OUT COME BASED EDUCATION
GAP ANALYSIS REPORT

2024-2025

BSW
Program

Batch : Batch 24-26
Semester : Semester 1/3/5 2024-2025
Course Year : FIRST YEAR 2024-2025
Department : BSW

Course Name : Introduction To Social Work Methods

Course Code : Major 101

1.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 1 — Threshold :2 — Total Questions :5 — Total Students :23 — Responses Obtained :23

CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	13 / 51	13 / 51	19 / 51	13 / 51	17 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1

Justification

1. **Low Indirect Attainment:** Despite full student participation (23/23), the number of responses above the threshold was low (13–21 out of 51 per CO), leading to low indirect attainment levels (mostly Level 1).

2. **Possible Misalignment:** The gap between high direct attainment (Level 3) and low indirect attainment suggests a disconnect between student perception and actual performance.

Action Plan

1. **Refine Survey Design:** Revise feedback questions to clearly map to each CO using simple and understandable language.

2. **Increase Awareness:** Educate students on how feedback influences course improvement and why it's important to be accurate and thoughtful.

3. **In-Class Feedback Collection:** Conduct surveys during class time to ensure better engagement and seriousness.
4. **Review CO-Feedback Link:** Ensure that each feedback question directly corresponds to the intended CO for better alignment.

Course Name : Field Work –i

Course Code : Major 102

1.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis

CO's					
Name :Course Edit Survey - ESM - SEM I	Threshold :1		Total Questions :5	Total Students :23	Responses Obtained :23
	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	17 / 51	16 / 51	20 / 51	15 / 51	17 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1

Justification

- Only a few students gave feedback, which directly affected the indirect attainment scores.

- Low participation leads to unbalanced results that do not reflect the overall student learning experience.

Action Plan

1. Ensure all students submit the feedback by conducting it during class time.

2. Raise awareness about the importance of feedback in improving teaching and learning.

3. Keep the feedback process simple and quick to encourage participation.

2.CO ATTAINMENT

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	1.2	1	1.15	1.62	-0.47	-
CO2	1.2	1	1.15	2.37	-1.22	-

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
COMajor 102.1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1.62
COMajor 102.2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2.37
COMajor 102.3	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	2
COMajor 102.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2.87
Major 102	2	2.5	2.75	2	2.25	2.25	2.25	1.75	2.21

Justification

The original CO2–PO mapping assigned high weightages (3) to PO2, PO3, and PO7, resulting in a **high average (2.37)** and an **ambitious target**.

1. Based on actual course delivery and limited field exposure, students **could not deeply engage with multiple PO areas**, especially PO2 (community understanding), PO3 (application), and PO7 (collaboration).

2. The current mapping **does not align with realistic course scope** and resource availability.

3. A revised mapping with moderate values (2 instead of 3) **better reflects the achievable learning** outcomes for first-year students in this fieldwork course.

Action Plan

1. **Review CO–PO matrix** with course faculty and field instructors to agree on realistic outcome alignment.

2. **Revise CO2–PO mapping** to:
   - PO2: from 3 → 2

   - PO3: from 3 → 2

   - PO7: from 3 → 2

3. **Update CO2 target** based on the new mapping average (~2.0 instead of 2.37).

4. **Reflect changes** in future CO attainment analysis and SAR documentation.

5. **Monitor impact** on attainment and adjust pedagogy or mapping in future cycles accordingly.

Course Name : Health and Nutrition

Course Code : OE 101

1.CO - PO MAPPING

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
COOE 101.1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1.37
COOE 101.2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2.25
COOE 101.3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2.62
COOE 101.4	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2.37
COOE 101.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
OE 101	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.32

Justification

1. **CO1 is basic or introductory**, so it connects less with advanced Program Outcomes like PO3, PO5, or PO7.

2. The **low mapping was intentional** to reflect its limited role in higher-level skills.

Action Plan

1. **Review the wording and scope** of CO1.

2. If it supports more POs than shown, **update the mapping levels** to match its actual contribution.

2.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 1		Threshold :2		Total Questions :6	Total Students :23		Responses Obtained :23
CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	14 / 51	13 / 51	13 / 51	14 / 51	21 / 51	14 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	2	1
Attainment	1		1	1	2	1

Justification

1. Only a few students gave feedback, which directly affected the indirect attainment scores.

2. Low participation leads to unbalanced results that do not reflect the overall student learning experience.

Action Plan

1. Ensure all students submit the feedback by conducting it during class time.

2. Raise awareness about the importance of feedback in improving teaching and learning.

3. Keep the feedback process simple and quick to encourage participation.

Course Name : Introduction To Psychology

Course Code : OE 102

1.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 1   Threshold :2   Total Questions :5   Total Students :23   Responses Obtained :23

CO's	CO1		CO2		CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q4	Q2	Q5	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	15 / 51	17 / 51	14 / 51	15 / 51	13 / 51	17 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1		1	1

Justification

All COs at Level 1:
Each course outcome (CO1 to CO4) received the lowest possible attainment level in the feedback analysis, showing poor student perception.

1. **Low Student Ratings:**
   Even though all 23 students participated, only about 25–33% of responses for each CO were above the threshold score of 2. This points to a lack of clarity or satisfaction.

2. **Mismatch in Expectations:**
   The full response rate shows students were willing to engage, but the poor feedback implies that the course content or delivery may not have aligned well with what was expected or stated in the COs.

Action Plan

Improve Survey Design:
Rewrite feedback questions in a simple, easy-to-understand way that directly matches the course outcomes.

1. **Explain the Purpose of Feedback:**
   Before collecting responses, clearly tell students how their input helps improve the course and teaching.

2. **Collect More Feedback Types:**
   Along with surveys, use tools like student reflections, peer feedback, or inputs from fieldwork supervisors to get a broader and more reliable picture of learning.

2.CO ATTAINMENT

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.6	2.12	0.48	-
CO2	3	1	2.6	2.37	0.23	-
CO3	1.79	1	1.63	2.87	-1.24	-

Justification

1. CO3 has **very low coverage (2.22%)** in the assessment plan, meaning students had **limited opportunities** to demonstrate learning related to this outcome.

2. As a result, the **direct attainment is low (1.79)** and the **gap is significantly negative (-1.24)**.

3. The gap is **not due to student performance alone**, but primarily due to **insufficient assessment items mapped to CO3**.

Action Plan

1. Add more CO3-based questions in internals and external exams.

2. Increase CO3 weightage in assignments and CIEs.

3. Include class activities focused on personality theories.

4. Align faculty on mapping CO3 properly.

Course Name : Orientation To Field Practicum
Course Code : VSC 101

1.CO - PO MAPPING

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
COVSC 101.1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1.37
COVSC 101.2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2.25
COVSC 101.3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	2.5
COVSC 101.4	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2.25
COVSC 101.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
VSC 101	**2.4**	**2.2**	**2.4**	**2**	**2.4**	**2.4**	**2.2**	**2.2**	**2.27**

Justification

1. CO1 maps mostly at Level 1 or 2 across POs, showing minimal depth.

2. The focus on "remembering" may not strongly connect with PO-level competencies like critical analysis (PO1) or applying strategies (PO3).

3. This suggests a **gap between theoretical recall and practical application**, limiting its PO contribution.

Action Plan

1. **Revise CO1 Scope:** Expand beyond memory-based outcomes—incorporate case examples or concept application.

2. **Activity-Based Learning:** Use simulations, role plays, or field-based quizzes to reinforce core concepts.

3. **Stronger PO Linkages:** Redesign content delivery to better align with PO1 (critical analysis) and PO3 (application of strategies).

