

OUT COME BASED EDUCATION GAP ANALYSIS REPORT 2024-2025

MSW Program



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/Sociological Perspectives	Formative	10	8.18	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	29	7	9	58/58
2	UNIT 2/Major Concepts in Sociology	Formative	10	8.32	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	23	0	58/58
3	UNIT 3/"Sociology of Gender"	Formative	10	7.82	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	40	4	0	58/58
4	UNIT 4/Political Sociology	Formative	20	17.18	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	34	9	58/58
5	Internal Assessment overall	Formative	50	41.53	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	31	4	58/58

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 1				Threshold :2		Total Questions :5		Total Students :0		Responses Obtained :0	
CO's	C01				C02		C03		C04		
	Q1	Q1	Q5	Q5	Q2	Q2	Q3	Q3	Q4	Q4	
Student Count above Threshold	19 / 58	19 / 58	13 / 58	13 / 58	15 / 58	15 / 58	17 / 58	17 / 58	16 / 58	16 / 58	
Attainment Level	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	
Attainment	2				2		2		2		

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
C01	1.2	2	1.36	1.57	-0.2	-
C02	1.2	2	1.36	2.42	-1.05	-
C03	1.2	2	1.36	2.42	-1.05	-
C04	1.2	2	1.36	2.42	-1.05	-

Justifications

1. All COs Well Mapped Across Internals
- Each CO is consistently represented in assessments, ensuring comprehensive skill coverage—especially through well-distributed unit-wise tasks.
2. High Student Performance vs. Low Feedback Scores
- Despite all students clearing the threshold in direct assessments, indirect attainment remains low, possibly due to limited understanding of COs or poor survey participation.
3. Higher Threshold Applied for Quality Assurance
- A strict 50% threshold was maintained across all assessments, promoting academic rigor, though it may need recalibration based on actual cohort data.

Actions

1. Enhance Indirect Attainment with Better Orientation
- Conduct pre-survey CO briefings and use student-friendly formats to improve clarity and engagement in exit surveys.

2. **Sustain Balanced CO Mapping in Internal Design**

Continue mapping all COs across internals while refining rubrics to promote critical analysis, especially in higher-order units like Political Sociology.

3. **Review and Adjust Thresholds and Targets**

Calibrate aspirational targets and thresholds using historical performance data to maintain challenge while ensuring achievability.

Course Name : Social Work With Groups
Course Code : CC 402
Co mapping to exams

Formative (CIE) Assessments								
Sr No	Exam Name	Total Marks	Threshold in %	C01	C02	C03	Avg Attainment	
1	Unit 1/Video Review Session	5	50	-	3	3	3	
2	Unit 1/ Assessment component	5	50	3	3	-	3	
3	Unit 2/Movie Review Session and Presentation	10	50	-	3	3	3	
4	Unit 2/ Reflecting Insights on the Topic Group Culture	5	50	-	3	3	3	
5	Unit 2/MCQ Test	5	50	3	3	-	3	
6	Unit 3/MCQ and Short Notes and Application Questions	10	50	3	3	3	3	
7	Unit 4/ Developing Posters, Flip Charts, Flash Cards, Training Modules on Games, Puppet Presentation	10	50	3	3	3	3	
9	Internal Assessment overall	50	50	3	3	3	3	

Summative (SEE) Assessments								
Sr No	Exam Name	Total Marks	Threshold in %	C01	C02	C03	C04	Avg Attainment
8	EXTERNAL EXAM	50	50	3	3	3	3	3

Justification

Uneven CO Mapping Across Assessments

While COs were generally covered, **C04 appeared only in the external exam**, which affected its final attainment despite good overall student performance.

Action

Distribute CO Mapping More Evenly

Ensure **C04 is also mapped to internal assessments** (e.g., Unit 3 or 4), to better balance learning outcomes and reinforce concepts before the summative exam.

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/Video Review Session	Formative	5	4.42	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	7	24	57/58
2	Unit 1/ Assessment component	Formative	5	4.63	50	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	33	57/58
3	Unit 2/Movie Review Session and Presentation	Formative	10	8.92	50	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	32	21	58/58
4	Unit 2/ Reflecting Insights on the Topic Group Culture	Formative	5	4.27	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	18	7	58/58
5	Unit 2/MCQ Test	Formative	5	4.75	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	8	43	58/58
6	Unit 3/MCQ and Short Notes and Application Questions	Formative	10	8.18	50	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	14	8	21	57/58
7	Unit 4/ Developing Posters, Flip Charts, Flash Cards, Trainimg Modules on Games, Puppet Presentation	Formative	10	9.12	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	36	20	58/58
8	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	50	33.66	50	0	0	0	1	5	6	15	23	4	0	49/54
9	Internal Assessment overall	Formative	50	44.55	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	28	27	58/58

Justification

Higher Threshold Maintained for Quality

A **50% threshold** was upheld across all components, ensuring academic rigor, though it may have marginally impacted indirect attainment.

Action

Review and Calibrate Thresholds

Maintain high standards but consider adjusting the **50% threshold** where necessary based on longitudinal data to balance challenge with attainability.

Target setting

Feedback Analysis

Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 1		Threshold :2		Total Questions :6		Total Students :0		Responses Obtained :0	
CO's	C01		C02		C03		C04		
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q6	Q3	Q4			
Student Count above Threshold	18 / 58	16 / 58	18 / 58	19 / 58	19 / 58	20 / 58			
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Attainment	1		1		1		1		

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
C01	3	1	2.6	1.57	1.03	-
C02	3	1	2.6	2.42	0.18	-
C03	2.99	1	2.59	2.57	0.02	-
C04	1.79	1	1.63	2.85	-1.22	-

Justifications

1. **High Attainment in Direct Assessments**
- Most COs achieved an average attainment of **3.0**, demonstrating consistent student performance across internal and external assessments.

Action

1. **Improve Indirect Attainment Measures**
- Raise awareness among students regarding the **importance of feedback surveys**, possibly by integrating short reflective sessions post assessments.

Co mapping to exams

Formative (CIE) Assessments

Sr No	Exam Name	Total Marks	Threshold in %	C01	C02	C03	Avg Attainment
1	Unit 1/Quiz	5	50	3	3	-	3
2	Unit 3/Assignment	15	50	3	3	3	3
4	Unit 2/presentation	5	50	3	3	-	3
5	Internal Assessment overall	25	50	3	3	-	3

Summative (SEE) Assessments

Sr No	Exam Name	Total Marks	Threshold in %	C01	C02	C03	C04	Avg Attainment
3	EXTERNAL EXAM	25	50	3	3	3	3	3

Justification

1. **Higher Threshold Maintained for Academic Standards**
The **50% threshold** ensured quality performance measurement but may have limited the number of students classified as “above threshold” in some assessments.

Action

1. **Review and Justify Threshold Levels**
Maintain high academic standards with the **50% threshold**, but analyze past performance data to **adjust thresholds where needed** for fairness and realistic expectations.

