

Feedback Analysis on Internet and Computer Facilities Academic Year 2022-23



Average



Figure 1 illustrates the distribution of ratings, with the highest percentage of responses falling under the "Good" category at 30.11%, followed by "Very Good" at 23% and "Excellent" at 18.38%. Lower ratings include "Fair" at 13.98% and "Poor" at 14.53%. This indicates that while the majority of respondents, over 71%, view the subject positively, there is a notable 28.51% combined dissatisfaction reflected in the "Fair" and "Poor" ratings. These results suggest that while the overall perception is favorable, addressing the concerns of the dissatisfied segment could further enhance satisfaction and balance the distribution of ratings.

How is the access to Internet centre when you require



Figure 2

Figure 2 histogram depicts the majority of responses are positive, with 29.94% rating it as "Good," followed by 21.87% marking "Very Good," and 20.4% selecting "Excellent." Lower ratings account for 13.01% for "Fair" and 14.78% for "Poor," indicating that a notable segment of users found accessibility lacking. Overall, while positive feedback dominates, with over 72% in the "Good" to "Excellent" range, the combined 27.79% of lower ratings highlights a need for improvement in internet center accessibility, possibly through better infrastructure or responsiveness to user needs during peak times. This distribution suggests both strengths and opportunities for refinement.



Are there enough number of nodes available in the Internet Centre

Figure	3
I Iguit	\cdot

Figure 3 the histogram displays the majority of respondents rated this aspect positively, with "Good" being the most selected category at 30.39%, followed by "Very Good" at 24.95%, and "Excellent" at 17.98%. However, lower ratings are also notable, with 13.04% marking "Fair" and 13.64% selecting "Poor." This data suggests a generally favourable perception of node availability, as over 73% of responses fall within the "Good" to "Excellent" categories. Nonetheless, the combined 26.68% of "Fair" and "Poor" responses indicate room for improvement. Addressing these concerns by increasing the number of nodes or optimizing their accessibility could help enhance overall user satisfaction. **Are the Internet Centre staff co-operative and helpful**



Figure 4 histogram depicts that most respondents rated the staff positively, with "Good" receiving the highest percentage at 31.46%, followed by "Very Good" at 23.78% and "Excellent" at 19.18%. Lower ratings were comparatively less frequent, with "Fair" at 12.63% and "Poor" at 12.95%. This indicates that while the majority, over 74%, view the staff favorably, there remains a notable 25.58% who rated the staff as "Fair" or "Poor." Addressing concerns raised by this group—perhaps through additional training or improved customer service protocols—could help elevate satisfaction and create a more universally positive experience for users.



How fast is the internet connection when you connect from computers other than the labs

Figure 5 presents that a significant portion of respondents rated the connection positively, with "Good" being the most selected category at 30.69%, followed by "Very Good" at 24.14%, and "Excellent" at 18.02%. However, dissatisfaction is notable, with 13.68% marking "Poor" and 13.47% selecting "Fair." While the majority of responses—over 72%—fall within the "Good" to "Excellent" range, the combined 27.15% of lower ratings point to areas needing attention. Enhancing internet speed and reliability, particularly outside the labs, could help address these concerns and improve user satisfaction further.





Figure 6 represents that a majority of participants rated the facilities positively, with 30.85% marking "Good," followed by 23.24% selecting "Very Good," and 19.15% choosing "Excellent." Lower ratings are comparatively significant, with 13.91% indicating "Poor" and 12.85% marking "Fair." Overall, while over 73% of responses fall within the "Good" to "Excellent" categories, the combined 26.76% of "Fair" and "Poor" ratings highlight notable dissatisfaction. Addressing these concerns— such as enhancing internet speed, accessibility, and reliability—could improve overall satisfaction and provide a better user experience.



Wi-Fi network facilities in the Institute

Fi	gure	7
	5010	

Figure 7 reveals that the majority of respondents provided positive feedback, with "Good" being the most common rating at 30.69%, followed by "Very Good" at 23.38%, and "Excellent" at 17.98%. However, lower ratings are also notable, with "Poor" at 14.37% and "Fair" at 13.58%. While over 71% of responses fall within the "Good" to "Excellent" range, the combined 27.95% of "Fair" and "Poor" ratings highlight dissatisfaction among a significant segment. These results suggest opportunities to improve Wi-Fi network accessibility, reliability, and speed to better meet user expectations and enhance overall satisfaction.

The strength of the Wi-Fi signal in the Institute



Figure 8 elucidates that most responses were favourable, with "Good" accounting for the highest percentage at 30.69%, followed by "Very Good" at 23.38%, and "Excellent" at 17.98%. However, lower ratings were still significant, with "Poor" at 14.37% and "Fair" at 13.58%. While over 71% of respondents rated the facilities positively, the combined 27.95% of "Fair" and "Poor" ratings indicate dissatisfaction among a notable segment. These results suggest that improvements in Wi-Fi network accessibility, reliability, and speed could enhance user satisfaction and address the concerns highlighted by the lower ratings.



The speed of the Wi-Fi connection in the Institute

Figure 9

Figure 9 shows that most participants rated the connection positively, with "Good" being the most common response at 30.07%, followed by "Very Good" at 23.89%, and "Excellent" at 17.85%. However, lower ratings were significant, with 14.69% marking "Poor" and 13.5% selecting "Fair." While over 71% of responses fall in the "Good" to "Excellent" range, the combined 28.19% of "Fair" and "Poor" ratings highlight considerable dissatisfaction. This distribution underscores the need for improvements in Wi-Fi speed and reliability to address user concerns and enhance satisfaction, aiming for a more consistent and superior experience across the board.





