence of a small neutral response shows minor differences in perception of these activities' frequency or relevance.

Finally, evaluation fairness (3.5) received the highest level of agreement, with 80% completely agreeing and 20% agreeing, resulting in a mean of 4.8 and SD of 0.4. This demonstrates strong consensus among respondents that grading and assessment are transparent, unbiased, and reliable, reinforcing trust in the evaluation process. Overall, Section 3 highlights that teaching methods, assessment practices, and resource availability are positively perceived, with ICT integration showing the most variability and representing an area for potential enhancement.

Comparative Study of Students and Teachers

Section 1: Teaching and Course Management: This is the teacher's Self assessment And the student's Satisfaction rating Shows the difference between.

Indicator	Teacher Mean	Student Mean	Teacher SD	Student SD	T-value	Conclusion
1.1 Syllabus	4.9	4.06	0.3	0.904	4.36	Significant
1.2 Regularity	4.87	4.096	0.34	0.838	4.24	Significant

1.3 With preparation	4.93	4.208	0.25	0.945	3.75	Significant
1.4 Class Discipline	5	3.84	0	0.956	6.07	Significant

Indicator 1.1) According to the analysis of "Syllabus completion on time", teachers have rated themselves highly in completing the syllabus on time. The mean of teachers is 4.9 and SD is 0.3 , which indicates high agreement and consistency among teachers. The mean of students is 4.06 and SD is 0.904 , which shows some variation in the experience of students. The difference between the mean of teachers and students is 0.84 and the T-value according to the T-test is 4.36 , which indicates this difference This confirms that the difference is statistically significant . This shows that teachers consider themselves to have a high level of ability to complete the course on time, while students, although positive, have relatively low ratings of this ability of the teacher.

Indicator 1.2) "Regularity", teachers have high confidence in their regularity, with a Mean of 4.87 and a SD of 0.34. This shows that there is high agreement and consistency in the experience of regularity among teachers. Students also evaluated the teacher's regularity positively , but the Mean of 4.096 confirms that the experience is relatively less than the teacher's self-assessment. According to the T-test , the T-value is 4.24 , which is greater than the critical T , indicating that there is a difference between the teacher's and the student's assessment. It is statistically significant. This shows that teachers perceived themselves to experience a high level of commitment in their regularity , but students rated such an experience somewhat lower.

Indicator 1.3) According to the analysis of " Prepared Teaching", teachers have rated their ability in prepared teaching highly , with a Mean of 4.93 and a SD of 0.25 . This shows a high level of agreement and consistency in the experience of prepared teaching among teachers. Students have also rated the teacher's prepared teaching positively , but the Mean of 4.208 confirms that the experience is less than the teacher's self-assessment. The student's SD is higher at 0.945 , which shows that there is some difference in experience among students in this regard. According to the T-test , the T-value is 3.75 , which is greater than the critical T , indicating that the difference between the teacher's and student's assessment is significant. It is statistically significant. This shows that teachers have shown a high commitment to teaching with preparation , while students, although positive, have had a comparatively low experience.

Indicator 1.4) According to the analysis of " Classroom Discipline", teachers consider themselves to be completely disciplined , with a Mean of 5 and SD of 0 , meaning that all teachers fully agree and there is no difference between teachers. Students also rated classroom discipline positively , but with a Mean of 3.84, it seems that the experience is relatively less than the teachers' self-assessment. According to the T-test , the T-value is 6.07 , which is extremely large and much higher than the critical T , which indicates that there is a significant difference between teacher and student assessments. Statistically , this confirms that the teacher has a high level of confidence in his classroom discipline , while the students , although positive, have experienced it less according to the teacher's perspective.

Interpretation: The analysis shows that teachers have high self-assessments of their abilities. Students also have positive experiences , but less so than teachers' self-assessments. The differences are particularly large in "classroom discipline" and "teaching with preparation". This suggests that measures are needed to better balance the experiences of teachers and students , so that the gap between teachers' self-assessments and students' actual experiences can be reduced.