Target setting negative gap issue

Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 1		Threshold :2		Total Questions :5		Total Students :0		Responses Obtained :0	
CO's	C01		C02		C03		C04		
	Q1	Q5	Q2	Q3	Q4				
Student Count above Threshold	16 / 58	15 / 58	18 / 58	17 / 58	15 / 58				
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1				
Attainment	1		1	1	1		1		

CO Attainment						
CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
C01	3	1	2.6	1.57	1.03	-
C02	3	1	2.6	2.42	0.18	-
C03	3	1	2.6	2.57	0.03	-
C04	1.79	1	1.63	2.57	-0.94	-

Justifications

1. **Strong Direct Attainment Across COs**
C01, C02, and C03 attained a consistent **direct score of 3**, reflecting effective teaching and student understanding of core topics.
2. **Uneven CO Mapping in Internal Assessments**
C04 appears only in the external exam, not in internal components, leading to a **lower final attainment (1.63)** compared to others, and contributing to the largest gap (-0.94).

Actions

1. **Rebalance CO Mapping Across Assessments**
Include **C04 in at least one internal assessment** (e.g., quiz, presentation, or assignment) to better support continuous learning and performance tracking.
2. **Enhance Indirect Attainment Measures**
Increase **survey participation** through reminders and awareness sessions to ensure valid indirect feedback, which currently shows **uniformly low attainment (1)** due to lack of responses.

Course Name : Health and Social Work

Course Code : DSE 401

Co mapping to exams

Formative (CIE) Assessments

Sr No	Exam Name	Total Marks	Threshold in %	C01	C02	C03	C04	C05	Avg Attainment
1	Unit 1/prepare health action plan on any topic of your choice/ health is not just a biomedical phenomenon but is influenced by a host of social, cultural and political factors: Critically analyse this statement by review of literature and by citing relevant example from field	15	50	-	-	-	3	-	3
2	Unit 2/MCQ	10	50	3	3	-	-	-	3
3	Unit 3/Write-up	5	50	-	-	-	3	3	3
4	Unit 3/Debate	5	50	-	-	-	3	3	3
5	Unit 4/Write-up	10	50	-	-	3	-	-	3
6	Unit 4/Presentation	5	50	-	-	3	-	-	3
8	Internal Assessment overall	50	50	3	3	-	-	-	3

Summative (SEE) Assessments

Sr No	Exam Name	Total Marks	Threshold in %	C01	C02	C03	C04	Avg Attainment
7	EXTERNAL EXAM	50	50	3	3	3	3	3

Justification

1. Uneven CO Mapping Across Assessments

Some COs are **not adequately represented** in internal and external assessments, which can skew overall attainment and fail to reflect actual student understanding.

Action

1. Evenly Distribute COs Across Evaluations

Rework assessment design to **ensure all COs are equally represented** across both formative (CIE) and summative (SEE) components, improving balance and validity.

Indirect attainment

Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 1

Threshold :2

Total Questions :6

Total Students :0

Responses Obtained :0

CO's	C01		C02	C03	C04	C05
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	19 / 26	18 / 26	16 / 26	14 / 26	13 / 26	16 / 26
Attainment Level	3	3	3	3	2	3
Attainment	3		3	3	2	3

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
C01	3	3	3	1.57	1.43	-
C02	3	3	3	2.85	0.14	-
C03	3	3	3	2.57	0.43	-
C04	3	2	2.8	2.71	0.08	-
C05	1.2	3	1.56	2.85	-1.29	-

Justifications

1. **C05 Direct Attainment Gap Identified**
A significant **negative gap for C05** suggests that either the assessment coverage was insufficient or the performance was below expectations, needing focused intervention.
2. **Low Indirect Attainment Due to Survey Gaps**
Limited student responses in course exit surveys have led to uniformly low indirect attainment scores, which may not accurately represent learning outcomes.

Actions

1. **Strengthen Assessment Mapping for C05**
Ensure **C05 is mapped to multiple assessments**—especially internal ones—to provide sufficient opportunity for students to demonstrate competency.
2. **Improve Survey Participation for Indirect Attainment**
Conduct **orientation sessions or reminders** before surveys to boost student engagement and gather more reliable data for indirect attainment analysis.

Course Name : Rural and Urban Community Development

Course Code : DSE 402

Co po mapping and target attainment level setting

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
CODSE 402.1	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1.57
CODSE 402.2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2.42
CODSE 402.3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2.71
CODSE 402.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
DSE 402	3	2	2.75	2.25	2.75	2.25	2	2.42

Justification

1. **Assumptive CO-PO Mapping**

Mapping lacks evidence-based alignment with course outcomes. It needs validation to reflect real teaching-learning linkage.

Action

1. **Review CO-PO Mapping**

Reassess CO-PO mapping collaboratively with faculty to ensure accurate and balanced linkage.

Target setting negative gap issue

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
C01	1.79	3	2.03	1.57	0.45	-
C02	1.79	3	2.03	2.42	-0.39	-
C03	1.79	3	2.03	2.71	-0.68	-
C04	1.79	3	2.03	3	-0.97	-

Justifications

1. **High Targets for C02–C04**

Targets were set too high compared to actual student performance. This led to negative attainment gaps across these COs.

2. **Uniform Direct Attainment**

All COs show identical direct attainment, suggesting a lack of specific CO-wise assessment distribution.

Actions

1. **Revise CO Targets**

Lower C02–C04 targets slightly to match batch trends while keeping them academically challenging.

2. **Differentiate CO Assessments**

Include varied assessment components mapped clearly to individual COs for accurate attainment tracking.

Co po mapping and target level setting leading to negative gap for CO3,4.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	P06	P07	Average
CODSE 403.1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1.57
CODSE 403.2	2	1	3	2	2	1	2	1.85
CODSE 403.3	3	1	3	3	3	2	2	2.42
CODSE 403.4	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2.57
DSE 403	2.25	1.25	2.5	2.25	2.5	1.75	2.25	2.1

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
C01	1.79	3	2.03	1.57	0.45	-
C02	1.79	3	2.03	1.85	0.17	-
C03	1.79	3	2.03	2.42	-0.39	-
C04	1.79	3	2.03	2.57	-0.54	-

Justifications

- 1. **High Targets Led to Negative Gaps**
C03 and C04 targets were set above average performance, causing negative attainment gaps.
- 2. **Overestimation Based on CO-PO Mapping**
High PO mapping values for C03 and C04 influenced overambitious target setting.
- 3. **Mismatch Between Expectations and Actuals**
Despite strong indirect scores, direct scores were consistent across COs, revealing inflated targets.

Actions

- 1. **Revise Targets Using Actual Data Trends**
Set C03 and C04 targets more realistically by analyzing past cohort performance.
- 2. **Validate CO-PO Mapping Annually**
Reassess mapping to avoid inflated expectations and align outcomes with achievable levels.
- 3. **Conduct Interim Reviews**
Monitor CO performance mid-semester to recalibrate targets if gaps begin to emerge.