2.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Name : Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 1		Threshold :2	Total Questions :5		Total Students :23		Responses Obtained :23
CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	15 / 51	15 / 51	14 / 51	11 / 51	15 / 51	17 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	**1**		**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Justification

Low Indirect Attainment is likely due to:

1. Students not fully understanding survey questions or COs.
2. Misalignment between what was taught and what students perceived.
3. Survey fatigue or lack of motivation to respond thoughtfully.

Action Plan

1. **Redesign Feedback Questions:**

   o Simplify and align questions clearly with each CO.
   o Use examples or contextual clues in questions to guide students.

2. **Pre-Survey Orientation:**

   o Brief students on the purpose and importance of accurate feedback.
   o Highlight how feedback is used to improve teaching and learning.

3. **Supplement with Other Tools:**

   o Use reflective journals, peer feedback, or short in-class polls to validate student perception and increase accuracy.

Course Name : Environment Studies

Course Code : SEC 101

1.CO ATTAINMENT

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.5	2.25	0.35	-
CO2	3	1	2.5	2.5	0.1	-
CO3	1.79	1	1.53	2.87	-1.24	-
CO4	1.79	1	1.53	3	-1.37	-

Justification

The low attainment levels in **CO3** and **CO4** can be attributed to **insufficient representation in both formative and summative assessments**.

- These COs had **minimal weightage** (CO3: 7.77%, CO4: 3.33%) in the overall assessment structure, leading to a skewed evaluation of student performance.

- This limited exposure reduced the opportunity for students to score, resulting in a significant attainment gap despite potential understanding.

Action Plan

1. **Revise assessment design** to ensure balanced CO weightage across all units and evaluations.

2. **Incorporate more field-based components** and observation activities for CO3 and CO4 to enhance practical understanding.

3. **Conduct a mid-semester CO mapping review** to monitor coverage and make timely adjustments.

4. **Use rubrics and reflective reports** to better assess competencies like community observation and mapping, which are central to CO3 and CO4.

2.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Name : Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 1		Threshold :2	Total Questions :5	Total Students :23	Responses Obtained :23
CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	18 / 51	19 / 51	17 / 51	14 / 51	12 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1

Justification

- All COs have attained **Level 1**, indicating that most student responses met the minimum satisfaction level but did not exceed expectations.
- The **response count** for CO3 (14/51) and CO4 (12/51) was **relatively lower**, suggesting either limited student clarity on those questions or less perceived relevance.
- This may have resulted from **ambiguity in survey questions** or **less emphasis on CO3 and CO4 during course delivery**.

Action Plan

1. **Enhance clarity** in feedback survey questions to better reflect CO intent.

2. **Conduct orientation sessions** on course outcomes before distributing surveys to ensure informed responses.

3. **Encourage broader participation** through in-class completion and reminders to improve response rates.

4. **Increase engagement** with CO3 and CO4 concepts through reflective activities and practical discussions to boost student perception and indirect attainment.

Course Name : Professional Values and Ethics

Course Code : VEC 101

1.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	18 / 51	19 / 51	15 / 51	16 / 51	16 / 51	17 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 1 — Threshold :2 — Total Questions :6 — Total Students :23 — Responses Obtained :23

Justification

1. **Low Attainment Levels Across All COs**
   Despite positive feedback from some students, the number of students scoring above threshold is **less than 50%**, leading to low indirect attainment.

2. **Limited Response Base (23/51)**
   Since less than half of the students responded, the **sample may not be fully representative**, affecting reliability of results.

3. **Positive Perception, But Weak Impact**
   All COs received similar minimal scores, indicating either **uniformly average perception** or **lack of clarity/engagement** with the feedback form.

Action Plan

1. **Increase Participation**

   o Conduct feedback collection in class with faculty support to ensure **minimum 80% response rate**.
   o Incentivize or emphasize the importance of survey participation.

2. **Improve Feedback Form Clarity**
3.
   o Simplify questions linked to each CO.
   o Use examples to help students relate COs to their learning.

4. **Awareness Building**

   o Brief students on **what COs mean**, how they're assessed, and how their feedback contributes to academic improvement.

Course Name : Indian Knowledge System in Social Work Profession

Course Code : IKS 101

1.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	13 / 51	16 / 51	19 / 51	13 / 51	17 / 51	13 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 1   Threshold :2   Total Questions :6   Total Students :23   Responses Obtained :23

Justification:

1. **Low Attainment Across COs**
   None of the COs achieved more than ~37% students above threshold → reflects limited student agreement or engagement with learni**ng outcomes.**

2. **Low Response Rate (45%)**
   While 23 students responded, the denominator used is 51, not 23. This mismatch results in underreported attainment, skewing data.

3. **Potential Misalignment**
   Questions mapped to COs may not have clearly reflected the learning outcomes → confusion in feedback.

1. **Action Plan**
2. Improve Survey Participation

3. Ensure in-class completion of surveys to boost response rate to 80%+.

4. Use class mentors or coordinators to follow up on pending responses.

5. Clarify Feedback Items

6. Reword survey questions to be more CO-specific and student-friendly.

7. Provide a short brief or visual mapping of COs to actual classroom activities before feedback collection.

8. Explain the purpose of CO-based surveys and how student feedback impacts curriculum improvement and teaching methods.

2.CO ATTAINMENT

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.6	1.75	0.85	-
CO2	1.2	1	1.15	2.62	-1.47	-
CO3	3	1	2.6	2.62	-0.02	-
CO4	3	1	2.6	2.12	0.48	-

Justification:

High Gap in CO2: CO2 had a significant negative attainment gap compared to the target.
1. **Student Performance Analysis**: Many students scored between **40%–50%**, just below the set threshold of 50%.
2. **Unfair Penalization**: Students with partial understanding were not counted as achievers due to a high threshold.
3. **Threshold Adjustment**: Reducing the threshold to **40%** allows inclusion of moderately performing students.
4. **Outcome**: This change improves **direct attainment** and significantly **reduces the attainment gap** for CO2.

Action Plan

Lower Threshold: Set threshold from **50% to 40%** for assessments mapped to CO2.
1. **Update Attainment Calculations**: Recalculate direct attainment using the revised threshold.
2. **Provide Academic Support**: Identify students in the 40–50% range and offer support sessions.
3. **Enhance Teaching Strategies**: Use simplified explanations and real-life examples to strengthen understanding of historical applications in social work.
4. **Continuous Monitoring**: Track CO2-linked performance in upcoming assessments to ensure sustained improvement.

Course Name : Wellness and Yoga

Course Code : CC 101

1.THRESHOLD

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold In %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	Unit 1 - Lifestyle Disease and Importance of Positive Social Relationships	Formative	5	3.82	50	1	5	0	6	0	5	0	7	0	27	39/51
2	Unit 2 - Introduction to Yoga and Yogic Practices	Formative	5	4.6	50	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	7	0	38	50/51
3	Unit 3 - Skills Lab	Formative	10	8.31	50	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	13	10	18	48/51
4	External Exam - SEM 1 - 24-2.5	Summative	30	19.28	50	0	1	0	3	8	4	10	8	7	0	30/41
5	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	16.74	50	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	22	13	49/51

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.6	1.87	0.73	-
CO2	3	1	2.6	2.37	0.23	-
CO3	3	1	2.6	2.75	-0.14	-
CO4	1.79	1	1.63	3	-1.37	-

Justification:

1. **50% threshold** was too stringent for current performance levels, especially in **External Exam**, which significantly affected CO4's attainment.

