

Date: 21.09.2026

office of Dean Student welfare

STUDENT GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL CELL

Effectiveness & Satisfaction Survey Report

Survey Year: 2026

Based on 405 student responses

Prepared for	University / Statutory Academic Review
Prepared by	Student Grievance Redressal Cell
Institution	Echelon Institute of Technology, Faridabad
Survey Instrument	Structured Student Satisfaction Questionnaire



1. Executive Summary

The Student Grievance Redressal Cell (SGRC) conducted an effectiveness and satisfaction survey to assess students' awareness of the Cell, accessibility of the grievance mechanism, clarity of the procedure, timeliness, fairness, confidentiality, staff behaviour, effectiveness of outcomes and overall satisfaction. A total of 405 responses were received.

Across the ten assessed parameters, the weighted overall mean rating was 3.78 out of 5. The results indicate a generally positive perception of the grievance redressal mechanism, while also highlighting opportunities to strengthen communication, turnaround time, process ownership, grievance tracking and awareness.

The survey has therefore been treated not only as a satisfaction exercise but also as an input for continuous improvement of the Cell's processes and student-facing communication.

2. Objectives of the Survey

- To assess students' awareness of the existence and functioning of the Student Grievance Redressal Cell.
- To assess ease of access and clarity of the grievance submission and redressal process.
- To assess acknowledgement and resolution timelines.
- To assess fairness, confidentiality and behaviour of Cell members/staff.
- To assess students' perception of the effectiveness of solutions/outcomes.
- To measure overall student satisfaction and identify areas for improvement.

3. Survey Methodology

Survey type	Student perception and satisfaction survey
Total responses	405
Rating scale	5-point scale: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Average, 2 = Poor, 1 = Very Poor
Parameters assessed	10
Data collection	Structured questionnaire / online response form
Analysis approach	Descriptive analysis of valid single-rating responses; qualitative review of suggestions/comments

Data-quality note: A small number of records contained multiple rating selections for a single parameter. Such records were excluded from the parameter-level numerical calculation rather than assigning an arbitrary score. Consequently, the valid response count varies slightly by parameter (390–396).

4. Respondent Profile

Programme-wise distribution:

Programme	Responses	Share
B.Tech	314	77.5%
BCA	46	11.4%
BBA	43	10.6%
MBA	2	0.5%



Semester-wise distribution:

Semester	Responses	Share
5	243	60.0%
3	108	26.7%
7	54	13.3%

Department-wise distribution:

Department/Group	Responses	Share
CSE & Allied Branches	297	73.3%
Computer Application	51	12.6%
Management	46	11.4%
ME	4	1.0%
CE	4	1.0%
ECE	3	0.7%

5. Parameter-wise Survey Results

Parameter	Valid	Mean / 5	Positive (4-5)	Low (1-2)
Awareness of the existence and functioning of the Student Grievance Redressal Cell	393	3.82	68.4%	6.9%
Ease of accessing the Cell / grievance submission process (online or offline)	393	3.85	69.5%	6.6%
Clarity of the grievance procedure communicated to students	393	3.78	66.9%	8.1%
Time taken to acknowledge the grievance	392	3.76	65.3%	9.7%
Time taken to resolve the grievance	395	3.63	59.5%	12.7%
Fairness during grievance resolution	393	3.78	65.4%	8.9%
Confidentiality maintained regarding the grievance and complainant's identity	396	3.85	67.4%	6.8%
Behaviour and cooperation of the Cell members / staff	390	3.83	65.6%	7.9%
Effectiveness of the solution / outcome provided	392	3.75	63.8%	10.2%
Overall satisfaction with the Student Grievance Redressal Cell	392	3.73	63.0%	10.2%

Overall weighted mean across the ten parameters: 3.78/5. The strongest numerical areas were ease of access, confidentiality, staff behaviour and general awareness. The comparatively lower-scoring areas were grievance resolution time and overall satisfaction, indicating that turnaround and outcome management merit focused attention.

6. Important Observations:

- Students generally report a positive-to-moderate perception of the Student Grievance Redressal Cell, with all ten parameters having a mean above 3.6/5.
- Accessibility of the Cell / grievance submission process received the highest mean rating (3.85/5), indicating that students who know about the mechanism generally find it accessible.
- Confidentiality of grievances also received a relatively strong mean rating (3.85/5), supporting confidence in the privacy aspect of the process.
- Time taken to resolve grievances received the lowest mean rating (3.63/5) among the assessed parameters, making turnaround time a clear improvement priority.
- Overall satisfaction was 3.73/5, suggesting that the system is functioning but can be strengthened through more visible communication, predictable timelines and clearer ownership.



- The qualitative comments repeatedly highlighted the need for faster resolution, clearer communication regarding whom to approach, stronger student awareness and better follow-up/tracking.
- Some comments referred to infrastructure/facility concerns. Such issues should be routed to the appropriate administrative/maintenance authority while keeping the grievance cell responsible for acknowledgement and tracking.

7. Conclusion

The Student Grievance Redressal Cell Effectiveness & Satisfaction Survey, based on 405 student responses, shows an overall weighted mean rating of 3.78/5 across the ten assessed parameters. The findings indicate that the Cell has a functional and generally positively perceived mechanism, particularly with respect to accessibility and confidentiality. At the same time, the survey identifies resolution time, communication, process clarity, tracking and accountability as important areas for further strengthening.

The Cell may use these findings as a continuous-improvement baseline and periodically review the effectiveness of the actions taken. Future surveys can be used to measure changes in awareness, turnaround time, satisfaction and perceived effectiveness.

Prepared by: _____
Convenor GRC