Target setting and Indirect attainment

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
CORMC 401.1	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	1.71
CORMC 401.2	3	2	3	3	2	2	1	2.28
CORMC 401.3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2.71
CORMC 401.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
RMC 401	3	2	2.75	2.75	2.5	2.25	1.75	2.42

CO set targets & Attainment Levels

CO	Target	Direct Attainment levels			Indirect Attainment levels		
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
CO1	1.7	0 - 40	41 - 50	51 - 100	0 - 40	41 - 50	51 - 100
CO2	2.2	0 - 40	41 - 50	51 - 100	0 - 40	41 - 50	51 - 100
CO3	2.7	0 - 40	41 - 50	51 - 100	0 - 40	41 - 50	51 - 100
CO4	3	0 - 40	41 - 50	51 - 100	0 - 40	41 - 50	51 - 100

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	-	2.4	1.71	0.69	-
CO2	3	-	2.4	2.28	0.12	-
CO3	3	-	2.4	2.71	-0.31	-
CO4	3	-	2.4	3	-0.6	-

Justifications

1. **High Target for CO3 & CO4**
CO3 and CO4 have high targets despite average attainment, leading to noticeable negative gaps.
2. **No Indirect Attainment**
Feedback forms were not filled, resulting in no data to support indirect attainment analysis.
3. **Identical Direct Attainment**
All COs have maximum direct attainment, indicating a lack of differentiated assessment across COs.

Actions

1. **Revise CO Targets**
Adjust CO3 and CO4 targets using past data to align ambition with realistic student performance.
2. **Ensure Feedback Participation**
Make feedback form submission mandatory to capture indirect attainment and student perception.
3. **Diversify CO Mapping in Assessments**
Link specific assessments to individual COs to enable varied and accurate direct attainment tracking.

MSW SEM 3

Course Name: Integrated Social Work Practice

Course Code: INSWP 3.1

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	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.08	50	1	0	0	18	0	21	0	18	0	4	43/62
2	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	5	2.24	50	14	7	0	17	0	6	0	10	0	8	24/62
3	SEM 3 - Unit 1/Quiz - 2024-2025	Formative	5	4.54	50	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	12	0	44	60/62
4	SEM 3 - Unit 2/Checklist - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.69	50	1	0	0	2	0	13	0	44	0	2	59/62
5	SEM 3 - Unit 3/Roleplay - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.87	50	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	0	0	61/62
6	SEM 3 - Unit 4/Reflection - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.45	50	1	0	0	1	0	28	0	32	0	0	60/62
7	SEM 3 - Unit 5/Mapping - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.93	50	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	0	0	60/62
8	SEM 3 - Unit 6/Case - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.96	50	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	0	0	61/62
9	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	40	28.79	50	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	25	10	0	61/62

Justification:

1. **High Threshold Maintained:** A 50% threshold ensures academic rigor and pushes students toward consistent performance.
2. **Mixed Performance Across Assessments:** While most units show excellent attainment (60+/62), Attendance and Class Participation fell short (43/62 and 24/62, respectively).
3. **Attendance and Class Participation Factors Impacting Scores:** Lower scores in attendance and participation may be due to scheduling, motivation, or external commitments.

Action Plan:

1. **Review Thresholds for Attendance and Class Participation:** Consider setting slightly lower thresholds for participation/attendance or provide flexibility based on genuine constraints.
2. **Engage Students Early:** Use motivational strategies, reminders, and class involvement to boost attendance and class interaction from the beginning.
3. **Track and Intervene Proactively:** Identify students at risk of falling below the threshold early in the semester and offer targeted support or mentoring.

2)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis						
Name :Course Exit Survey -MSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2		Total Questions :6		Responses Obtained :24
COs	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	19 / 62	15 / 62	13 / 62	16 / 62	21 / 62	17 / 62
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification

1. **Low Attainment Across All COs:** All Course Outcomes (CO1 to CO5) attained only Level 1, indicating that students did not perceive the course as meeting expected learning outcomes.
2. **Unclear feedback questions:** Although the response rate was 100%, low scores suggest possible confusion in interpreting feedback questions or misalignment between COs and the survey items.
3. **Need for Enhanced Delivery and Relevance:** The feedback may reflect gaps in teaching strategies, lack of interactive or practical components, or an insufficient real-world connection with social work practices.

Action Plan

1. **Enhance Teaching-Learning Methods:** Integrate more experiential learning, field-based examples, and case studies to make the content engaging and contextually relevant.
2. **Monitor and Intervene Mid-Semester:** Conduct a mid-course feedback session or open discussion to identify concerns early and implement timely interventions for improved outcomes.

3)GAP ANALYSIS

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	1.2	1	1.15	2.14	-0.99	-
CO2	1.2	1	1.15	2.42	-1.27	-
CO3	1.2	1	1.15	2.85	-1.7	-
CO4	1.1	1	1.08	3	-1.92	-
CO5	1.2	1	1.15	2.85	-1.7	-

Justification

1. **All COs Fall Below Target:** The final attainment for all COs is significantly below the target levels, resulting in negative gaps, indicating that learning outcomes are not being achieved as planned.
2. **High Target Values Increase Gap Magnitude:** CO3, CO4, and CO5 have higher targets (2.85–3.00), which, when paired with low attainment (around 1.1–1.2), lead to larger negative gaps (-1.7 to -1.92). These COs likely represent key skills or competencies that need stronger delivery.
3. **Low Indirect Attainment Suggests Student Dissatisfaction:** Indirect attainment (based on feedback) is consistently low (Level 1) for all COs, indicating that students perceive gaps in understanding or relevance of the course content.

Action Plan

1. **Review and Align Course Delivery with COs:** Reassess the teaching methodology to ensure that core concepts related to each CO, especially CO3–CO5, are delivered effectively using case studies, field work, and participatory methods.
2. **Unclear feedback questions:** Refine internal assessments to better reflect CO expectations. Enhance feedback tools to capture clearer student perception and improve the quality of indirect attainment data.
3. **Mid-Course Interventions and Faculty Reflection:** Conduct mid-semester feedback, analyze CO-wise performance early, and organize faculty review sessions to adjust teaching strategies in real time.

Course Name: Health
Course Code: HELTH 3.2

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember the concepts of health, wellness, and dimensions of health, including determinants and disparities

CO2: Applying knowledge to create community health action plans and educational materials for health awareness.

CO3: Understanding and analysing the linkage between health and development, including the impact of socio-economic and demographic factors.

CO4: Analyzing health disparities related to caste, gender, age, and migration.

CO5: Evaluating health reforms, health policies, out-of-pocket expenses, and the role of health insurance in addressing health disparities.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
COHELTH 3.2.1	3	1	2	1	2	1	-	1.66
COHELTH 3.2.2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2.42
COHELTH 3.2.3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
COHELTH 3.2.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
COHELTH 3.2.5	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.85
HELTH 3.2	3	2.2	2.8	2.2	2.8	2.4	2.75	2.55

Justification

- Strong Alignment with Key POs:** CO4 and CO5 show excellent integration across all POs (average of 2.85–3), indicating that the course effectively contributes to understanding complex health disparities and policy frameworks.
- CO1 Shows Weak Alignment:** CO1 has the lowest average mapping score (1.66), mainly due to low relevance or coverage in PO2–PO6. This suggests foundational health concepts are not strongly contributing to skill-based or ethical/social learning outcomes.