2. Lowering to **40%** better reflects realistic student learning without compromising quality.

3. This improves fairness while still maintaining minimum learning expectations.

Action Plan

1. Change threshold from 50% to 40% for assessments.

2. Helps more students meet the target and reduces the negative gap.

2.INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 1		Threshold :2	Total Questions :5	Total Students :23	Responses Obtained :23
CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	13 / 51	14 / 51	16 / 51	14 / 51	12 / 51	16 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification:

1. **Low Participation:** Only 23 out of 51 students responded, which reduces the accuracy of feedback.

2. **Low Scores:** Most students scored CO-related questions just around the threshold, leading to Level 1 attainment.

3. **Lack of Clarity:** Students may not fully understand the COs or the purpose of the survey.

4. **Gap in Perception:** Student feedback doesn't align well with the actual course performance.

Action Plan

1. **Improve Response Rate:** Conduct surveys during class to ensure more students participate.

2. **Simplify Communication:** Explain COs and survey purpose in simple terms before sharing.

3. **Encourage Honest Feedback:** Assure students that feedback is confidential and helps improve teaching.

4. **Mid-Sem Feedback:** Take feedback mid-semester too, so issues can be fixed early.

5. **Faculty Review:** Discuss feedback in faculty meetings to take necessary actions.

BSW SEM 3

Course Name: Social Work Practice With Groups
Course Code: Major 201

1)THRESHOLD

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	External Exam Sem 3 24-25	Summative	30	13.98	50	0	1	1	19	18	7	3	2	0	0	19/51
2	UNIT 2 / MCQ	Formative	6	3.67	50	0	0	1	4	14	5	12	8	8	0	43/52
3	UNIT 3 / REFLECTIVE ANSWER	Formative	4	3.11	50	0	0	1	0	13	0	0	17	0	21	51/52
4	UNIT 1 / ASSIGNMENT	Formative	10	6.43	50	1	0	1	3	3	10	19	12	3	0	44/52
5	Internal Assessment overall	Formative	20	13.46	50	0	0	0	3	3	10	18	15	3	0	48/52

Justification

1. **Low External Exam Performance:** Only 37% of students crossed the threshold in the summative exam, indicating a gap between student preparation and assessment expectations.
2. **High Internal Assessment Success**: Over 80% of students performed well in formative assessments, suggesting consistent engagement and understanding during the course.
3. **Better Output in Applied Assessments:** Strong performance in reflective answers and assignments highlights that students grasp concepts more effectively through practical and expressive formats.

Action Plan

1. **Adjust Threshold for Practical Attainability:** Reduce the current threshold slightly to align with student capabilities while still maintaining academic standards, especially for summative exams.
2. **Strengthen Assessment Alignment**: Bring formative and summative assessments in closer alignment in terms of structure and difficulty, ensuring better preparedness and outcome consistency.

2)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2		Total Questions :6	Total Students :24		Responses Obtained :24

CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	20 / 52	14 / 52	13 / 52	13 / 52	15 / 52	15 / 52
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification

1. **Low Attainment Across COs**: All Course Outcomes (CO1–CO5) attained Level 1, indicating minimal indirect attainment despite full response collection.
2. **Responses Below Threshold**: Most questions received fewer than 50% responses above the threshold (2/5 rating), reflecting a potential issue with student perception or survey interpretation.
3. **Participation vs. Quality**: Although the response rate was 100% (24/24), the quality of responses was low—likely due to unclear questions or lack of student seriousness in feedback.

Action Plan

1. **Refine Survey Design**: Simplify question phrasing and link them more clearly to specific COs to improve student understanding and more accurate feedback.
2. **Sensitize Students**: Brief students on the importance of honest, constructive feedback and how it impacts course improvement and accreditation.
3. **Supplement with Other Indirect Tools**: Use focus groups, one-on-one interviews, or classroom observations to triangulate and validate survey-based feedback for more reliable attainment measurement.

Course Name: Field Work-III
Course Code: Major 202

1)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis

CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	14 / 52	16 / 52	15 / 52	15 / 52	16 / 52
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 3 · Threshold :2 · Total Questions :5 · Total Students :24 · Responses Obtained :24

Justification

1. **Consistently Low Attainment (Level 1)**: All COs (CO1–CO4) scored Attainment Level 1, indicating minimal student satisfaction or clarity regarding course outcomes.
2. **Feedback Scores Below Threshold**: Although responses were obtained from all 24 students, fewer than 32% (14–16 out of 52) responses per CO crossed the threshold of 2, reflecting weak perceived effectiveness.
3. **Gap in Perception vs. Delivery**: The full response rate suggests willingness to participate, but the quality of feedback indicates either misalignment between course delivery and COs or poor question interpretation.

Action Plan

1. **Enhance Feedback Quality**: Redesign survey questions to directly reflect COs in clear, student-friendly language, avoiding ambiguity.
2. **Feedback Orientation**: Conduct a pre-survey orientation to explain the purpose and impact of honest responses on course improvement.
3. **Cross-verify Indirect Attainment**: Supplement surveys with reflective journals, peer reviews, and field supervisor feedback to ensure a holistic understanding of student perception.

Course Name: Social Work Practice With Communities
Course Code: Major 203

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember definitions of community, geographical categorizations, and models of community practice.

CO2: Understand the evolution of community social work practice in India.

CO3: Evaluate the effectiveness of community interventions and empowerment frameworks.

CO4: Apply the tools like community mapping and resource mapping to understand and address community needs

CO5: Analyz the community dynamics such as intersections of religion, caste, gender, and ableness through mapping tools.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
COMajor 203.1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1.37
COMajor 203.2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
COMajor 203.3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2.62
COMajor 203.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
COMajor 203.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Major 203	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.39

Justification

1. **Strong Higher-Order Alignment**: CO3, CO4, and CO5 show high mapping values (3.0) across all POs, indicating strong emphasis on application, evaluation, and analysis—core to community practice.
2. **Lower Cognitive Focus in CO1**: CO1 averages only 1.37, reflecting its focus on recall-based knowledge (definitions, categorizations), which justifies a lower PO alignment.
3. **Balanced Overall Mapping**: The overall average of 2.39 shows a moderate-to-strong connection with program outcomes, reflecting a well-rounded course structure combining knowledge, understanding, and application.

Action Plan

1. **Refine Initial Assumptions**: Review CO1 and CO2 mapping for over/underestimation, especially in lower-level cognitive domains, to ensure they truly reflect intended learning.
2. **Stakeholder Validation**: Involve faculty and industry experts in validating the mapping matrix to align better with current fieldwork and practice demands.
3. **Use CO-PO Mapping for Assessment Design**: Leverage the mapping to fine-tune assessments, ensuring that questions and tasks reflect the mapped POs, especially for CO4 and CO5 (application-heavy).

2)THRESHOLD

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	External Exam Sem 3 24-25	Summative	30	18.63	50	0	0	0	3	5	17	15	9	2	0	45/51
2	Unit 1/Vulnerable Community	Formative	5	2.38	50	0	17	0	13	0	7	0	15	0	0	22/52
3	UNIT 2/Models of C.O.	Formative	5	3.88	50	0	0	0	5	2	7	8	7	10	13	47/52
4	UNIT 3/Social work practice with communities	Formative	5	3.48	50	0	0	0	6	2	7	13	22	1	1	46/52
5	Internal Assessment overall	Formative	20	13.68	50	0	0	0	1	2	9	20	12	8	0	49/52

% Range of marks

Justification

1. **Strong Summative Performance**: 88% of students (45/51) scored above the threshold in the external exam, reflecting effective overall understanding and retention of course concepts.
2. **Varied Formative Outcomes**: Some units, like UNIT 1(Vulnerable Community) had lower attainment (22/52 above threshold), suggesting students struggled with early conceptual clarity or question design.
3. **Appropriate Threshold Setting**: With consistent internal success (e.g., 49/52 above threshold in Internal Assessment Overall), the 50% threshold appears suitable, though minor adjustments may be needed for certain units.

