

FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR STUDENTS
THEORY EXAMINATION

Please respond to the following questions by putting tick mark in the appropriate boxes

Sl No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	QUESTIONS WERE WITHIN SYLLABUS			✓		
2	COVERAGE OF SYLLABUS WAS APPROPRIATE			✓		
3	QUESTIONS WERE OF APPROPRIATE STANDARD			✓		
4	TIME WAS ADEQUATE					✓
5	ALLOCATION OF MARKS WAS APPROPRIATE			✓		
6	SUB ALLOCATION OF MARKS WAS APPROPRIATE			✓		
7	QUESTION PAPER BUNDLES OPENED IN FRONT OF STUDENT REPS					✓
8	CLEAR INSTRUCTIONS WERE GIVEN FOR FILLING OUT THE DETAILS IN ANSWER SCRIPTS			-		✓
9	ARRANGEMENTS IN THE HALL WERE ADEQUATE					✓
10	DOUBTS REGARDING QUESTIONS WERE CLARIFIED				✓	
11	CORRECTIONS IN QUESTION PAPERS INTIMATED				✓	

1. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

SUBJECT:

PAPER:

DATE:

FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR STUDENTS
THEORY EXAMINATION

Please respond to the following questions by putting tick mark in the appropriate boxes

Sl No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	QUESTIONS WERE WITHIN SYLLABUS			✓		
2	COVERAGE OF SYLLABUS WAS APPROPRIATE			✓		
3	QUESTIONS WERE OF APPROPRIATE STANDARD			✓		
4	TIME WAS ADEQUATE					✓
5	ALLOCATION OF MARKS WAS APPROPRIATE			✓		
6	SUB ALLOCATION OF MARKS WAS APPROPRIATE			✓		
7	QUESTION PAPER BUNDLES OPENED IN FRONT OF STUDENT REPS					✓
8	CLEAR INSTRUCTIONS WERE GIVEN FOR FILLING OUT THE DETAILS IN ANSWER SCRIPTS					✓
9	ARRANGEMENTS IN THE HALL WERE ADEQUATE					✓
10	DOUBTS REGARDING QUESTIONS WERE CLARIFIED				✓	
11	CORRECTIONS IN QUESTION PAPERS INTIMATED				✓	

1. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

SUBJECT:

PAPER:

DATE:

FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR STUDENTS
PRACTICAL & VIVA EXAMINATION

Sl No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	Exercise / Case allotted was within the purview of syllabus				✓	
2	Adequate time was given to complete the task					✓
3	Clear instructions were given on the tasks during examination					✓
4	Examiners spent adequate time with for discussing your task					✓
5	Chemicals/instruments/clinical materials were provided in sufficient quantity by the Departments				✓	
6	Questions asked in Viva –voce were within the syllabus			✓		
7	Questions asked in Viva Voce covered all the relevant topics			✓		
8	Examiners could listen to your response attentively				✓	
9	Examination took place in a non threatening atmosphere			✓		
10	Examiners and expert assistants were responsive to your concerns			✓		

1. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

SUBJECT:

DATE :

2021-22

FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR STUDENTS
PRACTICAL & VIVA EXAMINATION

Sl No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	Exercise / Case allotted was within the purview of syllabus					✓
2	Adequate time was given to complete the task					✓
3	Clear instructions were given on the tasks during examination				✓	
4	Examiners spent adequate time with for discussing your task					✓
5	Chemicals/instruments/clinical materials were provided in sufficient quantity by the Departments					✓
6	Questions asked in Viva –voce were within the syllabus					✓
7	Questions asked in Viva Voce covered all the relevant topics					✓
8	Examiners could listen to your response attentively					✓
9	Examination took place in a non threatening atmosphere					✓
10	Examiners and expert assistants were responsive to your concerns				✓	

1. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

SUBJECT:

DATE :

FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR EXAMINERS
THEORY EXAMINATION AND VALUATION (UG/PG)

Please respond to the following questions by putting tick mark in the appropriate boxes