Section 2: Practical and Participatory Learning

Section 2: T-test analysis comparing teacher self-evaluation and student satisfaction with practical and participatory learning is as follows:

Indicator	Teacher Mean	Student Mean	Teacher SD	Student SD	T-value	Conclusion
2.1 Discussion, presentation, group work	4.67	4.16	0.47	0.946	2.64	Significant
2.2 Case Study/Problem Solving	4.63	4	0.48	0.98	3.16	Significant
2.3 Connecting learning to community / local examples	4.23	4.088	0.42	1.03	0.7	Not Significant
2.4 Creativity and critical thinking / Creativity	4.83	3.996	0.37	1.056	4.08	Significant

2.5 Self-employment and skill development motivation / self-employment ideas	4.37	3.76	0.48	0.971	3.08	Significant

Indicator 2.1 (discussion, presentation, group work), the teacher mean is 4.67 and the student mean is 4.16. The T-value is **2.64**, which is statistically significant. This shows that teachers have rated the encouragement of participation in the class highly , while students have also rated it positively , but less than the teacher's perspective. Indicator 2.2 (Case Study/Problem Solving) has a teacher mean of 4.63 and a student mean of 4.0 . T-value 3.16 → significant, which shows a clear difference between teacher and student experience.

The mean difference in indicator 2.3 (connecting learning with community) is small (teacher 4.23, student 4.088) and T-value 0.70 → not significant. This shows that teachers and students have similar experiences in the practice of connecting learning with community. Indicator 2.4 (Creativity and Critical Thinking), the teacher mean is 4.83 and the student mean is 3.996. The T-value is 4.08 → significant, which indicates that the teacher has a high rating in promoting creativity and critical thinking, while the student experience is relatively low.

Finally , the Mean difference (Teacher 4.37, Student 3.76) and T-value 3.08 → significant in 2.5 (Self-employment and skill development motivation) shows that the teachers have given high priority to motivating students towards skill development and self-employment , while the students' experience is comparatively less.

Overall conclusion: There is a statistically significant difference in teacher and student ratings for four of the five indicators in Section 2. Only the "Connecting Learning to Community" indicator does not appear to have a difference. This shows that teachers place a high priority on classroom participation, creativity, problem solving, and skill development, but slightly lower ratings on student experience.

Section 3: Teaching Methods and ICT

Section 3: T-test analysis comparing teacher self-evaluation and student satisfaction with teaching methods and ICT is as follows:

Indicator	**Teacher Mean**	**Student Mean**	**Teacher SD**	**Student SD**	**T-value**	**Conclusion**

3.1 Use different teaching methods / Explicit teaching	4.47	4.02	0.5	1.049	2.12	Significant
3.2 Use of ICT tools	4.3	4.08	0.74	0.913	1.03	Not Significant
3.3 Handouts and Material Availability / Reference Materials	4.53	4.036	0.5	0.941	2.54	Significant
3.4 Quizzes, Homework, Term Paper / Homework/Term Paper	4.43	3.988	0.62	1.018	2.03	Significant
3.5 Fairness in evaluation/unbiased evaluation	4.8	4.136	0.4	0.928	3.6	Significant

Indicator 3.1 (use of different teaching methods), the teacher mean is 4.47 and the student mean is 4.02. The T-value is 2.12 → statistically significant. This shows that teachers have given high priority to using different teaching methods. Indicator 3.2 (ICT tool use), the mean difference is low (teacher 4.3, student 4.08) and T-value 1.03 → not significant. This shows that teachers and students do not show a significant difference in their experience in using ICT tools.

Indicator 3.3 (handout and material availability), teacher mean is 4.53 and student mean is 4.036, T-value 2.54 → significant. This shows that teachers have rated the provision of reference materials and handouts highly , while student experience is comparatively low. Indicator 3.4 (Quiz , Homework , Term Paper) has a Mean difference (Teacher 4.43, Student 3.988) and T-value 2.03 → significant . This indicates that teachers have a positive approach to assessment and homework provision , but there is less experience in student experience. Indicator 3.5 (Fairness in assessment), teacher mean 4.8 and student mean 4.136, T-value 3.60 → highly significant. This confirms that teachers have high self-assessment in ensuring fairness and transparency in assessment.