Figure 10

Figure 10 the histogram presents feedback on Wi-Fi usage in classrooms, with most ratings falling within positive categories. "Good" received the highest average value at 29.22, followed by "Very Good" at 21.61 and "Excellent" at 17.94. Lower ratings were less frequent, with "Fair" at 13.49 and "Poor" at 17.74. Overall, the data suggests general approval, though there is a notable portion of respondents who rated the Wi-Fi as "Poor." Addressing connectivity issues or improving reliability could enhance user satisfaction.



Places of Using Wi-Fi: Laboratories



Figure 11 depicts that most respondents rated their experience positively, with "Good" being the highest at 30.1%, followed by "Very Good" at 23.67% and "Excellent" at 18.7%. Lower ratings accounted for notable proportions, with "Fair" at 13.22% and "Poor" at 14.31%. This suggests that over 72% of responses fall in the "Good" to "Excellent" categories, indicating overall satisfaction with the Wi-Fi quality. However, the combined 27.53% of "Fair" and "Poor" responses highlight areas for improvement, such as enhancing connectivity reliability and speed. Addressing these concerns could elevate user satisfaction and optimize the Wi-Fi experience in laboratory settings.

Places of Using Wi-Fi: Library



Figure 12 represents that most common rating is "Good," accounting for 28.02%, followed by "Very Good" at 21.74% and "Excellent" at 16.51%. Lower ratings are also notable, with "Fair" at 16.9% and "Poor" at 16.84%. This distribution highlights that while over 66% of responses fall into the "Good" to "Excellent" range, approximately 33.74% represent dissatisfaction. To enhance user experience, focusing on improving Wi-Fi speed, connectivity, and reliability in the library could help address the concerns reflected in the lower ratings. These actions may lead to a more balanced and satisfactory perception of library Wi-Fi services.



Places of Using Wi-Fi: Academic Building

Figure	13
I Iguit	10

Figure 13 displays the highest rating, "Good," accounts for 26.85%, followed by "Very Good" at 20.58% and "Fair" at 19.7%. Lower ratings include "Poor" at 17.47%, and "Excellent" at 15.4%. While over 63% of responses fall within the "Good" to "Excellent" range, the notable combined 37.17% of "Fair" and "Poor" ratings highlights dissatisfaction among a significant portion of users. These results suggest opportunities to improve Wi-Fi services, focusing on connectivity, speed, and reliability to better meet the needs of users and reduce dissatisfaction levels.

Places of Using Wi-Fi: Administrative Building



Figure 14 elucidate that most respondents rated the service positively, with "Good" being the highest category at 27.34%, followed by "Very Good" at 20.95%, and "Excellent" at 16.14%. Lower ratings accounted for notable portions, with 18.32% selecting "Fair" and 17.25% marking "Poor." While over 64% of responses fall within the "Good" to "Excellent" range, the combined 35.57% of "Fair" and "Poor" ratings highlight dissatisfaction among a significant segment of users. These findings suggest opportunities to improve connectivity, speed, and reliability to better meet user expectations and enhance the overall Wi-Fi experience in the administrative building.



Computers and the internet used by the Students to retrieve information

Figure	15
--------	----

Figure 15 describes that most common rating is "Good," accounting for 31.54%, followed by "Very Good" at 23.86%, and "Excellent" at 20.16%. Lower ratings include "Fair" at 12.38% and "Poor" at 12.06%. This indicates that over 75% of respondents positively assess their skills, highlighting a majority confidence in the effective use of computers and the internet. However, the 24.44% combined "Fair" and "Poor" ratings suggest some gaps in skills or access. To address these concerns, implementing focused training or providing additional resources could further enhance students' technological proficiency and reduce the dissatisfaction highlighted in the lower ratings.



Computers and the internet used by the Students to work in a collaborative way

Figure 16 outlines that the majority of respondents rated their experience positively, with "Good" being the most common rating at 32.28%, followed by "Very Good" at 23.84% and "Excellent" at 19.65%. Lower ratings were less frequent, with "Fair" at 12.24% and "Poor" at 11.98%. This indicates that over 75% of respondents find their use of technology for collaboration satisfactory, with a significant portion expressing high approval. However, the combined 24.22% of "Fair" and "Poor" ratings suggest room for improvement, such as enhancing access to collaborative tools or providing better training to optimize their use. These insights highlight both strengths and opportunities for refinement in fostering effective collaboration through technology.



Computers and the internet used by the students to learn in an autonomous way

Figure 17 demonstrates that the majority of responses are positive, with "Good" being the most common rating at 31.57%, followed by "Very Good" at 24.05%, and "Excellent" at 20.4%. Lower ratings include "Fair" at 12.02% and "Poor" at 11.97%. This indicates that over 76% of respondents view the use of computers and the internet for autonomous learning favorably. However, the combined 24% of "Fair" and "Poor" ratings highlight areas for improvement. Enhancing access to resources, providing better tools, or offering guidance on effective autonomous learning methods could address these concerns and further improve satisfaction levels.

Figure 17