Action Plan

- Strengthen Outcome Delivery for CO1:** Integrate more interactive lectures, infographics, or foundational case studies in early modules to better link health concepts (CO1) with applicable outcomes like communication (PO2) and ethics (PO4).
- Enhance Practical Application in Teaching:** Increase use of community fieldwork, group projects, and health education tools to boost CO-PO mapping, especially for COs 2 and 3, where applied skills are essential.
- Faculty Workshop on CO-PO Integration:** Organize a faculty-level session to review teaching practices and ensure that all COs are explicitly connected to PO goals through classroom delivery, assignments, and assessments.

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	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.62	50	1	0	0	1	0	40	0	20	0	0	60/62
2	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.44	50	5	4	0	15	0	15	0	15	0	8	38/62
3	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/Assignment - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.37	50	1	0	0	2	6	14	22	10	7	0	59/62
4	SEM 3 - UNIT 2/MCQ - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8.17	50	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	8	14	21	60/62
5	SEM 3 - UNIT 3/Debate - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.15	50	1	0	0	3	4	4	9	31	10	0	54/62
6	SEM 3 - UNIT 4/Group Presentation - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.3	50	1	0	0	2	4	1	12	30	12	0	56/62
7	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	25	17.75	50	0	0	0	1	4	11	19	10	11	5	56/61
8	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	14.16	50	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	23	6	0	60/61

Justification

- High Overall Performance:** Most assessments showed that a large majority of students scored above the 50% threshold, indicating strong subject understanding.
- Low Scores in Participation & Attendance:** These two areas had the lowest averages, suggesting reduced engagement or external constraints affecting student consistency.
- Well-Structured Assessment Design:** The mix of formative and summative assessments allowed students to perform well, especially in group and application-based tasks.

Action Plan

- Maintain Threshold, Review Engagement Tools:** Keep the 50% threshold to ensure academic quality, but revise participation and attendance strategies for better outcomes.
- Boost Engagement:** Introduce motivational strategies like activity-based learning, reward systems, or flexible participation formats.
- Sustain Diverse Assessments:** Continue using interactive formats like presentations, debates, and MCQs that have positively impacted learning outcomes.

3)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis						
Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2	Total Questions :6		Total Students :24	Responses Obtained :24
CO's	C01		C02	C03	C04	C05
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	16 / 61	16 / 61	14 / 61	12 / 61	17 / 61	11 / 61
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification

1. **Low Indirect Attainment:** All COs achieved only Level 1, indicating that students rated their learning experience below expectations.
2. **Full Response, Yet Low Scores:** Although all 24 students responded, very few met the threshold, which points to gaps in perceived learning or feedback clarity.
3. **Mismatch with Direct Performance:** Compared to direct assessments, the low indirect scores suggest a gap between delivery and student perception.

Action Plan

1. **Revise and Simplify Survey Tools:** Align feedback questions more closely with COs and make them student-friendly for accurate responses.
2. **Enhance Course Engagement:** Use case studies, activities, and group discussions to improve student involvement and perception.
3. **Introduce Mid-Term Feedback:** Collect feedback mid-semester to identify issues early and make timely improvements in teaching methods.

4)GAP ANALYSIS

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.6	1.42	1.18	-
CO2	3	1	2.6	2.42	0.18	-
CO3	3	1	2.6	2.85	-0.25	-
CO4	3	1	2.6	3	-0.39	-
CO5	1.19	1	1.15	2.85	-1.7	-

Justification

1. **Strong Direct Attainment in CO1–CO4:**These COs have a high direct attainment (Level 3), showing students performed well in assessments and understood core concepts.
2. **Low Indirect Attainment Across All COs:** Despite good direct scores, all COs show indirect attainment at Level 1, indicating a perception gap or low student feedback engagement.
3. **Significant Gap in CO5:** CO5 has both low direct (1.19) and indirect (1) attainment, resulting in a large negative gap (–1.7), highlighting the need to improve teaching and assessment in this area.

Action Plan

1. **Improve Feedback Quality and Response:** Modify survey tools to be more student-friendly and ensure students understand the purpose to gain meaningful feedback.
2. **Strengthen CO5 Delivery:** Use real-life case studies, visual aids, and simplified explanations to improve student understanding of policies and reforms.
3. **Continuous Monitoring:** Conduct mid-semester feedback and internal reviews to adjust teaching strategies early and bridge gaps in both perception and performance.

Course Name: Rural and Urban Studies

Course Code: RUST 3.3

1)CO PO MAPPING:

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember the historical contexts of rural and urban development, such as the industrial revolution and agrarian crises.

CO2: Understand the rural, urban, and tribal structures, systems, and issues such as migration, slums, and land displacement.

CO3: Critically understand the knowledge of development programs like MGNREGA, NRLM, and JNNURM to address community-specific challenges.

CO4: Evaluating the effectiveness of governance policies, tribal acts (PESA 1996, Forest Dwellers Act), and redevelopment schemes.

CO5: Analyze the class disparities, caste dynamics, gender discrimination, and livelihood issues in rural, urban, and tribal communities.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
CORUST 3.3.1	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1.71
CORUST 3.3.2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2.57
CORUST 3.3.3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.85
CORUST 3.3.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
CORUST 3.3.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
RUST 3.3	3	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.62

Justification

- Progressive Alignment:** The CO-PO mapping shows a steady increase from CO1 (Avg 1.71) to CO5 (Avg 3), indicating stronger integration of program outcomes as the course progresses.
- Need for Initial Refinement:** Mapping for CO1 is based on assumptions and shows relatively weaker alignment (Avg 1.71), suggesting the need for a more refined mapping approach.

Action Plan

- Revalidate CO1 Mapping:** Reassess CO1 in terms of its alignment with POs to ensure better accuracy, especially where historical context links to practical application.
- Maintain Strong Mapping in CO3–CO5:** Retain the robust linkage seen in CO3 to CO5, which effectively maps to critical program outcomes like policy evaluation and societal analysis.
- Faculty Workshop on CO-PO Mapping:** Conduct internal calibration or workshops to train faculty in fine-tuning CO-PO mapping for consistency and outcome-based teaching.

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	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.75	50	1	0	0	1	0	17	0	35	0	8	60/62
2	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	5	2.06	50	10	21	0	7	0	11	0	5	0	8	24/62
3	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/Rural & Urban Studies - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7	50	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	21	22	1	53/62
4	SEM 3 - UNIT 2/Rural & Urban Studies - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.98	50	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	22	53/62
5	SEM 3 - UNIT 3/Rural & Urban Studies - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.96	50	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	45	11	0	61/62
6	SEM 3 - UNIT 4/Rural & Urban Studies - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.7	50	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	43	4	0	61/62
7	SEM 3 - UNIT 5/Rural & Urban Studies - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.48	50	1	0	0	1	0	3	20	31	6	0	60/62
8	SEM 3 - UNIT 6/Rural & Urban Studies - 2024-2025	Formative	20	15.33	50	1	0	0	3	2	4	9	21	20	2	58/62
9	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	50	35.81	50	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	25	8	0	60/60

Justification

1. **Mixed Student Results:** In areas like Attendance Marks, only 24 out of 62 students met the required marks, suggesting some students struggled to reach the set standards.
2. **Good Performance in Key Tests:** However, in major tests like the External Exam, all 60 students surpassed the required marks, showing they did well in important evaluations.