Overall conclusion: Four out of the five indicators in Section 3 (3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5) are T-test significant , except for ICT use. This indicates that teachers rate their teaching methods , material availability , homework/term papers and assessment highly , while student

experience is somewhat lower. This indicates that improvement measures are needed to balance teacher and student experience.

T-test values appear significant for the five indicators in Section 4, compared to teacher self-evaluation and student satisfaction.

Section 4: Motivation and Student Support

Indicator	Teacher Mean	Student Mean	Teacher SD	Student SD	T-value	Conclusion
4.1 Encouraging student motivation / participation	4.73	4.208	0.44	0.856	2.97	Significant
4.2 Poor student support	4.83	3.668	0.37	1.015	5.89	Significant
4.3 Inclusive Environment / Inspirational Role	4.9	4.468	0.3	0.825	2.7	Significant
4.4 Availability outside of class	4.67	3.8	0.47	0.938	4.54	Significant
4.5 Morale and Participation Cooperation / Respectful Behavior	4.8	4.184	0.4	0.833	3.65	Significant

Indicator 4.1 (Student Motivation), the teacher mean is 4.73 and the student mean is 4.208. T-value 2.97 → statistically significant. This indicates that teachers have rated the level of student motivation high , while student experience is somewhat low. Indicator 4.2 (Weak student support), the teacher mean is 4.83 and the student mean is 3.668. T-value is 5.89 → highly significant. This indicates that teachers have given high priority to providing support and guidance to weak students , but there is a large gap in student experience.

Indicator 4.3 (Inclusive environment / Motivational role), the mean difference between teachers is 4.9 and students is 4.468, T-value 2.70 → significant. This shows that teachers are striving to maintain an inclusive and positive classroom environment.

Indicator 4.4 (availability outside the classroom), teacher mean is 4.67 and student mean is 3.8, T-value is 4.54 → significant. This indicates that teachers believe in being available to students outside the classroom , but students have somewhat reduced the experience. Indicator 4.5 (morale and participation support / respectful behavior), teacher mean 4.8 and student mean 4.184, T-value 3.65 → significant. This indicates that teachers have made positive self-evaluations in terms of increasing student morale and participation.

Overall conclusion: There is a statistically significant difference between teacher and student experience across all indicators in Section 4. Teachers rated their motivation, poor student support, inclusive environment, availability outside the classroom, and morale and participation support highly, while students rated their experience somewhat lower. This suggests that improvement measures are needed to balance the teacher and student experience.

Analysis of Open-ended Questions

1. **What similarities and differences did you find between your self-assessment and student feedback?**

In our (Teachers) self-assessment, we rated ourself highly on completing the syllabus on time, maintaining classroom discipline, and teaching with proper preparation. Students also gave positive feedback on these aspects, but their ratings were slightly lower than my self-assessment. Differences were particularly noticeable in classroom discipline, student participation, and Q&A activities. This indicates that while both teachers and students perceive teaching positively, there is a gap in actual classroom experiences. Students sometimes reported less engagement or relevance in certain activities. This reflects the difference between teacher perception and student experience. we realized that it is common to have higher self-assessment scores compared to student feedback. Reducing this gap requires structured feedback mechanisms and more interactive classroom practices. Overall, aligning teacher self-assessment with student experiences is crucial to improve teaching effectiveness.

2. **What are your major teaching strengths and areas for improvement?**

Our (Teachers) main teaching strengths include completing the syllabus on time, punctuality, well-prepared lesson plans, and maintaining classroom discipline. These strengths help students gain confidence and clarity in their learning process. Areas for improvement include increasing student participation, enhancing the effective use of ICT tools, and promoting participatory and project-based learning. Further attention is needed to support weak students and provide individualized guidance. Incorporating community-based learning activities could improve practical experience and social awareness. Developing students' critical thinking and creativity also requires additional time and resources. Maintaining strengths while addressing these areas will enhance overall learning outcomes and student satisfaction. Focused efforts on these improvement areas are necessary to maximize the effectiveness of teaching.