Action Plan

1. **Review Low-Performing Units**: Analyze question clarity and teaching strategies for *Unit 1* to address content gaps and improve future student performance.
2. **Maintain Threshold with Targeted Support**: Retain the 50% threshold, but provide focused remediation for topics or units with lower scores through tutorials or peer learning.
3. **Align Formative with Summative Standards**: Ensure formative assessments follow similar cognitive levels and format as the summative exam to reinforce consistent learning progression.

3)INDIRECT ANALYSIS

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2	Total Questions :6		Total Students :24	Responses Obtained :24
CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	16 / 52	18 / 52	16 / 52	19 / 52	15 / 52	15 / 52
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification

1. **Low Attainment Across COs**: All Course Outcomes (CO1–CO5) received Attainment Level 1, indicating low student satisfaction or unclear perception of learning outcomes.
2. **Moderate Response Quality Despite 100% Participation**: Although all 24 students responded, the number of responses above the threshold remained low (15–19 out of 52), signaling a possible disconnect between delivery and perception.
3. **Possible Gaps in Question Interpretation**: Uniformly low ratings across COs suggest that either the survey questions lacked clarity or students didn't relate them clearly to their learning experience.

Action Plan

1. **Revise Survey Tool**: Redesign feedback questions using simpler, outcome-linked language to ensure students can easily relate them to their learning experience.
2. **Student Awareness Sessions**: Brief students on the importance of meaningful feedback and how it helps shape and improve their academic journey.
3. **Use Complementary Feedback Methods**: Augment survey data with reflective exercises, group feedback, or mentor reviews to capture a more accurate picture of indirect attainment.

Course Name: Contemporary Development Studies
Course Code: Minor 201

1)THRESHOLD

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	External Exam Sem 3 24-25	Summative	60	34.28	50	1	0	0	2	12	12	19	4	0	0	36/51
2	UNIT 1/Contemporary Development Studies	Formative	20	19.07	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	0	41	52/52
3	UNIT 2/Contemporary Development Studies	Formative	20	11.34	50	4	0	0	1	12	15	19	1	0	0	47/52
4	UNIT 3/Contemporary Development Studies	Formative	20	19.15	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	43	52/52
5	UNIT 4/Contemporary Development Studies	Formative	20	11.71	50	1	0	0	0	1	48	0	2	0	0	51/52
6	Internal Assessment overall	Formative	40	28.25	50	0	0	1	0	0	1	15	34	1	0	51/52

Justification

1. **Strong Internal Performance**: Most internal assessments, especially Unit 1, Unit 3, and Internal Overall, show excellent student performance with near-universal achievement above threshold (e.g., 52/52, 51/52).
2. **Moderate External Exam Results**: 36 out of 51 students crossed the threshold in the summative assessment, indicating some challenges in long-format or integrative questions compared to formative tasks.
3. **Disparity in Unit-Wise Scores**: Unit 2 and Unit 4 show relatively lower average marks (~11/20), suggesting content difficulty or variation in student understanding of specific topics.

Action Plan

1. **Re-evaluate Unit 2 & 4 Delivery**: Review teaching methods or materials for Unit 2 and 4 to identify gaps, and provide reinforcement sessions or revised instructional support.
2. **Adjust Threshold for Fairness**: Slightly lower the threshold (if needed) for assessments showing systemic struggle while maintaining academic rigor through compensatory strategies.
3. **Align Summative with Formative**: Analyze question patterns to ensure that summative assessments reflect the structure and cognitive level of formative tasks, aiding in better performance continuity.

3)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 3   Threshold :2   Total Questions :5   Total Students :24   Responses Obtained :24

CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	15 / 52	13 / 52	15 / 52	18 / 52	14 / 52
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1

Justification

1. **Full Participation, Low Above-Threshold Count**: While 100% of enrolled students responded (24/24), only a small portion crossed the set threshold, indicating possible gaps in students' understanding of the survey or perceived attainment.
2. **Uniform Low Attainment Level**: All COs show an attainment level of 1, which suggests students may not have clearly recognized the learning achieved, despite strong direct performance in CO1–CO3.
3. **Need for CO Awareness**: The indirect data reflects a gap in awareness or articulation of COs among students, highlighting the importance of connecting course content and assessments explicitly to COs.

Action Plan

1. **Improve CO Communication**: Ensure students are made aware of the course outcomes at regular intervals and how their activities and assessments map to each CO.
2. **Clarify Feedback Purpose**: Conduct a brief orientation before survey distribution to help students understand how to evaluate their learning relative to each CO.
3. **Integrate Reflection Activities**: Add activities like short reflective notes or peer discussions mapped to COs, enabling students to recognize their progress and give more informed feedback.

4)GAP ANALYSIS

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	2.99	1	2.59	1.87	0.71	-
CO2	3	1	2.6	2.25	0.35	-
CO3	2.99	1	2.59	2.62	-0.03	-
CO4	1.2	1	1.15	2.75	-1.6	-

Justification

1. **Uneven CO Weightage Distribution**: CO4 has received only 5.55% weightage compared to others like CO2 (40%), which has limited students' opportunity to demonstrate competence in that outcome.
2. **CO3 and CO4 Represented in Only One Assessment**: The limited evaluation scope for CO3 and CO4 impacts the reliability of attainment data and skews final attainment calculation.
3. **Gap in CO4**: A significant negative gap (-1.6) for CO4 highlights the need for improved visibility, engagement, and reinforcement of this outcome in both instruction and assessment.

Action Plan

1. **Ensure Balanced CO Distribution:** Redistribute assessment weightage more evenly across all COs to ensure fair representation and accurate reflection of learning, reducing future attainment gaps.
2. **Expand Assessment Coverage for CO3 & CO4:** Include multiple assessments mapped to CO3 and CO4, such as class activities, assignments, or short tests, to strengthen attainment data.
3. **Link Learning Clearly with COs**: Reinforce the relevance of each CO throughout the course to help students better connect assessments and learning outcomes, improving both direct and indirect attainment.

Course Name: Introduction To Economics
Course Code: OE 201

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember definitions and basic concepts of economics, including demand, supply, and market structures.

CO2: Understanding the factors of production (land, labor, capital) and their characteristics

CO3: Analyzing the theories of national income, rent, wages, interest, and profit

CO4: Evaluate the effectiveness of economic policies addressing challenges in primary, secondary, and tertiary sectors in India.

CO5: Apply the laws of demand and supply to interpret economic behavior.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
COOE 201.1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1.37
COOE 201.2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
COOE 201.3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2.5
COOE 201.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
COOE 201.5	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2.25
OE 201	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.2	2	2.2	2	2.22

Justification

1. Most COs are well aligned with relevant POs, especially CO3, CO4, and CO5, which involve analysis and evaluation.
2. CO1 has a relatively lower average due to its basic-level nature, focused on recall and definitions.

Action Plan

1. Revisit the CO-PO mapping for all COs to ensure proper alignment, especially CO1.
2. Conduct a faculty review session to validate and fine-tune the PO levels for each CO.
3. Update the mapping to reflect the actual depth of teaching and assessment for better accuracy in future evaluations.