Action Plan

1. **Attendance Threshold:** Reduce the attendance threshold slightly to make it more achievable without compromising discipline.
2. **Spot Problem Areas:** Identify which assessments had lower scores and find out why, so targeted help can be provided to students in those areas.
3. **Boost Student Participation:** Use methods like interactive classes or attendance rewards to encourage students to engage more, which can lead to better overall performance.

3)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis						
Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2		Total Questions :5		Responses Obtained :24
CO's	CO1		CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	21 / 60	20 / 60	18 / 60	18 / 60	21 / 60	18 / 60
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification

- Moderate Attainment Levels:** The survey indicates that for each Course Outcome (CO), approximately 18 to 21 out of 60 students surpassed the set threshold. This suggests that while a portion of students met the expected standards.
- Consistent Feedback Across COs:** The attainment levels are uniformly at level 1 across all COs, reflecting a consistent pattern in student feedback. This consistency points to a general trend rather than isolated issues in specific areas.
- Potential Underlying Challenges:** The moderate attainment may be influenced by factors such as survey design, student engagement, or clarity in course content delivery. Identifying these factors is crucial for targeted improvements.

Action Plan

- Enhance Survey Participation:** Implement strategies to boost student engagement in surveys, such as clarifying the purpose of feedback, ensuring anonymity, and communicating how past feedback has led to tangible course improvements.
- Refine Survey Instruments:** Review and revise survey questions to ensure they are clear, concise, and directly aligned with the course outcomes. This will help in obtaining more accurate and actionable feedback.

4)GAP ANALYSIS

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.6	1.71	0.89	-
CO2	3	1	2.6	2.57	0.03	-
CO3	3	1	2.6	2.85	-0.25	-
CO4	2.99	1	2.59	3	-0.41	-
CO5	1.08	1	1.06	3	-1.94	-

Justifications:

1. **Lower Direct Attainment Score:** CO5 has a Direct Attainment score of 1.08, which is notably lower than other course outcomes. This suggests that students faced challenges in mastering the content related to CO5.
2. **High Target Benchmark:** The target for CO5 is set at 3.00. Given the low attainment, this high benchmark results in a more pronounced negative gap.
3. **Complexity of CO5 Content:** CO5 involves analyzing class disparities, caste dynamics, gender discrimination, and livelihood issues in various communities. The multifaceted nature of these topics may have contributed to the lower attainment.

Action Plan:

1. **Curriculum Review:** Evaluate and possibly simplify the content and teaching methods related to CO5 to enhance student comprehension.
2. **Additional Support:** Provide supplementary resources such as tutorials or discussion sessions focused on CO5 topics to aid student understanding.
3. **Assessment Refinement:** Reassess the evaluation methods for CO5 to ensure they effectively measure student understanding and adjust them to better align with the learning objectives.

Course Name: Mental Health

Course Code: MEHE 3.4

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Recognize mental health disorders, their causes, and treatment approaches.

CO2: Explain the role of social determinants in shaping mental health outcomes.

CO3: Critically examine policies and laws for accessibility and availability of mental health services.

CO4: Apply provisions of legal frameworks and intervention models with an emphasis on person-centered/strengths-based and recovery-oriented model in the promotion of mental health across various settings.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
COMEHE 3.4.1	3	1	2	1	2	1	-	1.66
COMEHE 3.4.2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2.42
COMEHE 3.4.3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
COMEHE 3.4.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
MEHE 3.4	3	2	2.75	2.25	2.75	2.25	2.66	2.48

Justifications:

- Initial Assumptions in Mapping:** The current mapping was based on preliminary assumptions, which may not accurately reflect the true alignment between Course Outcomes (COs) and Program Outcomes (POs).
- Variability in CO-PO Alignment:** The average alignment scores range from 1.66 to 3, indicating inconsistencies in how COs contribute to POs. For example, COMEHE 3.4.1 has a lower average (1.66), suggesting a weaker alignment.

Actions:

- Comprehensive Review of Mapping:** Conduct a detailed analysis involving faculty and curriculum experts to reassess and accurately align each CO with the relevant POs.
- Standardization of Mapping Criteria:** Develop clear guidelines and criteria for CO-PO mapping to ensure consistency and objectivity across all courses.
- Regular Validation and Updates:** Implement a periodic review process to validate the effectiveness of the mapping and make necessary adjustments based on feedback and evolving program objectives.

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	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/Article Review and Viva Voce - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.54	50	1	0	0	8	0	30	0	1	0	22	53/62
2	SEM 3 - Unit 2/Case/NGO Study/Creative Art Expression on Issues concerning mental illness	Formative	10	7.26	50	1	0	0	1	2	24	8	9	5	12	60/62
3	SEM 3 - UNIT 3/Campaign on Suicide Prevention - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.56	50	2	0	0	4	24	2	2	0	0	28	56/62
4	SEM 3 - Unit 4/Field Visit and Group Presentation - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.84	50	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	14	28	3	61/62
5	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	2.45	50	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	61/62
6	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	0.84	50	26	5	0	12	0	8	0	3	0	8	19/62
7	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	25	19.09	50	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	19	13	10	59/61
8	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	14.56	50	1	0	0	0	0	9	20	16	7	7	59/60

Justifications:

- High Standards Set:** The course assessments were designed with higher thresholds to maintain academic rigor and ensure a high level of competency among students.
- Student Performance Variability:** Analysis indicates that while many students met these thresholds, certain assessments, such as Attendance Marks, had lower average scores, suggesting potential challenges.

Actions:

- Review Assessment Criteria:** Reevaluate the set thresholds for each assessment to ensure they are challenging yet attainable, considering historical performance data.
- Provide Additional Support:** Offer supplementary resources or support for assessments where a significant number of students score below the threshold, such as attendance.
- Monitor and Adjust:** Continuously monitor student performance and adjust thresholds as necessary to maintain academic integrity while promoting student success.

3)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis				
Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2	Total Questions :5	Responses Obtained :24
CO's	C01	C02	C03	C04
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Student Count above Threshold	14 / 61	18 / 61	16 / 61	13 / 61
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1	1	1	1

Justifications:

1. **Low Response Rates:** The Course Exit Survey had a low response rate, which may have skewed the feedback and not accurately represented the overall student experience.
2. **Uniform Attainment Levels:** All Course Outcomes (COs) achieved an attainment level of 1, suggesting that the feedback may not have captured the full spectrum of student learning and experiences.

Actions:

1. **Enhance Survey Participation:** Implement strategies to boost survey response rates, such as emphasizing the importance of feedback.
2. **Refine Survey Instruments:** Revise the survey questions to more accurately reflect and assess each CO, ensuring that the feedback gathered is meaningful and actionable.
3. **Regular Feedback Analysis:** Establish a routine process for analyzing survey results and integrating findings into course improvement plans to enhance overall educational effectiveness.

Course Name: Informal Labour and Informal Sector

Course Code : ILIS 3.4

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember the definitions and concepts of informal sector, informal employment, and related legislation.

CO2: Understanding the causal factors for the exploitative nature of informal labor, including gender and caste dynamics.

CO3: Analyzing the impact of economic reforms, migration, and working conditions in urban and rural informal sectors.