3. **What innovative methods or changes would you like to implement in the future to improve learning effectiveness?**

In the future, Our (Teachers) plan to incorporate more group work, presentations, and project-based learning. These methods will help students develop practical problem-solving skills and creative thinking in addition to theoretical knowledge. We aim to use ICT tools more actively and interactively to enhance digital literacy. Learning connected with the community and real-life examples will increase practical exposure. We also intend to include creative challenges to boost student motivation and innovation. Digital platforms will be utilized for self-study and self-assessment. Strengthening group collaboration and student interaction is another goal. These methods are expected to improve learning effectiveness, student engagement, and overall skill development.

4. **How can the campus support your professional development?**

The campus can support professional development by providing ICT training, workshops, and professional development programs. Structures to enhance research skills, innovative teaching methods, and lesson preparation would be valuable. Peer evaluation and regular feedback mechanisms can help improve teaching practices. Provision of teaching tools, resources, and instructional materials will support quality education. Administrative and environmental support from the campus can focus on improving both teacher and student outcomes. Conferences, seminars, and research collaboration opportunities will promote professional growth. Overall, campus support enhances teacher competence and contributes to long-term benefits for both teachers and students.

5. **What are your personal teaching goals for the upcoming semester or academic year?**

The upcoming semester, my goal is to increase student participation and engagement. Our (Teachers) aim to use ICT tools more effectively to enhance interactive learning. Creating an inclusive classroom environment where all students feel equally involved is a priority. We will focus on providing individual guidance and supporting weaker learners. Emphasis will be given to group work, projects, and presentations as primary teaching methods. Strategies will be implemented to enhance students' critical thinking, creativity, and self-motivation. We will continue to maintain punctuality, complete the syllabus on time, and ensure classroom discipline. Teaching methods will be adjusted based on student feedback and assessment results. Achieving these goals will improve both teaching quality and learning effectiveness.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The study conducted at Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus reveals a generally positive perception of teaching and learning effectiveness among both teachers and students. Section 1 of the analysis shows that teachers demonstrate high competence in course management, time management, preparation, and classroom discipline. While students also rate these aspects positively, their feedback is slightly lower than teachers' self-assessments, indicating minor gaps in perception and experience. Section 2 highlights the effectiveness of practical and participatory learning, with group discussions, presentations, case studies, creativity, and critical thinking being well-received. However, learning connected to community activities and self-employment skills shows room for further enhancement. Section 3 indicates that diverse teaching methods, availability of learning materials, quizzes, and fair evaluation are well implemented, though ICT integration varies and requires improvement. Section 4 identifies a significant difference between teacher and student experiences regarding motivation, support for weak learners, inclusivity, availability outside class, and morale. Teachers consistently rate their efforts higher, suggesting the need to better align student experiences with teacher intentions.

The comparative analysis using T-tests confirms statistically significant differences in most indicators, particularly in classroom discipline, prepared teaching, creativity, and support for weak students. Overall, the study demonstrates that while teachers at Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus maintain high standards and dedication, students' experiences sometimes reflect less engagement or practical exposure. The findings emphasize the need for improved participatory learning strategies, more effective ICT use, community engagement, individualized support, and mechanisms to ensure alignment between teacher self-perception and student experience. By addressing these gaps, the campus can enhance overall teaching effectiveness, student engagement, skill development, and learning outcomes.

Recommendations

- Strengthen participatory learning activities, including discussions, presentations, and group work, to increase student engagement.
- Integrate more case studies and problem-solving exercises to improve analytical and critical thinking skills.
- Enhance the use of ICT tools in teaching, ensuring consistent access and training for both teachers and students.

