

**Internal Appraisal Report of Faculty and Non-Teaching Staff of  
Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus 2082**



**Prepared by:  
Internal Quality Assurance Committee  
Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus  
Attariya, Kailali**

## Internal Appraisal Report of Faculty and Non-Teaching Staff of Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus 2082

### Introduction

This report presents the appraisal outcomes of faculty members and non-teaching staff of Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus, Attariya, Kailali for the academic year 2082 BS. The appraisal process was conducted with the objective of assessing professional performance, institutional contribution, service quality, and overall effectiveness of both teaching and non-teaching personnel. The appraisal system was designed to promote accountability, professional growth, institutional improvement, and quality assurance.

The appraisal process was conducted through multiple evaluation tools including self-appraisal forms, student appraisal forms, and institutional appraisal forms. The evaluation was based on a five-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent).

### Objectives of the Appraisal

The major objectives of the appraisal process were:

1. To assess the professional performance of faculty and non-teaching staff.
2. To identify strengths and areas requiring improvement.
3. To enhance teaching-learning effectiveness and institutional services.
4. To encourage accountability, punctuality, and professional ethics.
5. To support institutional planning and quality enhancement activities.

### Appraisal Methodology

The appraisal process was carried out using the following instruments:

- Self-Appraisal Form for Faculty
- Self-Appraisal Form for Non-Teaching Staff
- Faculty Appraisal by Students Form
- Non-Teaching Staff Appraisal by Students Form
- Faculty Appraisal by Institution Form
- Non-Teaching Staff Appraisal by Institution Form

### Participants

Category	Number of Participants				
	Permanent	Full time contract	Parttime	Total	
Faculty Members	19	8	8	35	
Non-Teaching Staff	Officer	Head assistant	Assistant	Support	Total
	2	1	2	6	11



Student Respondents	Graduate	Undergraduate	Total
	45	210	255
Institutional Evaluators	6		
Grand Total	307		

### Faculty Self-Appraisal Results

The faculty self-appraisal focused on lesson planning, teaching methods, assessment practices, punctuality, research engagement, mentoring, and institutional contribution.

**Table 1: Faculty Self-Appraisal Summary**

S.N.	Evaluation Area	Mean Score	Interpretation
1	Lesson Planning and Preparedness	4.5	Excellent
2	Subject Knowledge	4.6	Excellent
3	Teaching Methods	4.3	Good
4	Assessment Fairness	4.4	Good
5	Feedback Utilization	4.1	Good
6	Punctuality and Attendance	4.7	Excellent
7	Research and Publication	3.8	Satisfactory
8	Use of ICT and Resources	4.2	Good
9	Student Mentoring	4.3	Good
10	Institutional Contribution	4.4	Good
	Overall Mean Score	4.33	Good

The self-appraisal results indicate that faculty members demonstrated strong commitment towards lesson preparation, subject expertise, punctuality, and institutional responsibilities. Faculty members reported high levels of confidence in classroom teaching and assessment practices. However, comparatively lower scores were observed in research and publication activities, indicating the need for increased academic research engagement and scholarly publication.

### Non-Teaching Staff Self-Appraisal Results

The self-appraisal of non-teaching staff assessed work efficiency, punctuality, responsiveness, teamwork, confidentiality, and initiative.



**Table 2: Non-Teaching Staff Self-Appraisal Summary**

S.N.	Evaluation Area	Mean Score	Interpretation
1	Work Knowledge	4.4	Good
2	Efficiency and Speed	4.2	Good
3	Accuracy and Record Keeping	4.3	Good
4	Punctuality and Regularity	4.5	Excellent
5	Responsiveness	4.1	Good
6	Teamwork	4.4	Good
7	Use of Resources	4.2	Good
8	Problem Solving	4.0	Good
9	Confidentiality	4.5	Excellent
10	Initiative	4.1	Good
	Overall Mean Score	4.27	Good

The appraisal findings show that non-teaching staff maintained satisfactory professional standards in office management, punctuality, teamwork, and confidentiality. Staff members demonstrated positive attitudes toward institutional responsibilities and student services. Some improvement is needed in problem-solving capacity and proactive service delivery.

#### Faculty Appraisal by Students

Student appraisal focused on teaching clarity, classroom interaction, fairness, punctuality, respectful behavior, and overall teaching effectiveness.

**Table 3: Faculty Appraisal by Students**

S.N.	Evaluation Area	Mean Score	Interpretation
1	Clarity of Teaching	4.4	Good
2	Class Interaction	4.2	Good
3	Availability Outside Class	4.1	Good
4	Fair Assessment	4.3	Good
5	Punctuality of Teacher	4.6	Excellent
6	Use of Teaching Aids	4.1	Good
7	Respectful Behavior	4.5	Excellent
8	Feedback on Progress	4.0	Good



9	Encourages Creativity	4.1	Good
10	Overall Effectiveness	4.3	Good
	Overall Mean Score	4.26	Good

Student responses revealed a positive perception of faculty performance. Students appreciated teachers' punctuality, respectful behavior, teaching clarity, and fairness in assessment. Moderate scores in feedback on progress and creativity promotion suggest the need for more learner-centered and interactive pedagogical practices.

#### **Non-Teaching Staff Appraisal by Students**

Student appraisal of non-teaching staff focused on helpfulness, responsiveness, fairness, professionalism, and service efficiency.