CO4: Evaluating the effectiveness of interventions like financial inclusion schemes and campaigns for legislative changes for informal sector.

CO5: CO5Applying knowledge of labor laws, government schemes, and NGO interventions to address informal sector issues.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
COILIS 3.4.1	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1.57
COILIS 3.4.2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2.42
COILIS 3.4.3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.85
COILIS 3.4.4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
COILIS 3.4.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
ILIS 3.4	3	2.2	2.8	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.53

Justifications:

- Initial Assumptions:** The current CO-PO mapping was based on initial assumptions, which may not accurately reflect the true alignment between Course Outcomes (COs) and Program Outcomes (POs).
- Variability in Alignment:** Some COs, like COILIS 3.4.1, with an average of 1.57, show weaker alignment with POs, indicating inconsistencies in the mapping process.

Actions:

- Review and Refine Mapping:** Conduct a thorough review of CO-PO mappings to ensure they accurately represent the relationships between COs and POs.
- Standardize Mapping Criteria:** Establish clear criteria for mapping, using frameworks like Bloom's Taxonomy, to ensure consistency and objectivity.
- Implement Continuous Monitoring:** Set up a system for regular evaluation and validation of CO-PO mappings, incorporating feedback for ongoing improvements.

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	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.42	50	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	19	0	0	19/45
2	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.38	50	7	4	0	9	0	8	0	6	0	11	25/45
3	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/Informal Labour and Informal Sector - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.84	50	0	1	0	0	0	16	0	16	0	12	44/45
4	SEM 3 - UNIT 2/Informa Sector in Urban Areas - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.98	50	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	37	0	5	42/45
5	SEM 3 - UNIT 3/Informa Sector in Rural Areas - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	2.04	50	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	38	0	6	44/45
6	SEM 3 - UNIT 4/Acts and Laws related to Informal Sector - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.44	50	0	2	0	1	0	20	0	19	0	3	42/45
7	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	25	19.53	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	25	11	2	45/45
8	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	14.4	50	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	13	6	2	43/45

Justification:

- Low Class Participation:** Only 19 out of 45 students (42%) scored above the 50% threshold in class participation, indicating limited engagement.
- Poor Attendance:** 25 out of 45 students (56%) met the attendance threshold, suggesting that nearly half the class had attendance issues.
- Impact on Performance:** Research indicates a positive correlation between class attendance and academic performance; low attendance and participation likely contributed to subpar outcomes.

Action Plan:

- Set Clear Expectations:** Communicate the importance of attendance and participation, outlining their impact on academic success.
- Implement Engagement Strategies:** Introduce interactive activities to make sessions more engaging, encouraging active participation.
- Monitor and Support:** Regularly track attendance and participation, offering support to students facing challenges to improve their engagement.

3)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis						
Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2		Total Questions :6		Responses Obtained :24
CO's	C01		C02	C03	C04	C05
	Q1	Q6	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	16 / 45	14 / 45	11 / 45	12 / 45	16 / 45	17 / 45
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1	1

Justification:

1. **Low Indirect Attainment Levels:** All Course Outcomes (COs) achieved an attainment level of 1, indicating that student feedback did not meet the expected threshold.
2. **Limited Student Feedback:** The Course Exit Survey had 24 responses out of 45 students, resulting in a 53% response rate. This limited participation may not accurately reflect the overall student experience.

Action Plan:

1. **Enhance Survey Participation:** Implement strategies to increase response rates for Course Exit Surveys, such as allocating class time for completion or sending reminders, to obtain more representative feedback.
2. **Clarify Course Objectives:** Ensure that course outcomes are clearly communicated and understood by students at the beginning and throughout the course to align expectations.

4)GAP ANALYSIS

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	2.8	1	2.44	1.57	0.86	-
CO2	2.8	1	2.44	2.42	0.02	-
CO3	2.8	1	2.44	2.85	-0.41	-
CO4	2.93	1	2.54	2.85	-0.31	-
CO5	1.2	1	1.15	3	-1.85	-

Justification:

1. **Significant Negative Gap in CO5:** CO5 exhibits a gap of -1.85 between the Final Attainment (1.15) and the Target (3), which is substantially larger than the gaps observed in other Course Outcomes (COs).
2. **Lower Direct Attainment:** The Direct Attainment for CO5 is 1.2, notably lower than that of other COs, indicating that students struggled more with assessments related to CO5.
3. **Consistent Indirect Attainment:** All COs, including CO5, have an Indirect Attainment of 1, suggesting uniformly low student-perceived achievement across outcomes.

Action Plan:

1. **Review CO5 Assessment Methods:** Analyze the assessment tools and criteria used for CO5 to identify potential issues affecting student performance.
2. **Enhance Instructional Support:** Provide additional resources or instructional sessions focused on CO5 content to bolster student understanding and performance.
3. **Monitor and Adjust:** Continuously monitor the effectiveness of implemented strategies and make necessary adjustments to ensure improved attainment in CO5.

Course Name: Therapeutic Intervention

Course Code: THIN 3.6

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	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	2.5	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	40/40
2	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.56	50	2	6	0	6	0	9	0	5	0	12	26/40
3	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/ Testing Component - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8.27	50	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	12	8	40/40
4	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/Assignment Component - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8.25	50	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	13	8	39/40
5	SEM 3 - UNIT 2/Assignment - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8.41	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	25	0	40/40
6	SEM 3 - UNIT 3/Assignment - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8.75	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	19	10	40/40
7	SEM 3 - UNIT 4/Assignment - 2024-2025	Formative	5	4.95	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	37	40/40
8	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	25	21.42	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	8	17	39/40

Justification:

- Perfect Class Participation:** All 40 students achieved full marks in class participation, indicating high engagement levels.
- Variable Attendance Scores:** Only 26 out of 40 students (65%) met the 50% threshold for attendance, suggesting attendance issues among a significant portion of the class.

Action Plan:

- Address Attendance Issues:** Investigate the reasons behind lower attendance and implement strategies to encourage regular attendance, such as awareness programs highlighting its importance.
- Monitor and Support:** Establish a system to track attendance patterns and provide support to students facing challenges, ensuring they remain engaged and can achieve academic success.

Course Name: Social Inclusion and Exclusion

Course Code: SIEX 3.7

1)CO - PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: To understand the concepts of social exclusion, inclusion, types and factors responsible for social exclusion.

CO2: To remember constitutional provisions, policies, and commissions for inclusion in India to strengthen knowledge of legal frameworks supporting marginalized communities.

CO3: To analyze the impact of exclusion on marginalized groups and the effectiveness of policies to develop critical thinking about social inequalities.

CO4: To apply frameworks like SDGs, human development indicators, and advocacy strategies for inclusion to promote effective intervention practices.