- Increase practical exposure through community-based learning, internships, and real-world projects.
- Promote creativity and critical thinking by incorporating innovative teaching methods and interactive classroom activities.
- Provide additional support and guidance for weaker students, including remedial classes and mentoring.
- Ensure inclusive classroom practices that encourage participation from all students.
- Maintain punctuality and adherence to the course schedule while monitoring student progress.
- Improve availability of handouts, reference materials, and digital resources to support learning.
- Regularly review and refine assessment strategies, including quizzes, homework, and term papers, to maintain fairness and effectiveness.
- Develop teacher training programs focused on innovative pedagogy, ICT integration, and student-centered learning approaches.
- Establish structured feedback mechanisms to reduce the gap between teacher self-assessment and student experience.
- Encourage self-employment and skill development activities to enhance employability and entrepreneurship among students.
- Organize workshops and seminars for professional development and peer learning among teachers.
- Use digital platforms and online tools for self-study, collaborative learning, and continuous assessment.
- Monitor and evaluate teaching and learning effectiveness regularly to ensure ongoing improvement.
- Foster a respectful and motivating classroom environment that enhances student morale, participation, and cooperation.

References

Aidoo, B. (2024). Integrating ICT to adopt online learning in teacher education: Impact and practices. *Education Sciences, 14*(12), 1313.

Baig, M. I., & Yadegaridehkordi, E. (2023). Flipped classroom in higher education: A systematic literature review and research challenges. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20*, 61. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00430-5

Hassan, S. (2022). Teachers' perceptions of technology integration in teaching-learning practices: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.920317

Idowu, E. (2025). The impact of ICT on teaching and learning in higher education institutions. *Preprints.org*.

Joshi, B. M. (2024). Analyzing barriers to ICT integration in higher education in Nepal: A systematic review. *The Third Pole: Journal of Geography, 24*.

Nhlanhla, M. M. (2025). A systematic review of information and communication technology integration in teaching and learning. *Durban University of Technology Research*.

Rochimah, H., Japar, M., & Solihatin, E. (2025). Systematic literature review: The effectiveness of technology-assisted project-based English language learning. *Participatory Educational Research, 12*(1), 195–221. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.25.11.12.1

Shahi, D. K. S., & Khadka, B. K. (2025). English teachers' perceptions towards ICT integration in EFL classroom in Nepal. *Journal of Innovative Research, 3*(1), 31–40. https://doi.org/10.54536/jir.v3i1.4071

Sibagariang, S. A., Pohan, F., Lubis, M. J., & Zainuddin, Z. (2023). Information and communication technology in the world of education: A theoretical and empirical overview – A literature review. *Education and Human Development Journal, 8*(3), 12–24.

Annex -1

सुदूरपश्चिम विश्वविद्यालय

दुर्गालक्ष्मी बहुमुखी क्याम्पस,

गोदावरी अत्तरीया, कैलाली

शिक्षकको आत्म–चिन्तन र स्व–मूल्यांकन (TEACHER'S REFLECTION AND SELF EVALUATION)

नाम: .....

पद: ..... **क्याम्पस/विभाग:** .....

दुर्गालक्ष्मी बहुमुखी क्याम्पसले प्रत्येक सेमेस्टरको अन्त्यमा सबै शिक्षकहरूलाई स्व–मूल्यांकन फाराम भर्न अनुरोध गर्दछ। शिक्षकहरूले आफ्नो प्रदर्शनबारे आत्म–चिन्तन गरी, प्रतिवेदनलाई आफ्ना पोर्टफोलियोमा समावेश गर्नुपर्छ, र सेमेस्टरको अन्तिम दिनसम्म शिक्षण समितिका प्रमुखलाई एक प्रतिलिपि बुझाउनुपर्छ।

यो प्रक्रिया तपाईंको स्व–धारणा र विद्यार्थी प्रतिक्रियाको बीचमा समानता ल्याउन मद्दत गर्दछ। कृपया उत्तर लेख्नु अघि विद्यार्थीहरूको फाराम (सुझाव) अध्ययन गरी उनीहरूले दिएका सुझावहरू विचार गर्नुहोस्।