Sl No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	Questions were within syllabus				✓	
2	Weightage given to different topics of syllabus was appropriate				✓	
3	Questions were of appropriate standard				✓	
4	The time allotment and expected length of answer were corresponding				✓	
5	Allocation of marks to different set of questions were appropriate					✓
6	Long essay questions were well framed					✓
7	Short essay questions were well framed					✓
8	Questions were addressing different domains of cognitive learning				✓	
9	Do you think short answer questions are necessary in Post graduate exams				✓	
10	Arrangements in the valuation hall were adequate				✓	

11. WORK LOAD WAS APPROPRIATE

Yes

No

12. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

NAME:

Dr. Manu G

SUBJECT:

Pharmacology

DATE:

26.03.22

MOBILE NUMBER:

9886302822

PAPER:

SIGNATURE



FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR EXAMINERS
PRACTICAL EXAMINATION (UG/PG)

Please respond to the following questions by putting tick mark in the appropriate boxes

Sl No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	Exercise/ Cases allotted to the candidates were within the purview of syllabus				✓	
2	Time allotted for exercises/ long and short case were adequate				✓	
3	Rare/ Uncommon cases or exercises were given to the candidates	✓				
4	Punctuality of candidates was satisfactory				✓	
5	Practical exercises were of satisfactory standard				✓	
6	The exercises covered all three domains of learning				✓	
7	There was a scope to assess communication skills and professionalism of students				✓	
8	Arrangements for practical exams were satisfactory				✓	
9	Internal examiners and expert assistants were responsive to your needs				✓	
10	Do you think OSPE/OSCE/OSLER* can be introduced as a part of assessment in final exams				✓	

*OSCE: Objective Structured Clinical Examination OSPE: Objective Structured Practical Examination

OSLER: Objective Structured Long Case Examination and Report

11. Do you think any of the exercises in practical examination can be added / removed?

Added	Removed

12. WORK LOAD WAS APPROPRIATE

Yes

No

13. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

NAME: Dr. Manu G

MOBILE NUMBER: 9886502822

SUBJECT: Pharmacology

DATE: 26-03-22

SIGNATURE

(Handwritten Signature)

FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR EXAMINERS
THEORY EXAMINATION AND VALUATION (UG/PG)

Please respond to the following questions by putting tick mark in the appropriate boxes

Sl No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	Questions were within syllabus				✓	
2	Weightage given to different topics of syllabus was appropriate				✓	
3	Questions were of appropriate standard				✓	
4	The time allotment and expected length of answer were corresponding				✓	
5	Allocation of marks to different set of questions were appropriate					✓
6	Long essay questions were well framed					✓
7	Short essay questions were well framed					✓
8	Questions were addressing different domains of cognitive learning				✓	
9	Do you think short answer questions are necessary in Post graduate exams				✓	
10	Arrangements in the valuation hall were adequate				✓	

11. WORK LOAD WAS APPROPRIATE

Yes

No

12. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

NAME: Dr. PUSHPA. V.H

SUBJECT: Pharmacology

DATE: 26/03/22

MOBILE NUMBER: 9480380727

PAPER:

SIGNATURE

VHP

FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR EXAMINERS
PRACTICAL EXAMINATION (UG/PG)

Please respond to the following questions by putting tick mark in the appropriate boxes

SI No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	Exercise/ Cases allotted to the candidates were within the purview of syllabus				✓	
2	Time allotted for exercises/ long and short case were adequate				✓	
3	Rare/ Uncommon cases or exercises were given to the candidates	✓				
4	Punctuality of candidates was satisfactory				✓	
5	Practical exercises were of satisfactory standard				✓	
6	The exercises covered all three domains of learning				✓	
7	There was a scope to assess communication skills and professionalism of students				✓	
8	Arrangements for practical exams were satisfactory				✓	
9	Internal examiners and expert assistants were responsive to your needs				✓	
10	Do you think OSPE/OSCE/OSLER* can be introduced as a part of assessment in final exams				✓	

*OSCE: Objective Structured Clinical Examination OSPE: Objective Structured Practical Examination