2)THRESHOLD

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	UNIT 1/What is Economics?	Formative	5	2.16	50	6	7	0	15	3	16	0	5	0	0	24/52
2	UNIT 2/Family and Firm	Formative	10	9.11	50	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	16	26	51/52
3	UNIT 3/Market and Nation	Formative	10	8.86	50	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	7	23	17	52/52
4	External Exam Sem 3 24-25	Summative	30	17.38	50	0	0	1	5	12	10	18	3	2	0	37/51
5	Internal Assessment overall	Formative	20	15.84	50	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	18	21	2	51/51

Justification

1. Unit 1 (Formative) had a lower average score (2.16/5) and fewer students above the threshold, indicating it may have been challenging for students as an introductory topic.
2. The threshold for Unit 1 might be high for beginners, making it difficult to meet the attainment level.
3. In the External Exam, the current threshold might be slightly high considering the paper's overall difficulty, which may affect attainment despite fair performance by students.

Action Plan

1. Consider slightly reducing the threshold for Unit 1 to better reflect initial student learning levels.
2. Reassess the external exam threshold to ensure it aligns with the average difficulty and performance trends.
3. Conduct regular formative assessments with feedback to monitor understanding and address learning gaps early.

3)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	13 / 51	12 / 51	15 / 51	15 / 51	16 / 51	18 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 3   Threshold :2   Total Questions :6   Total Students :24   Responses Obtained :24

Justification

1. All COs achieved attainment level 1, which indicates that students generally had a positive but basic understanding of the course outcomes.
2. The response count was low (24 out of 51), which may not fully reflect the overall student perception.
3. Variation in CO response scores suggests a need for more focused feedback collection to capture CO-specific insights.

Action Plan

1. Improve student participation in the feedback process through timely reminders and brief orientation on the importance of surveys.
2. Clarify survey questions to ensure they are directly aligned with specific COs for more accurate indirect assessment.
3. Include mid-course feedback as a strategy to track student perception early and take corrective measures during the course.

Course Name: Social Entrepreneurship
Course Code: VSC 201

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember the steps for Ideation, Design Thinking and Registration of a Social Enterprise.

CO2: Understand the Social Entrepreneurship Ecosystem, Traits & Competencies of a Social Entrepreneur.

CO3: Analyze the feasibility of opportunities, business plans, and market research for social enterprises.

CO4: Evaluate the Sustainability Strategies for Social Enterprises, including Financial Plans and Resource Linkages.

CO5: Apply the Ideation / Design Thinking Process and Innovation to craft and test competitive Lean Canvas and Business Plans.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
COVSC 201.1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1.62
COVSC 201.2	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
COVSC 201.3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2.62
COVSC 201.4	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2.62
COVSC 201.5	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.87
VSC 201	2.6	2	2.6	2	2.6	2.6	2.2	2.2	2.34

Justification

1. CO1 has the lowest average (1.62) among all COs, indicating weaker alignment with Program Outcomes.
2. This may be because CO1 is more theoretical, focusing on remembering steps and definitions rather than application or analysis.
3. Enhancing its depth and relevance can help align it better with PO expectations, especially related to problem-solving and practical skills.

Action Plan

1. Incorporate practical tasks like short design-thinking exercises, mini-projects, or registration simulations to make CO1 more engaging and application-oriented.
2. Link CO1 more clearly to entrepreneurial outcomes (like PO3, PO5), by showing how these foundational concepts contribute to real-world social enterprise development.
3. Review the mapping scale for CO1 to ensure it reflects any improved instructional strategies and student performance in upcoming assessments.

2)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2	Total Questions :6		Total Students :24	Responses Obtained :24
CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	16 / 52	16 / 52	16 / 52	17 / 52	17 / 52	13 / 52
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification

1. All COs have attained Level 1, indicating low perception of course understanding among students through feedback.
2. Although the response rate (24/24) is good, the number of students scoring above the threshold is low (13 to 17 out of 52).
3. This may suggest a gap in students' perception or recall of the course content relevance, especially for CO5.

Action Plan

1. Enhance student engagement during the course by connecting lessons with real-life social enterprise examples and hands-on activities.
2. Increase awareness of COs and their purpose by discussing them openly during sessions, helping students relate feedback questions to what they learned.
3. Improve the feedback process with better-designed surveys and orientation so students can provide more accurate, reflective responses.

Course Name: Hindi
Course Code: AEC 201

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: To remember basic Hindi grammar rules to enhance their foundational language skills.

CO2: To understand the importance of Hindi in professional communication, especially in social work, for effective engagement.

CO3: To apply reading comprehension skills to analyze articles, periodicals, and literary texts for critical insights.

CO4: To analyze the cultural and social themes in Hindi literature and their relevance to daily life for deeper understanding.

CO5: To evaluate personal language proficiency and areas for improvement in speaking, reading, and writing for self-enhancement.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
COAEC 201.1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
COAEC 201.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1.25
COAEC 201.3	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	1.75
COAEC 201.4	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
COAEC 201.5	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	3	1.87
AEC 201	2	1.5	1.25	1.25	1.4	1.75	2	2.25	1.57

Justification

1. Average CO-PO mapping score is 1.57, which shows a moderate alignment between course outcomes and program outcomes.
2. Some COs (like CO1) are mapped with very limited POs, which affects the overall average and weakens the contribution to broader program goals.
3. COs such as CO4 and CO5 show a strong and balanced mapping across multiple POs, contributing positively to the course's overall effectiveness.

Action Plan

1. Revisit and expand CO1's mapping to include relevant POs such as PO1 (basic knowledge) and PO2 (understanding), which align with grammar skills.
2. Validate all CO-PO links to ensure they accurately reflect the teaching and assessment methods used in the course.
3. Use CO4 and CO5 as references to strengthen mapping of other COs, aiming for balanced contribution to all applicable program outcomes.

2)THRESHOLD

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	UNIT 1/KABIR DAAS	Formative	5	4.57	50	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	46	48/52
2	UNIT 2/SHORT QUESTIONS	Formative	15	10.06	50	1	0	2	0	5	7	14	14	8	1	45/52
3	External Exam Sem 3 24-25	Summative	30	16.34	50	3	0	3	10	7	8	6	7	7	0	29/51
4	Internal Assessment overall	Formative	20	15.09	50	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	18	15	1	49/51

Justification

1. UNIT 1 and Internal Assessment show very good performance, with a majority of students scoring above the threshold, indicating clarity in concepts and effective teaching methods.
2. UNIT 2 performance is satisfactory but shows a slight dip in middle ranges (41-60%), suggesting varied understanding among students.
3. External Exam has a lower percentage of students above threshold (29/51), indicating the exam might have been relatively difficult or threshold too high.

Action Plan

1. Review the threshold level for External Exam, as the current setting may be on the higher side; adjust if needed to reflect realistic student performance.
2. Strengthen revision sessions and exam-oriented preparation to improve external exam outcomes.
3. Continue effective strategies used in UNIT 1 and Internal Assessment across all units to maintain consistency in performance.

Course Name: Participatory Rural Appraisal
Course Code: FP 201

1)CO PO MAPPING

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2		Total Questions :6	Total Students :24		Responses Obtained :24
CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5	
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	
Student Count above Threshold	19 / 52	14 / 52	14 / 52	16 / 52	13 / 52	20 / 52	
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1	

Justification

1. Overall Attainment Level is 1 across all COs, indicating that while students met the minimum threshold, there's scope for improvement in perception.
2. Lower response rates per question (13–20 out of 52) suggest limited engagement or possible ambiguity in survey understanding.
3. Despite this, consistent scores across COs reflect that students found the course relevant and outcomes understandable.

Action Plan

1. Improve survey communication by briefing students on its importance and ensuring clarity in question phrasing.
2. Encourage 100% participation through reminders or by integrating feedback activities into class sessions.
3. Validate indirect attainment with informal feedback during sessions to supplement structured surveys.

Course Name: Theatre Skills
Course Code: CC 201

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember the contributions of key figures like Bertolt Brecht and Dario Fo in people's theatre.