क्षेत्रहरू र मापदण्डहरू

क्षेत्र तथा मापदण्ड	**विषय १**		**विषय २**		**विषय ३**	
	मेरो मूल्यांकन	**विद्यार्थी मूल्यांकन**	**मेरो मूल्यांकन**	**विद्यार्थी मूल्यांकन**	**मेरो मूल्यांकन**	**विद्यार्थी मूल्यांकन**
1. सेक्सन 1: शिक्षण तथा कोर्स व्यवस्थापन						
1.1	म निर्धारित समयभित्र कोर्स पूरा गर्छु।					
1.2	म समयपालक छु र समय व्यवस्थापन प्रभावकारी रूपमा गर्छु।					
1.3	म कार्य योजना तथा पाठ्यक्रमलाई व्यवस्थित रूपमा पालना गर्छु।					
1.4	म कक्षामा अनुशासन र संरचना कायम राख्छु।					

2. सेक्सन 2: व्यावहारिक तथा सहभागात्मक सिकाइ						
2.1	म छलफल, प्रस्तुति, र समूह कार्यलाई प्रोत्साहित गर्छु।					
2.2	म केस स्टडी, समस्या समाधान, र भूमिका निर्वाह अभ्यासहरू प्रयोग गर्छु।					
2.3	म कक्षाकोठाको सिकाइलाई समुदाय वा वास्तविक अभ्याससँग जोड्छु।					
2.4	म सिर्जनात्मकता, नवीनता, तथा आलोचनात्मक सोचलाई प्रवर्द्धन गर्छु।					
2.5	म स्व–रोजगार र सीप विकासतर्फ विद्यार्थीलाई प्रेरित गर्छु।					
3. सेक्सन 3: शिक्षण विधि तथा ICT						
3.1	म विभिन्न शिक्षण विधिहरू प्रभावकारी रूपमा प्रयोग गर्छु।					
3.2	म ICT उपकरण तथा डिजिटल स्रोतलाई शिक्षणमा समावेश गर्छु।					
3.3	म ह्यान्डआउट, पाठ्य सामग्री, र अतिरिक्त स्रोतहरू उपलब्ध गराउँछु।					
3.4	म क्विज, गृहकार्य, टर्म पेपर दिन्छु र मूल्यांकन गर्छु।					
3.5	म मूल्यांकनमा निष्पक्षता, पारदर्शिता, र विश्वसनीयता सुनिश्चित गर्छु।					
4. सेक्सन 4: प्रेरणा तथा विद्यार्थी सहयोग						
4.1	म विद्यार्थीलाई प्रेरित गर्छु र जिज्ञासा तथा खोजीभाव प्रोत्साहित गर्छु।					

4.2	म कमजोर विद्यार्थीलाई समय र मार्गदर्शन प्रदान गर्छु।					
4.3	म सम्मानजनक, समावेशी, र सकारात्मक सिकाइ वातावरण बनाउँछु।					
4.4	म कक्षा बाहिर पनि विद्यार्थीहरूका लागि उपलब्ध रहन्छु।					
4.5	म विद्यार्थीको मनोबल, सहभागिता, र सिकाइमा सहयोग पुऱ्याउँछु।					

प्रतिबिम्ब (Reflection) प्रश्नहरू (छोटोमा लेख्नुहोस्)

1. तपाईंको स्व–मूल्यांकन र विद्यार्थी प्रतिक्रियाबीच कस्ता समानता र भिन्नता भेटिनुभयो?

.....

.....

2. तपाईंका शिक्षणका प्रमुख बलियापक्षहरू के–के हुन्? सुधार गर्नुपर्ने क्षेत्रहरू के–के हुन्?

.....

.....

3. सिकाइ प्रभावकारिता बढाउन भविष्यमा तपाईंले प्रयोग गर्न चाहनुभएको नवीन विधि वा परिवर्तनहरू के के हुन्?

.....

.....

4. क्याम्पसले तपाईंको पेशागत विकासका लागि कसरी सहयोग पुऱ्याउन सक्छ?

.....

.....

5. आगामी सेमेस्टर वा शैक्षिक वर्षका लागि तपाईंको व्यक्तिगत शिक्षण लक्ष्य के हो?

.....

.....

दस्तखत: _____ मिति: _____