Guardians' Perceptions towards Kailali Multiple Campus

Far Western University

Kailali Multiple Campus

Dhangadhi, Kailali

November 2025

Abstract

Guardian's perception plays a vital role in evaluating the quality and effectiveness of higher education institutions. This study aimed to assess the perception of guardians regarding various aspects of Kailali Multiple Campus (KMC), including teaching quality, facilities, administrative services, co-curricular activities, and overall satisfaction. A descriptive research design was adopted, and data was collected from 207 guardians of students enrolled in different programmes at the campus using a structured questionnaire.

The findings revealed that most of the guardians were satisfied with the teaching quality. Regarding campus facilities, such as classrooms, library, and technological resources, guardians expressed moderate satisfaction, highlighting the need for infrastructural improvements. Administrative services received mixed responses, with some guardians noting timely and transparent processes, while others suggested improvements in communication and responsiveness. Co-curricular activities were moderately appreciated, though several guardians emphasized the need for more diverse programmes to enhance students' holistic development. Overall, the study indicated a positive perception of guardian of KMC, while also identifying specific areas requiring attention.

Based on the findings, it is recommended that the campus enhance infrastructure, strengthen administrative procedures, and expand co-curricular programs to better meet guardians' expectations and support students' all-round development. The study contributes to understanding the importance of guardian feedback in improving institutional quality and offers practical insights for campus management to enhance educational services and overall satisfaction.

Table of contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1   Background of Study

Kailali Multiple Campus (KMC), located in Dhangadhi, Kailali, is a well-known educational institution in Far Western Nepal, established in 2037 B.S. (1980 AD). KMC is the leading campus in Nepal's Sudurpashchim Province. At first, it was known as Kailali Commerce Campus. As it expanded to include more faculties, it was later renamed as Kailali Multiple Campus. At the time of its establishment, Nepal was under the Panchayat System. The literacy rate in Sudurpashchim was very low, and students who wanted to pursue higher education had to travel to Kathmandu or India. Social workers, political leaders, and pioneers of Dhangadhi felt an urgent need to establish a local campus. The credit of the efforts and appeal for the establishment of KMC goes to the then Seti Zonal Commissioner Ratna Bahadur Gurung. King Birendra approved the establishment of the campus on 27 bighas of land.

During its forty-four-year journey as a community-based campus, it has produced many students who have contributed significantly to various sectors of national development. Many of them are also doing better abroad. It has set some remarkable records in its academic history. Tribhuvan University awarded Kailali Multiple Campus a cash prize and a certificate as the best private college in Nepal in 2045 B.S. Students of the Intermediate level (IA) and Master of Business Studies (MBS) received gold medals from TU as the top scorers in their respective board exams. In 2065 B.S., the campus was selected to participate for Quality Assurance and Accreditation (QAA) by the University Grants

Commission (UGC), Nepal. Following the procedures and meeting the requirements, the campus received the QAA certificate in 2069 B.S. As the top-ranked community-based campus in Nepal, it was chosen for the Higher Education Reform Project (HERP) by the UGC in 2072 B.S. The campus underwent the secondary phase of the QAA process and was re-accredited in 2075 B.S.

After a series of extensive meetings and discussions with representatives of local-level government organizations, social workers, student leaders, professors, political party leaders, and other stakeholders, and getting their consent, the Campus Management Committee signed an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Far Western University (FWU) and the campus became its constituent campus in Magh, 2077 B.S. The campus is now functioning as per the policies, rules, and regulations of Far Western University. Kailali Multiple Campus is doing its best to provide quality education in the far western region of Nepal. For the third cycle QAA under NEHEP, the campus has submitted the Self-Study Report (SSR) to the UGC in 2080 B.S. With the special assistance of UGC, recently, KMC has established a 'Far Western University Incubation Center' (FWUIC) to enhance entrepreneurial culture among the students. The UGC has been supporting the Entrepreneurship Support Program (ESP) for the betterment of the activities of FWUIC. Furthermore, the campus has prepared a Strategic Development Plan and internal guidelines in line with the rules and regulations of the University for the operation of the institution.

Kailali Multiple Campus (KMC) is a leading public campus in far western Nepal. Guardian's perception towards the campus is important because its influences student enrolment decisions, support, and campus reputation. This study assessed the guardian's

views on teaching quality, infrastructure, campus management, and student support, and examined whether perceptions vary by sociodemographic characteristics.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Educational institutions are the backbone of social transformation and community development. Guardians, as the primary stakeholders in their children's education, play a significant role in determining the reputation, trustworthiness, and effectiveness of an academic institution. Their perceptions about the quality of education, institutional management, faculty performance, physical facilities, and overall learning environment reflect both the strengths and limitations of an institution. In the case of Kailali Multiple Campus, guardians' evaluation and feedback provide essential insights into its current performance and prospects.

Despite being one of the oldest and most reputed higher education institutions in Far Western Nepal, Kailali Multiple Campus is continuously challenged by changing academic demands, increasing competition from private and international colleges, and growing expectations from guardians and students. Guardians' perceptions often revolve around critical issues such as the quality of teaching, adequacy of infrastructure, affordability of fee structures, transparency in administration, extracurricular activities, and the employability of graduates. These perceptions directly influence the level of community trust, student enrollment, and institutional sustainability.