CO2: Understand the role of theatre as a medium for social change and its ethical considerations.

CO3: Analyze the different theatre practices, including street plays and folk traditions, for their impact on communities.

CO4: Evaluate the effectiveness of theatre practices in addressing social issues and engaging audiences.

CO5: Apply the acting, improvisation, scriptwriting, and direction techniques to create impactful performances.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
COCC 201.1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1.5
COCC 201.2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
COCC 201.3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2.75
COCC 201.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
COCC 201.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
CC 201	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.45

Justification

1. CO1 has the lowest average (1.5) due to its focus on remembering theoretical content, which typically has less direct application compared to other COs involving skills and performance.
2. Higher averages in CO3 to CO5 reflect strong alignment with practical and community-focused learning, central to the course's nature.
3. Overall average (2.45) indicates good alignment between course outcomes and program outcomes, especially in practical and socially engaging aspects.

Action Plan

1. Revise CO1 delivery to include interactive elements like presentations or short performances based on historical figures to improve PO alignment.
2. Validate CO-PO mapping through faculty review and incorporate student feedback on how each PO is reflected in activities.
3. Sustain practical focus in CO3–CO5 by continuing hands-on sessions, real-world projects, and performance evaluations.

2)THRESHOLD

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2		Total Questions :6	Total Students :24		Responses Obtained :24

CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	17 / 51	15 / 51	15 / 51	17 / 51	11 / 51	16 / 51
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification

1. Attainment Level is low (Level 1) across all COs despite full participation in the survey, indicating a need for improved student satisfaction or perception.
2. CO5 has the lowest count (11/51) above the threshold, suggesting challenges in students applying performance techniques or recognizing their own progress.
3. Responses may reflect a gap in understanding how course activities align with outcomes, not necessarily a lack of actual learning.

Action Plan

1. Improve survey awareness by explaining COs and their relevance before the feedback process to help students respond meaningfully.
2. Engage students in reflections and discussions post-activities to reinforce learning outcomes, especially for practical components like CO5.
3. Enhance feedback quality by revising question framing in the survey to be clearer and more directly connected to each CO.

3)GAP ANALYSIS

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.6	1.5	1.1	-
CO2	2.99	1	2.59	2	0.58	-
CO3	3	1	2.6	2.75	-0.14	-
CO5	3	1	2.6	3	-0.39	-

Justification

1. CO1 has the highest gap (1.1) because of a low indirect attainment (Level 1), even though direct attainment was excellent (Level 3).
2. This significant gap in CO1 affects the overall average and final attainment, pulling down the perception of course effectiveness.
3. Other COs (like CO2, CO3, and CO5) also show gaps mainly due to low indirect attainment, not due to performance in assessments.

Action Plan

1. Explain CO relevance clearly to students during the course to improve their understanding and responses in feedback.
2. Use reflection sessions after learning activities to reinforce connections between what was taught and the expected COs (especially for CO1).
3. Revise survey questions to ensure they reflect the actual learning outcomes and practical experiences more accurately.

Batch : Batch 24-26
BSW SEM 5 (AY 24-25)

Course Name : Social Work Theories
Course Code : SWTH 5.1

Threshold

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	UNIT 1/INTRODUCTION TO THEORY	Formative	10	8.1	50	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	17	15	7	56/56
2	UNIT 2/BEHAVIOURAL AND SYSTEM THEORIES	Formative	10	6.66	50	0	0	0	4	5	19	13	8	7	0	52/56
3	UNIT 3/MARXIST AND FEMINIST THEORIES	Formative	10	7.6	50	0	0	0	1	2	7	14	16	16	0	55/56
4	UNIT 4/POST MODERN AND SOCIAL JUSTICE PERSPECTIVE	Formative	10	6.92	50	0	0	0	1	2	8	34	11	0	0	55/56
5	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	Summative	30	18.64	50	0	0	0	1	5	19	23	7	0	0	49/55
6	Class Participation	Formative	2.5	1.8	50	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	45	0	0	45/56
7	Attendence	Formative	2.5	0.81	50	25	9	0	6	0	3	0	4	0	9	16/56
8	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	12.44	50	0	0	0	0	5	24	19	8	0	0	54/56

Justification:
Attendance and Participation Issues: Very low attendance (only 16/56 above threshold) and limited class participation negatively impacted internal scores and engagement.

Action:
Strengthen Student Engagement & Attendance: Implement interactive strategies and track attendance rigorously to boost participation and formative scores.

Indirect Attainment

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 5		Threshold :2	Total Questions :4	Total Students :55	Responses Obtained :55
CO's	**CO1**	**CO2**		**CO3**	**CO4**
	Q1	Q2		Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	15 / 56	21 / 56		16 / 56	27 / 56
Attainment Level	1	1		1	2
Attainment	1	1		1	2

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	2.39	1	2.11	1.62	0.48	-
CO2	1	1	1	2.87	-1.87	-
CO3	2.2	1	1.96	2.75	-0.79	-
CO4	1.8	2	1.84	1.5	0.34	-

Justifications

1. CO2 and CO3 Underperformance
   Final attainment for CO2 (1) and CO3 (1.96) fell short of targets, indicating weak conceptual grasp and/or insufficient assessment mapping.
2. Low Indirect Attainment
   Feedback for CO1 to CO3 was consistently low, possibly due to limited student awareness or clarity of course objectives.

Actions

1. Balance CO Mapping Across All Assessments
   Revisit assessment design to ensure even and meaningful CO coverage that reflects intended learning outcomes.
2. Improve Survey Awareness & Response Quality
   Educate students on the importance of honest feedback and course outcomes to enhance the reliability of indirect attainment data.

Course Name : Social Movements
Course Code : SOMO 5.2

Co mapping to formative and summative exams

Formative (CIE) Assessments

Sr No	Exam Name	Total Marks	Threshold in %	CO1	CO2	Avg Attainment
1	UNIT 1/CHRACHTERISTICS	3	50	3	-	3
2	UNIT 2/THEORIES ON SOCIAL MOVEMENTS	2	50	-	3	3
3	UNIT 3/POSTER OR CREATIVE WRITING ON MOVEMENTS	5	50	3	3	3
4	UNIT 4/MUSIC AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS	5	50	-	3	3
6	Internal Assessment Overall	20	50	3	3	3

Summative (SEE) Assessments

Sr No	Exam Name	Total Marks	Threshold in %	CO1	CO2	CO3	CO4	Avg Attainment
5	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	30	50	2	2	1	1	1.5

Justifications
1. Uneven CO Mapping
   CO3 and CO4 are only assessed in the summative exam, leading to significantly low direct attainment (0.6). Lack of formative coverage skews overall performance.

Action
1. Balance CO Mapping Across All Assessments
   Integrate CO3 and CO4 into formative assessments through activities like case analysis, group presentations, or advocacy simulations to ensure continuous evaluation.

Threshold and Indirect attainment

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	UNIT 1/CHRACHTERISTICS	Formative	3	1.53	50	0	0	0	26	0	0	30	0	0	0	30/56
2	UNIT 2/THEORIES ON SOCIAL MOVEMENTS	Formative	2	1.44	50	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	25	56/56
3	UNIT 3/POSTER OR CREATIVE WRITING ON MOVEMENTS	Formative	5	3.33	50	0	0	0	2	0	33	0	21	0	0	54/56
4	UNIT 4/MUSIC AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS	Formative	5	3.96	50	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	18	0	18	56/56
5	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	Summative	30	17.54	50	0	0	1	2	1	28	23	0	0	0	51/55
6	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	12.37	50	0	0	0	1	11	17	17	8	2	0	51/56

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 5   Threshold :2   Total Questions :4   Total Students :55   Responses Obtained :55

CO's	CO1	CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	16 / 56	14 / 56	25 / 56	22 / 56
Attainment Level	1	1	2	1
Attainment	1	1	2	1

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	2.39	1	2.11	1.12	0.98	-
CO2	2.4	1	2.12	1.87	0.25	-
CO3	0.6	2	0.88	2.75	-1.87	-
CO4	0.6	1	0.68	2.87	-2.19	-

Justifications

1.Indirect Attainment Gap
 CO3 and CO4 received lower student feedback (Attainment: 2 and 1), indicating poor conceptual understanding or unclear learning outcomes.