CO5: To evaluate the role of social movements, legal reforms, and international frameworks in promoting social inclusion to foster comprehensive understanding of advocacy.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
COSIEX 3.7.1	3	-	2	1	2	1	-	1.8
COSIEX 3.7.2	3	1	2	2	2	2	-	2
COSIEX 3.7.3	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	2.57
COSIEX 3.7.4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
COSIEX 3.7.5	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
SIEX 3.7	3	1.5	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.66	2.41

Justification:

- Initial Assumptions:** The CO-PO mapping was based on initial assumptions, which may not accurately reflect the true alignment between Course Outcomes (COs) and Program Outcomes (POs).
- Variability in Mapping:** Some COs (e.g., COSIEX 3.7.1 and COSIEX 3.7.2) are not mapped to certain POs (e.g., PO2, PO7), indicating potential gaps in alignment.
- Overall Average:** The course's overall CO-PO mapping average is 2.41, suggesting a moderate alignment that could be improved.

Action Plan:

- Review and Refine Mapping:** Conduct a thorough review of the CO-PO mapping to ensure each CO appropriately aligns with relevant POs, addressing any gaps identified.
- Stakeholder Consultation:** Engage faculty and curriculum designers in discussions to validate and refine the mapping process, ensuring it accurately reflects course objectives and program goals.
- Continuous Monitoring:** Implement a system for regular assessment and refinement of CO-PO alignment, incorporating feedback and assessment data to enhance educational effectiveness.

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	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.93	50	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	30	0	0	30/32
2	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.2	50	3	8	0	7	0	5	0	5	0	4	14/32
3	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/Social Inclusion and Exclusion - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8.56	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	13	7	32/32
4	SEM 3 - Unit 2/Social Inclusion and Exclusion - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.43	50	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	10	6	0	32/32
5	SEM 3 - UNIT 3/Social Inclusion and Exclusion - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.56	50	0	0	0	2	0	6	7	7	7	3	30/32
6	SEM 4 - UNIT 4/Social Inclusion and Exclusion - 2024-2025	Formative	10	7.4	50	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	16	0	0	32/32
7	SEM 3 - Assignment/Social Inclusion and Exclusion - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3	50	0	2	0	0	0	26	0	4	0	0	30/32
8	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	25	21.28	50	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	18	10	31/32
9	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	14.03	50	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	10	1	0	32/32

Justification:

- Attendance Concerns:** The average attendance score is 1.2 out of 2.5, with only 14 out of 32 students meeting the 50% threshold. This indicates significant absenteeism, which can hinder student engagement and comprehension.
- Class Participation:** The average class participation score is 1.93 out of 2.5, with 30 out of 32 students surpassing the 50% threshold. This suggests that while students are actively participating when present, their overall attendance issues may limit consistent engagement.

Action Plan:

- Implement Attendance Policies:** Introduce clear attendance policies that emphasize the importance of regular class attendance and outline consequences for excessive absences.
- Enhance Engagement Strategies:** Develop interactive and engaging teaching methods to motivate students to attend classes regularly and participate actively.
- Monitor and Support:** Regularly track attendance and participation, identifying students with frequent absences or low engagement. Provide support or interventions as needed to address underlying issues.

3)GAP ANALYSIS

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	3	1	2.6	1.28	1.32	-
CO2	3	-	2.4	1.71	0.69	-
CO3	3	2	2.8	2.57	0.23	-
CO4	3	3	3	2.85	0.14	-
CO5	1.1	3	1.48	2.85	-1.37	-

Justification:

1. **Low Direct Attainment:** CO1 has a direct attainment score of 3, while CO5 has a significantly lower score of 1.1, indicating that students struggled more with assessments related to CO5.
2. **Indirect Attainment Discrepancy:** CO1's indirect attainment is 1, suggesting students' self-assessment aligns with their performance. In contrast, CO5's indirect attainment is 3, indicating a mismatch between students' perceptions and actual performance.
3. **Significant Gaps:** CO1 has a gap of 1.32 (final attainment 2.6 vs. target 1.28), while CO5 has a larger negative gap of -1.37 (final attainment 1.48 vs. target 2.85), highlighting a more pronounced shortfall in meeting CO5's target.

Action Plan:

1. **Curriculum Enhancement:** Review and enhance the curriculum for both CO1 and CO5 to address areas where students face challenges, ensuring alignment with learning objectives.
2. **Assessment Alignment:** Develop assessments that accurately reflect the intended outcomes for CO1 and CO5, providing students with clear expectations and preparation guidelines.
3. **Student Support Initiatives:** Implement targeted support, such as workshops or tutoring sessions, focusing on the areas related to CO1 and CO5 to bridge the identified gaps and improve student performance.

Course Name: Communication Skills

Course Code: COMS 3.8

1)CO - PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember the definitions of communication, development communication, and various media types.

CO2: Understanding communication barriers, methodologies, and frameworks for development communication.

CO3: Analyzing the influence of media on target groups, media ethics, and values conveyed by advertisements and programs.

CO4: Evaluating the effectiveness of media strategies, social marketing programs, and media planning processes.

CO5: Applying media tools like IEC materials, simulations, and social networking for campaigns and field interventions.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
COCOMS 3.8.1	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1.57
COCOMS 3.8.2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2.42
COCOMS 3.8.3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.71
COCOMS 3.8.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
COCOMS 3.8.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
COMS 3.8	3	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.8	2.4	2.2	2.54

Justification:

- Initial Assumptions in CO-PO Mapping:** The current Course Outcome (CO) to Program Outcome (PO) mapping was established based on preliminary assumptions, which may not accurately reflect the course's contributions to the program's objectives.
- Discrepancies in CO1 Alignment:** CO1 exhibits a lower average alignment with POs (1.57) compared to other COs, indicating a potential misalignment or limited scope in addressing the intended POs.

Action Plan:

- Review and Revise CO1:** Conduct a thorough analysis of CO1 to ensure it encompasses elements that align more effectively with relevant POs, thereby enhancing its contribution to the overall program outcomes.
- Diversify Assessment Methods:** Implement varied assessment strategies for CO1 that target multiple POs, facilitating a more comprehensive evaluation of student competencies.
- Continuous Monitoring:** Regularly assess the effectiveness of CO1's alignment with POs and make iterative adjustments to maintain its relevance and impact within the program.

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	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	2.23	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	6	13/13
2	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	0.76	50	4	4	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	5/13
3	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/Communication Skills - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8	50	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4	0	13/13
4	SEM 3 - UNIT 2/Communication Skills - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8.46	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	1	13/13
5	SEM 3 - UNIT 3/Communication Skills - 2024-2025	Formative	10	8	50	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	0	13/13
6	SEM 3 - UNIT 4/Communication Skills - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.76	50	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	6	0	3	11/13
7	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	25	19.83	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	1	12/12
8	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	15.41	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	1	12/12

Justification:

- Low Attendance Performance:** Despite high scores in other assessments, the attendance marks had a low average (0.76), with only 5/13 students crossing the threshold, affecting overall internal attainment.
- Strong Performance in Core Assessments:** In most formative assessments and external exams, all or almost all students exceeded the threshold, indicating conceptual clarity and engagement.
- Balanced Threshold Level:** The 50% threshold level is appropriate and highlights real gaps without inflating performance, ensuring academic integrity.

Action Plan:

- Improve Attendance Tracking & Awareness:** Conduct orientation on the importance of attendance and its weight in internal marks to improve student focus on regularity.
- Refine Attendance Evaluation Criteria:** Consider flexible yet fair attendance marking (e.g., linking participation + attendance) to support students facing genuine issues.