**Table 4: Non-Teaching Staff Appraisal by Students**

S.N.	Evaluation Area	Mean Score	Interpretation
1	Helpfulness	4.3	Good
2	Behavior and Attitude	4.4	Good
3	Speed of Service	4.1	Good
4	Clarity of Information	4.0	Good
5	Availability	4.3	Good
6	Problem Resolution	4.1	Good
7	Professional Appearance	4.5	Excellent
8	Fairness	4.4	Good
9	Campus Environment Support	4.2	Good
10	Overall Satisfaction	4.3	Good
	Overall Mean Score	4.26	Good

Students expressed overall satisfaction with the services provided by non-teaching staff. Staff behavior, professionalism, and fairness were positively evaluated. Areas such as service speed and communication clarity can be further strengthened to improve administrative efficiency.

#### **Faculty Appraisal by Institution**

Institutional appraisal evaluated curriculum adherence, professional development, attendance, innovation, leadership, and overall contribution.



**Table 5: Faculty Appraisal by Institution**

S.N.	Evaluation Area	Mean Score	Interpretation
1	Curriculum Adherence	4.5	Excellent
2	Student Performance Results	4.2	Good
3	Compliance with Policies	4.4	Good
4	Contribution to Accreditation	4.0	Good
5	Professional Development	4.1	Good
6	Attendance and Punctuality	4.6	Excellent
7	Student Feedback Score	4.3	Good
8	Leadership and Committee Work	4.2	Good
9	Innovation in Teaching	4.0	Good
10	Overall Institutional Value	4.4	Good
	Overall Mean Score	4.27	Good

The institutional appraisal reflects that faculty members effectively fulfilled academic responsibilities and contributed positively to institutional functioning. Strong performance was observed in curriculum completion, attendance, and policy compliance. Additional encouragement is required to strengthen innovation in teaching and participation in accreditation-related activities.

#### **Non-Teaching Staff Appraisal by Institution**

Institutional appraisal of non-teaching staff focused on job knowledge, office protocol, coordination, integrity, and overall contribution.

**Table 6: Non-Teaching Staff Appraisal by Institution**

S.N.	Evaluation Area	Mean Score	Interpretation
1	Job Knowledge and Skill	4.3	Good
2	Attendance and Punctuality	4.6	Excellent
3	Efficiency and Output Quality	4.2	Good
4	Following Office Protocol	4.4	Good
5	Inter-department Coordination	4.2	Good
6	Student Service Record	4.1	Good
7	Resource Management	4.0	Good
8	Confidentiality and Integrity	4.5	Excellent



9	Problem-solving Ability	4.0	Good
10	Overall Contribution	4.3	Good
	Overall Mean Score	4.26	Good

The appraisal findings indicate that non-teaching staff members effectively supported institutional administration and student services. Strong punctuality, integrity, and adherence to office procedures were observed. Continued professional development and service management training would further enhance institutional effectiveness.

### Comparative Summary of Overall Appraisal Scores

**Table 7: Comparative Overall Mean Scores**

Category	Overall Mean Score	Interpretation
Faculty Self-Appraisal	4.33	Good
Non-Teaching Staff Self-Appraisal	4.27	Good
Faculty Appraisal by Students	4.26	Good
Non-Teaching Staff Appraisal by Students	4.26	Good
Faculty Appraisal by Institution	4.27	Good
Non-Teaching Staff Appraisal by Institution	4.26	Good

### Major Strengths Identified

The appraisal process identified several institutional strengths:

- Strong punctuality and attendance among faculty and staff.
- Positive teacher-student relationships and respectful behavior.
- Effective curriculum completion and classroom management.
- Cooperative and disciplined non-teaching staff.
- Positive institutional commitment and teamwork culture.
- Fair and transparent assessment practices.

### Areas for Improvement

The appraisal process also identified areas requiring further improvement:

- Increased faculty involvement in research and publication.
- Greater use of innovative and technology-based teaching methods.
- Improved feedback mechanisms for students.
- Faster administrative service delivery.
- More professional development and training opportunities.



- Enhanced problem-solving and communication skills among administrative staff.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the appraisal findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Organize regular faculty development and research training programs.
2. Encourage faculty members to participate in seminars, workshops, and publication activities.
3. Strengthen the use of ICT and learner-centered teaching approaches.
4. Conduct customer-service and office management training for non-teaching staff.
5. Establish a continuous monitoring and feedback mechanism.
6. Provide recognition and incentives for outstanding performance.
7. Strengthen institutional support for innovation, research, and professional growth.
8. Conduct appraisal activities annually for continuous quality enhancement.

### **Conclusion**

The appraisal process of faculty and non-teaching staff at Durgalaxmi Multiple Campus, Attariya, Kailali for the year 2082 BS revealed an overall satisfactory and positive performance across different evaluation dimensions. Faculty members demonstrated commitment towards academic excellence, while non-teaching staff contributed effectively to institutional administration and student support services. The appraisal findings indicate a healthy institutional environment characterized by professionalism, discipline, and cooperation.

At the same time, the report highlights the need for further improvement in research engagement, innovation, service efficiency, and professional development. The recommendations provided in this report are expected to support institutional quality enhancement and strengthen the overall effectiveness of academic and administrative services in the campus.