2.Overambitious Targets & High Thresholds
 The set target levels and thresholds were higher than student performance trends, contributing to attainment gaps across COs, especially CO3 and CO4.

Actions

1. Redesign Assessment Tools & Rubrics
    Align assessment questions and rubrics closely with CO learning verbs and real-world application to bridge conceptual gaps and improve CO-level performance.

2. Strengthen Feedback & Student Awareness
    Conduct pre-survey briefings to enhance student awareness of COs and improve feedback reliability; also, collect qualitative feedback to support score interpretation.

Course Name : Research
Course Code : RES 5.3

Co po mapping Target

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	PO8	Average
CORES 5.3.1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1.12
CORES 5.3.2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1.87
CORES 5.3.3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2.75
CORES 5.3.4	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.62
RES 5.3	**2**	**2**	**2.25**	**2**	**1.75**	**2.5**	**2.25**	**2**	**2.09**

Justification
1. Uneven CO Mapping Across Assessments
   CO1 is overrepresented in lower-order tasks (quiz), while CO3 & CO4, which are higher-order (SPSS, charts), lack deeper formative engagement.

Action

1. Balance CO Mapping Across All Assessments
   Redistribute COs more evenly by integrating reflective, analytical components for CO3 & CO4 in both formative and summative tasks.

Threshold Affecting direct attainment and Indirect Attainment

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	Summative	60	32.43	50	2	0	2	4	15	11	13	7	1	0	33/55
2	unit 1/Quiz	Formative	5	4.19	50	2	0	0	2	0	8	0	13	0	31	52/56
3	unit 2&3/Proposal making (Assignment)	Formative	10	6.1	50	0	0	2	4	14	14	12	8	2	0	50/56
4	unit 4/Exporting data to SPSS	Formative	5	4.6	50	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	0	40	55/56
5	unit 5/Crearting tables and charts	Formative	5	2.51	50	0	10	0	16	0	21	0	9	0	0	30/56
6	unit 6/Short Notes	Formative	5	2.48	50	0	13	0	17	0	15	0	8	0	3	26/56
7	Class Participation	Formative	5	4.51	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	0	29	56/56
8	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	40	24.42	50	0	0	0	0	7	21	23	5	0	0	54/56

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 5   Threshold :2   Total Questions :4   Total Students :55   Responses Obtained :55

CO's	CO1	CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	20 / 56	19 / 56	22 / 56	22 / 56
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1	1	1	1

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	2.63	1	2.3	1.12	1.17	-
CO2	2.51	1	2.2	1.87	0.33	-
CO3	2.59	1	2.27	2.75	-0.48	-
CO4	2.4	1	2.12	2.62	-0.5	-

Justifications

1.Low Indirect Attainment Across All Cos:All COs scored level 1 in feedback despite moderate direct attainment, showing gaps in student understanding and engagement.

2.Mismatch Between Targets and Performance:Over-ambitious targets and a high threshold (50%) resulted in notable gaps, especially in CO3 and CO4.

Actions

1. Revise Assessment Design & Rubrics:Align tasks more clearly with cognitive levels—e.g., critical analysis in proposal writing and visual interpretation in data/chart exercises.

2. Improve Student Orientation & Feedback Collection:Introduce pre-feedback CO explanation and interactive feedback tools to increase clarity, participation, and accuracy of indirect attainment.

Course Name : Education
Course Code : EDU 5.4

Threshold

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	Summative	30		50	1	1	2	26	6	13	2	1	2	0	18/55
2	UNIT 1/ MCQ	Formative	3	1.96	50	0	3	0	3	10	0	19	0	21	0	50/56
3	unit 3	Formative	3	1.63	50	5	4	0	11	7	0	9	0	20	0	36/56
4	unit 4	Formative	4	1.95	50	0	1	4	9	27	0	15	0	0	0	42/56
5	unit 2/assignment	Formative	5	3.55	50	0	1	4	1	4	8	12	12	8	6	50/56
6	Class Participation	Formative	2.5	1.06	50	0	0	0	52	0	1	0	3	0	0	4/56
7	Attendence	Formative	2.5	1.58	50	6	7	0	7	0	6	0	11	0	19	36/56
8	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	12.12	50	0	0	0	2	9	22	16	6	1	0	52/56

Justification

1. High Threshold & Attendance Impact
    Very few students met attendance and class participation thresholds (only 4/56), lowering internal marks and overall attainment.

Action

1. Reevaluate and Moderate Threshold Levels
    Set realistic thresholds based on actual performance data while still maintaining academic standards.

Co mapping

Sr No	Exam Name	Date	Total Marks	Threshold in %	CO1	CO2	CO3	CO4	Avg Attainment
2	UNIT 1/ MCQ	02/09/2024	3	50	3	-	-	-	3
3	unit 3	03/02/2025	3	50	-	3	-	-	3
4	unit 4	03/02/2025	4	50	-	-	3	-	3
5	unit 2/assignment	13/02/2025	5	50	-	-	3	3	3
6	Class Participation	13/02/2025	2.5	50	-	-	1	1	1
7	Attendence	05/02/2025	2.5	50	-	-	3	3	3
8	Internal Assessment Overall	14/02/2025	20	50	3	3	3	3	3

Summative (SEE) Assessments

Sr No	Exam Name	Date	Total Marks	Threshold in %	CO1	CO2	Avg Attainment
1	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	20/10/2024	30	50	2.5	2	2.25

Justifications

CO3 & CO4 Performance Gaps
 Final attainment for CO3 and CO4 is significantly below target due to limited and uneven assessment coverage.

Actions

Balance CO Mapping Across All Assessments
 Ensure each CO is linked to multiple assessments, with clear and consistent coverage to reflect true learning outcomes.

Indirect attainment and gap

Name : Course Exit Survey - BSW - SEM 5   **Threshold :** 2   **Total Questions :** 4   **Total Students :** 55   **Responses Obtained :** 55

CO's	CO1	CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	18 / 56	25 / 56	19 / 56	22 / 56
Attainment Level	1	2	1	1
Attainment	**1**	**2**	**1**	**1**

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	2.7	1	2.36	1.25	1.1	-
CO2	2.4	2	2.31	2	0.31	-
CO3	1.04	1	1.03	2.75	-1.72	-
CO4	1	1	1	2.87	-1.87	-

Justification
1.Low Indirect Attainment Across COs
 Student perception (CO1–CO4) is low in surveys, possibly due to lack of clarity or poor engagement with the course delivery.

Action
1.Improve Student Engagement & Feedback Participation
 Foster active participation through interactive methods, and sensitize students about the importance of surveys for quality improvement.

Course Name : Ageing Studies
Course Code : AGST 5.5

Threshold

<div align="center">% Range of marks</div>

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	CLASS PARTICIPATION	Formative	2.5	2.22	50	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	9/11
2	ATTENDANCE	Formative	2.5	1	50	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4/11
3	UNIT 1/Ageism	Formative	5	3.81	50	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	4	10/11
4	UNIT 2/Issues of Elderly	Formative	5	3.81	50	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	0	2	11/11
5	Unit 4/National Policy for Older persons	Formative	2.5	1.81	50	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	6/11
6	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	Summative	30	19.13	50	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	0	0	11/11
7	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	16.36	50	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	1	10/11

Justification
1. Thresholds & Low Attendance Affect Scores
    High thresholds and poor attendance (only 4/11 above threshold) impacted performance, especially in formative assessments.

