# 📐⚙️ Department of Mechanics and Mathematics

Student Feedback and Course Evaluation Questionnaire
📅**Survey Period- 05.03.2025-15.04.2025**
Number of Student Participants:148

📘**1.** What year are you studying in?

📚 Academic year	👥 Number of students
1 year	51
2 year	82
3 year	13
4 year	0

This data is used to determine student participation by year and to conduct statistical analysis. The responses per year help in evaluating the effectiveness of the course.

🏫 2. The faculty (school) you are studying in :

This question aims to enable a comparative analysis of satisfaction levels across faculties.

Number of Students by Faculty

Faculty	Number of Students
Psychology	7
Design	0
Political and Social Sciences	2
Advanced Technology and Innovative Engineering	124
Economics	7
Business and Management	7
Philology	0

Legend:
- High technologies and innovative engineering
- Business and management
- Psychology
- Economics
- Political and social sciences

(Pie chart values: 5%, 5%, 5%, 1%)

📊 **3.** Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Through this questionnaire, students express their opinions on the instructor's teaching approach, clarity of explanation, preparedness, communication skills, and the relevance of the teaching materials.
"Responses are assessed using a three-point Likert scale with the options: 'Totally Agree', 'Agree', and 'Disagree'."

	Totally Agree	Agree	Disagree
Overall, you are satisfied with the delivery of the course.	56.8	28.8	14.4
Create a fair and reliable learning environment	53.4	30.1	16.4
Information regarding the examination procedures has been...	56.6	37.2	6.2
Utilize electronic systems and share relevant information...	56.8	33.6	9.6
Use of modern resources appropriate to the requirements of...	55.5	31.5	13
Provide informative feedback on assessments	54.5	31	14.5
Encourages students to engage in discussion and questioning	55.2	34.5	10.3
Presents course materials in an engaging and effective manner	55.2	29	15.9
Allocating time efficiently for the practical part	54.8	25.9	19.3
They come well-prepared to the lesson.	58.2	34.9	6.8
The course objectives and learning outcomes have been...	59.7	31.9	8.3
Making a syllabus available to students	62.3	32.2	5.5

🌟**4 Finally, please evaluate your satisfaction with the instructor's teaching quality using the scale below:**

Students' end-term feedback is required on the overall teaching quality of the instructor on a 10-point scale. This rating is intended to reflect the student's overall impression throughout the course.

Overall Quality Satisfaction
8.31

📌 Department of Finance and Accounting – Average Satisfaction Score

🎯 8.54 / 10

🔍 The performance of instructors is associated with a high level of student satisfaction.

📊 **Student Feedback Rating Scale (10-point scale)**

Score Range	Assessment Level	Explanation
9 – 10	Very high satisfaction	Students are fully satisfied with the instructor's performance.
7 – 8	High satisfaction	Students are generally satisfied.
5 – 6	Partial satisfaction	Students' opinions are varied, and the performance is rated at an average level.
1 – 4	Low satisfaction	Students are generally dissatisfied.

📈 **Statistical Analysis of the Quality Indicators of Departmental Faculty Members**

Satisfaction Level	Interest Rate Range	Category	Sign
Totally agree	**95%-100%**	(Very High Satisfaction)	✅
Agree	**75%-94%**	(High and Moderate Satisfaction)	☑️
Partially agree	**50%-74%**	(Moderate Level of Satisfaction)	🔶
Disagree	**0%-49%**	(Low Level of Satisfaction)	❌

Instructor's Full Name	Number of Students Participating in the Survey (114 students)	Satisfaction level %	Low level of satisfaction (1 to 10 rating scale)	Analysis of Teacher Effectiveness Based on a Survey
Həbibov Sənan	8	**84.3%**	**3 score**→1 person	☑️
Bəşirov Şaban	8	**96.3%**	-	✅
Firdus Elnarə	0			
Həmidova Gülnar	5	**92%**	**6 score** → 1 person	✅
Quliyeva Svetlana	14	**67.1%**	**1 score**→2 people **3 score**→1 person	🔶

			4 score→1 person **5 score→2** people	
Rüstəmova Dürdanə	13	**53.8%**	**1 score→2** people **3 score→2** people **4 score→1** person **5 score→3** people **6 score→1** people	🔶
Səlimov İlham	6	**81.6%**	**3 score→1** people **6 score→1** person	☑️
Əmiraslanova Fatma	24	**97.5%**	−	✅
Tağıyev Rauf	11	**64,5%**	**2 score→2** people **5 score→2** people **6 score→1** person	🔶
Qulubəyov Aydın	12	**65.5%**	**2 score→1** person **5 score→2** people	🔶

			6 score→1 person	
Əzizli Nərmin	21	**94.7%**	-	✅
Fərəcova Sona	6	**100%**	-	✅
Remizov Mixail	18	**90.5%**	**5 score→2** people	✅
Nəbiyeva Səyyarə	1	**50%**	**5 score→1** person	🔶
Atayev İbrahim	1	**100%**	-	✅

📝 Result**:**

According to the results of the conducted survey, the majority of teachers — 86% — rated the presented activity with a moderate level of satisfaction.

	Level of Satisfaction
Totally Agree	5
Agree	4
Partially Agree	5
Disagree	0