OSLER: Objective Structured Long Case Examination and Report

11. Do you think any of the exercises in practical examination can be added / removed?

Added	Removed

12. WORK LOAD WAS APPROPRIATE

Yes

No

13. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

NAME: Dr. RUSHPA. V H

MOBILE NUMBER: 9480380727

SUBJECT: Pharmacology

DATE: 26/03/22

SIGNATURE

RHP

FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR EXAMINERS
THEORY EXAMINATION AND VALUATION (UG/PG)

Please respond to the following questions by putting tick mark in the appropriate boxes

SI No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	Questions were within syllabus				✓	
2	Weightage given to different topics of syllabus was appropriate				✓	
3	Questions were of appropriate standard				✓	
4	The time allotment and expected length of answer were corresponding				✓	
5	Allocation of marks to different set of questions were appropriate					✓
6	Long essay questions were well framed					✓
7	Short essay questions were well framed					✓
8	Questions were addressing different domains of cognitive learning				✓	
9	Do you think short answer questions are necessary in Post graduate exams				✓	
10	Arrangements in the valuation hall were adequate				✓	

11. WORK LOAD WAS APPROPRIATE

Yes

No

12. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

NAME:

Dr. Maryatha .KR

MOBILE NUMBER:

9448508992

SUBJECT:

Pharmacology

PAPER:

DATE:

26/3/22

SIGNATURE



FEEDBACK PROFORMA FOR EXAMINERS
PRACTICAL EXAMINATION (UG/PG)

Please respond to the following questions by putting tick mark in the appropriate boxes

Sl No	Item	Not at all	To very little extent	To some extent	To large extent	To great extent
1	Exercise/ Cases allotted to the candidates were within the purview of syllabus				✓	
2	Time allotted for exercises/ long and short case were adequate				✓	
3	Rare/ Uncommon cases or exercises were given to the candidates	✓				
4	Punctuality of candidates was satisfactory				✓	
5	Practical exercises were of satisfactory standard				✓	
6	The exercises covered all three domains of learning				✓	
7	There was a scope to assess communication skills and professionalism of students				✓	
8	Arrangements for practical exams were satisfactory				✓	
9	Internal examiners and expert assistants were responsive to your needs				✓	
10	Do you think OSPE/OSCE/OSLER* can be introduced as a part of assessment in final exams				✓	

*OSCE: Objective Structured Clinical Examination OSPE: Objective Structured Practical Examination
OSLER: Objective Structured Long Case Examination and Report

11. Do you think any of the exercises in practical examination can be added / removed?

Added	Removed

12. WORK LOAD WAS APPROPRIATE

Yes

No

13. ANY OTHER (SPECIFY)

NAME: Dr. Marpatha.kc MOBILE NUMBER: 9448528992

SUBJECT: 9448528992

DATE: 26/3/22

SIGNATURE

[Signature]

FEEDBACK

- 1) Name of the Examiner: Dr. Maryatha K S
 2) Department: Pharmacology
 3) Year of experience as a teacher: 25 yrs
 4) Year of experience as an examiner: 20 years.

Date: 26/3/22 time: 11.15 AM

Signature of the Examiner

Stream	BSc	MBBS ✓	MD / MS	
--------	-----	--------	---------	--

Q. No.	On a level of 1-5 how would you grade (1=worst, 5=best)	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Overall students' performance			✓		
2.	Marking the answered/ unanswerd questions in the front sheet			✓		
3.	Writing question numbers, haedings and subheadings			✓		
4.	Specificity of the answers to the questions asked			✓		
5.	Adequacy of the answers written for the marks allotted to the questions			✓		
6.	Time management			✓		
7.	Writing brief heading for the Essays			✓		
8.	Highlighting the important points			✓		
9.	Use of diagrams for illustration			✓		
10.	Presentation of the answers in the flow charts		✓			
11.	Handwriting			✓		
12.	Grammatical competence		✓			
13.	Spacing and neatness			✓		
14.	Overall capacity to frame and present the answers capacity			✓		
15.	Writing answers in the sequence of Main question, Short note, Short answers or Serial number wise			✓		

16. What can be done to improve the students' ability to answer the questions, in your opinion? (Ex. Special training for answering, Model exams, orientation program etc) Special training.