3)GAP ANALYSIS

CO Attainment

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
CO1	2.4	2	2.31	1.57	0.74	-
CO2	2.4	3	2.52	2.42	0.1	-
CO3	2.4	3	2.52	2.71	-0.18	-
CO4	3	2	2.8	3	-0.2	-
CO5	0.93	2	1.14	3	-1.86	-

Justification:

1. **Assessment Weightage:** CO5's lower direct attainment (0.93) indicates that assessments linked to this outcome may have been underweighted or not effectively measuring the intended skills.
2. **Student Performance:** The significant negative gap (-1.86) suggests students struggled with CO5-related assessments, possibly due to unclear expectations or challenging content.
3. **Indirect Attainment Consistency:** Despite a moderate indirect attainment score (2), the disparity with direct attainment points to potential misalignment between teaching methods and assessment strategies for CO5

Action Plan:

1. **Curriculum Review:** Reevaluate and adjust the curriculum to ensure CO5 is adequately covered, aligning teaching methods with assessment criteria.
2. **Assessment Alignment:** Redesign assessments to better reflect CO5 objectives, ensuring they effectively measure the intended competencies.

Course Name: Sustainable Development and Environment

Course Code: SDEN 3.9

1)CO PO MAPPING

Course Outcomes

CO1: Remember the key protocols, laws, and frameworks like UNFCCC, Indian Forests Act 2019, and PESA.

CO2: Understanding the socio-environmental challenges in rural (land, water, forest) and urban (housing, waste management) contexts.

CO3: Evaluating the effectiveness of environmental laws, regulatory bodies, and NGO interventions in fostering sustainability.

CO4: Applying sustainable development frameworks, protocols, and government action plans to real-world scenarios.

CO5: Analyzing the impact of climate change, deforestation, and development-induced displacement.

CO - PO Mapping

CO	PO1	PO2	PO3	PO4	PO5	PO6	PO7	Average
COSDEN 3.9.1	3	1	2	1	2	1	-	1.66
COSDEN 3.9.2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2.42
COSDEN 3.9.3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
COSDEN 3.9.4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
COSDEN 3.9.5	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.85
SDEN 3.9	3	2.2	2.8	2.2	2.8	2.4	2.75	2.55

Justifications

1. CO1 targets basic knowledge, hence maps strongly to PO1 but weakly to higher-order POs, resulting in a lower average (1.66).
2. The course shows strong alignment with PO6 & PO7, reflecting its focus on sustainability, ethics, and environmental impact.
3. Slight underperformance in PO2 & PO4 suggests scope to improve analytical and investigative elements in some COs.

Actions

1. Add case-based examples in CO1 to improve PO2 and PO3 linkage.
2. Revise activities in CO2 & CO5 to include more analytical tasks addressing PO2 and PO4.
3. Conduct a mapping review each semester using assessment data and faculty inputs for continuous improvement.

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	SEM 3 - Class Participation Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.5	50	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	26	0	1	27/55
2	SEM 3 - Attendance Marks - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	0.9	50	19	9	0	6	0	10	0	6	0	5	21/55
3	SEM 3 - UNIT 1/Sustainable Development and Environment - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.7	50	0	0	0	1	0	23	0	22	0	9	54/55
4	SEM 3 - UNIT 2/Rural Sustainability - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.52	50	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	26	0	2	28/55
5	SEM 3 - UNIT 3/Urban Sustainability - 2024-2025	Formative	2.5	1.47	50	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	23	0	2	25/55
6	SEM 3 - UNIT 4/Acts and Laws - 2024-2025	Formative	5	3.41	50	0	2	0	0	0	29	0	21	0	3	53/55
7	EXTERNAL EXAM	Summative	25	19.51	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	29	14	5	53/54
8	Internal Assessment Overall	Formative	20	12.85	50	0	0	0	1	8	20	11	13	0	1	53/54

Justifications

- Threshold Level is Balanced but Slightly High in a Few Areas:** Most assessments meet the 50% threshold, but attendance and participation show lower averages, affecting threshold achievement.
- High Success in Conceptual Assessments:** Performance in Unit 1, Unit 4, and External Exam indicates a strong grasp of core concepts, validating threshold levels for academic quality.
- Inconsistent Scoring in Low-Weight Assessments:** Some 2.5-mark assessments (Units 2 & 3) had low averages and fewer students above threshold, likely due to under-engagement or low perceived importance.

Actions

- Review Participation and Attendance Criteria:** Simplify or recalibrate these assessments to ensure fairness and better student engagement.
- Reinforce the Value of Low-Weight Assessments:** Communicate their contribution to internal marks to motivate students for consistent performance.
- Continue Monitoring with Minor Adjustments:** Retain the current threshold but tweak assessment strategies based on unit-wise performance trends.

3)INDIRECT ATTAINMENT

Feedback Analysis					
Name :Course Exit Survey - MSW - SEM 3		Threshold :2	Total Questions :6	Total Students :54	Responses Obtained :19
CO's	C01		C03	C04	C05
	Q1	Q6	Q3	Q4	Q5
Student Count above Threshold	19 / 54	13 / 54	17 / 54	19 / 54	17 / 54
Attainment Level	1	1	1	1	1
Attainment	1		1	1	1

Justifications

1. **Low Response Rate (35%):** Only 19 out of 54 students responded, which limits the reliability of the feedback data.
2. **All COs Below Threshold Attainment:** Each CO scored an attainment level of 1, indicating perceived gaps in delivery or engagement.
3. **Possible Misalignment or Misunderstanding:** Students may not have fully understood COs or survey questions, affecting the accuracy of feedback.

Actions

1. **Improve Survey Participation:** Conduct surveys during class hours or incentivize responses to boost the participation rate.
2. **Clarify COs and Survey Intent:** Brief students about course outcomes and the purpose of surveys before sharing forms.
3. **Conduct Mid-Sem Feedback Checks:** Add a mid-semester feedback round to identify and correct issues early.

4)GAP ANALYSIS

CO	Direct Attainment	Indirect Attainment	Final Attainment	Target	Gap	Justification
C01	2.59	1	2.27	1.42	0.85	-
C02	2.86	-	2.28	2.42	-0.14	-
C03	2.59	1	2.27	2.85	-0.58	-
C04	2.59	1	2.27	3	-0.73	-
C05	1	1	1	2.85	-1.85	-

Justifications

1. **CO5 has the Lowest Direct and Indirect Scores (1.00):** Indicates both performance and perception issues, possibly due to complexity or unclear delivery.
2. **High-Order Thinking Not Met:** CO5 demands analysis of climate change and displacement, but assessments may not have effectively captured this level.
3. **Mismatch Between Target and Delivery:** With a high target (2.85) and very low attainment (1), there's a significant gap in learning outcome alignment.

Actions

1. **Redesign CO5 Assessments:** Introduce case-based or scenario-driven questions to better align with its analytical nature.
2. **Enhance Concept Delivery:** Use real-life examples, videos, or group discussions to clarify CO5 topics.
3. **Conduct CO-Specific Feedback Mid-Sem:** Identify issues with CO5 understanding early and adjust teaching strategies accordingly.