Action
1. Enhance Student Engagement & Feedback Response
    Conduct interactive sessions and awareness drives to boost attendance, class participation, and meaningful feedback in surveys.

Indirect attainment

CO's	CO1	CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	4 / 11	6 / 11	6 / 11	5 / 11
Attainment Level	1	3	3	2
Attainment	1	3	3	2

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.6	1	1.6	-
CO2	3	3	3	2	1	-
CO3	1	3	1.4	2.75	-1.35	-
CO4	0.93	2	1.14	3	-1.86	-

Justifications

1. High Direct but Low Indirect Attainment in CO1 & CO4
   Students performed well in assessments (CO1 & CO4) but gave lower feedback scores, indicating a possible disconnect in perceived learning.

2. Uneven CO Performance & Coverage
   CO3 and CO4 show significant gaps due to uneven distribution across assessments, limiting opportunities for students to demonstrate learning.

Actions

2. Balance CO Mapping Across All Assessments
   Redesign internal evaluations to ensure all COs are covered uniformly to improve final attainment accuracy.

3. Reassess Threshold Levels
   Modify current threshold values based on cohort performance to maintain academic quality while being realistically attainable.

Course Name : Field Work-v
Course Code : BFW5 5.9

Indirect attainment

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	Feild work	Formative	80	58.96	50	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	28	13	0	56/56

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO3	1.2	-	0.96	1.87	-0.91	-
CO4	1.2	-	0.96	2.12	-1.16	-

Justifications

1. High Target vs. Actual Attainment
   CO3 and CO4 targets were set high, but actual final attainment is significantly lower, showing a performance gap.

2. No Indirect Attainment Data
   Feedback forms were not filled, causing absence of indirect attainment and skewing the final result.

3. Assessment Mapping Needs Balance
   COs are not evenly mapped to assessments, leading to underrepresentation in measuring actual outcomes.

Actions

1. Adjust CO Targets Based on Trends
   Recalibrate CO3 and CO4 targets by referring to past performance to set achievable benchmarks.

2. Mandate Feedback Collection
   Make feedback compulsory to gather indirect attainment and better reflect student experience.

3. Balance CO Mapping Across Assessments
   Ensure that all COs are equally represented in evaluation tools to provide fair and accurate attainment results.

Course Name : Child Rights and Protection
Course Code : CRPR 5.6

Threshold

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	Summative	30	14.99	50	0	0	0	12	25	8	6	3	0	0	24/54
2	UNIT 1/ MCQ	Formative	3	1.67	50	1	4	0	5	20	0	15	0	10	0	45/55
3	Unit 1/Child Rights	Formative	3	1.67	50	1	4	0	5	20	0	15	0	10	0	45/55
4	unit 3/POCSO	Formative	3	1.85	50	0	3	0	4	16	0	16	0	15	1	48/55
5	unit 4/Adoption	Formative	4	1.98	50	1	0	3	11	22	0	17	1	0	0	40/55
6	unit 2/assignment	Formative	5	4.14	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	7	9	25/27
7	Class Participation	Formative	2.5	1.11	50	0	0	0	45	0	7	0	3	0	0	10/55
8	Attendence	Formative	2.5	1.57	50	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	9	18/27
9	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	12.43	50	0	0	0	4	4	19	18	8	2	0	50/55

Justification

1. Uneven Performance in Summative Assessment
   The external exam (Avg: 14.99/30) saw only 24/54 students above threshold. This suggests a gap in deep understanding or exam preparedness, especially impacting CO3 and CO4.

2. Low Engagement in Participation & Attendance
   Class participation (10/55) and attendance (18/27) are significantly low, affecting overall internal assessment and engagement-based learning outcomes.

Action

1. Promote Consistent Class Participation
   Integrate marks for participation into internal assessments and use interactive, case-based learning to keep students actively engaged and attending regularly.

2. Enhance Student Preparedness for External Exams
   Conduct mock tests, revision workshops, and provide targeted feedback on weak areas before the final assessment to boost summative performance.

Co Attainment And Target Setting

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	2.99	2	2.79	1.37	1.42	-
CO2	3	2	2.8	2.25	0.54	-
CO3	2.54	3	2.63	2.87	-0.24	-
CO4	2.73	2	2.58	3	-0.41	-

Justifications

1.Strong CO1 & CO2 Attainment
 CO1 and CO2 exceeded targets, indicating a solid grasp of fundamental child rights and legal frameworks, supported by consistent direct and indirect attainment.

Actions

1. Ensure Balanced CO Coverage Across All Assessments
 Redesign assessments to equally distribute and represent all COs, ensuring no CO is under- or over-assessed. Map every question/activity clearly to COs.

Course Name : Social Inclusion and Exclusion
Course Code : SIE 5.7

Threshold

Sr	Assessment Title	Type	Total Marks	Avg Marks	Threshold in %	No of Students Scoring										Total Students above Threshold
						0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	
1	CLASS PARTICIPATION	Formative	2.5	1.83	50	0	0	0	18	0	1	0	13	0	20	34/52
2	ATTENDANCE	Formative	2.5	0.84	50	17	10	0	9	0	9	0	2	0	5	16/52
3	UNIT 1/Basic Concepts of Social Exclusion and Inclusion	Formative	5	4.03	50	1	2	0	3	0	5	0	18	0	23	46/52
4	UNIT 2/Types of Excluded communities	Formative	5	4.8	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	44	52/52
5	UNIT 3/Policies for inclusion of excluded communities	Formative	2.5	2.2	50	0	4	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	41	45/52
6	Unit 4/Social Movements for inclusion	Formative	2.5	2.23	50	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	4	0	40	44/52
7	External Exam - SEM 5 - 24-25	Summative	30	17.44	50	0	0	1	5	11	15	8	10	1	0	37/51

Justification

1. Low Attendance and Participation Affecting Learning
   Attendance (16/52) and class participation (34/52) below threshold indicate engagement issues that likely impacted performance, especially in formative assessments and indirect feedback for CO4.

Action

1. Review and Adjust Thresholds
   Re-evaluate threshold levels using current and past cohort data to maintain both academic rigor and realistic expectations.

Indirect attainment

CO's	CO1	CO2	CO3	CO4
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	25 / 52	27 / 52	35 / 52	25 / 52
Attainment Level	2	3	3	2
Attainment	**2**	**3**	**3**	**2**

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	2	2.8	1	1.79	-
CO2	3	3	3	2	1	-
CO3	2.73	3	2.78	2.87	-0.09	-
CO4	2.8	2	2.63	3	-0.37	-

Justifications

1. Strong CO1 and CO2 Achievement
   CO1 and CO2 exceeded their targets (Final Attainment: 2.8 & 3), showing effective delivery of foundational concepts and understanding of social exclusion themes.

2. Unequal CO Distribution Across Assessments
   There is an imbalance in how COs are assessed across formative and summative components, possibly skewing the reflection of student understanding in final CO attainment—especially for CO3 and CO4.

Actions

1. Ensure Balanced CO Coverage
   Restructure assessment plans to distribute all COs equally across internal and external evaluations to ensure fair and accurate attainment tracking.

2. Boost Student Engagement
   Implement strategies to improve class participation, attendance, and survey completion—such as interactive sessions, reminders, and awareness about the importance of feedback.