The data collected for this study provides empirical evidence regarding guardians' socio-demographic background and their level of satisfaction across different dimensions of the campus. Preliminary review of the data indicates variations in guardians' opinions based

on factors such as age, gender, and educational background. While some guardians are satisfied with the teaching-learning environment, others express concerns about facilities, administrative responsiveness, and the overall competitiveness of the campus. However, these insights have not been systematically analyzed or documented in the past.

Therefore, it becomes crucial to conduct a descriptive analysis of guardians' perception toward Kailali Multiple Campus. Such a study will not only highlight the socio-economic and demographic profile of guardians but also identify the areas where the campus is performing well and where improvements are needed. Understanding guardians' viewpoints is essential for formulating evidence-based policies, improving institutional quality, and strengthening the relationship between the campus and the community. Ultimately, this research will help Kailali Multiple Campus to align its educational services with the aspirations and expectations of the guardians and society at large.

1.3   Research Questions

This study has the following research questions:

i.   What is the socio-economic and demographic profile of the guardians whose children are studying at Kailali Multiple Campus?

ii.   How do guardians perceive the quality of teaching and learning, physical facilities, classrooms, and infrastructure provided by the campus?

iii. What is the level of parental satisfaction regarding administrative management, transparency, and communication of the campus?

iv.   To what extent do guardians believe the campus is preparing students for future opportunities, including employment and further studies?

1.4   Objectives of the Study

The overall aim of this study is to assess guardians' perceptions toward Kailali Multiple Campus in relation to their socio-economic and demographic characteristics and their evaluation of the institutional performance. The study focuses on understanding how guardians perceive the quality, effectiveness, and relevance of educational services provided by the campus.

Specific Objectives

i.   To describe the socio-economic and demographic profile of the guardians whose children are enrolled at Kailali Multiple Campus

ii. To examine guardians' perceptions regarding different aspects of the campus such as teaching-learning environment, infrastructure, faculty performance, administrative management, and co-curricular activities

iii. To analyze the level of satisfaction among guardians with respect to academic quality, institutional facilities, and student support services

iv. To provide recommendations for improving the educational quality and institutional effectiveness of the campus in alignment with guardians' expectations

1.5   Significance of the Study

Educational institutions exist not only to impart knowledge but also to meet the expectations of the community and stakeholders they serve. Among these stakeholders, guardians hold a particularly important role, as they are directly involved in their children's educational journey and often influence decisions regarding academic choices. Understanding guardians' perceptions, therefore, provides valuable insights into the

quality, effectiveness, and social relevance of an institution. This study is significant for several reasons:

i. For Kailali Multiple Campus, the findings will provide an evidence-based evaluation of the campus's current performance from the perspective of guardians. The study will highlight areas of strength, such as teaching quality and institutional reputation, while also identifying areas requiring improvement, such as infrastructure, administrative transparency, or co-curricular activities. This feedback can serve as a guideline for the campus administration to improve institutional quality and strengthen trust among the community.

ii. For guardians and students, by systematically documenting guardians' views, the study gives a voice to those who invest financially and emotionally in their children's education. This ensures that parental concerns and expectations are acknowledged, which in turn helps create a more supportive and collaborative educational environment.

iii. For policy makers and stakeholders, the study provides data that can inform educational policy decisions at the local and regional levels. Since Kailali Multiple Campus is a leading community-based campus in Sudurpashchim Province, its experiences and challenges reflect the broader state of higher education in the region. Policy makers can use these findings to design programs and allocate resources more effectively.

iv. For academic research, the research contributes to the limited body of literature on parental perceptions toward higher education institutions in Nepal. It sets a foundation for further comparative studies across community campuses, private institutions, and universities.

v. For Quality Assurance and Sustainability, as Nepal's higher education system is increasingly emphasizing quality assurance and accreditation, the insights from this study can be used to align the campus with national and international standards. Meeting parental expectations is critical for student retention, enrollment growth, and long-term institutional sustainability.

1.6   Organization of the Study

This study is divided into six chapters. Chapter one deals mainly with the general background, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives and significance of the study. Chapter two presents a review of literature relating to the topic. Chapter three describes the research design, sampling frame, study population and sample, data collection tools and procedure, data processing and analysis, reliability of the perception scale (Cronbach's Alpha), ethical considerations, and delimitation of the study. Chapter four presents background characteristics of the respondents. Chapter five deals with perception of guardians towards Kailali Multiple campus. Chapter six presents discussion, conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

The literature indicates that parental perception is multi-dimensional, encompassing teaching quality, facilities, administration, co-curricular programs, and overall satisfaction. Evaluating these perceptions provides valuable insights into institutional strengths and areas requiring improvement, contributing to effective planning, quality enhancement, and sustainable educational development.

2.1   Perception in Education

Parental perception is a critical factor in evaluating the quality and effectiveness of educational institutions. Epstein (2018) emphasizes that guardians' perceptions influence students' academic motivation, engagement, and overall development. Guardians often assess institutions based on teaching quality, administrative efficiency, facilities, and co-curricular activities, which in turn shape their satisfaction and trust in the institution.

2.2   Teaching and Learning Quality

Teaching quality is a primary determinant of parental satisfaction. Darling-Hammond (2017) highlights that effective teaching practices, such as student-centered approaches, interactive learning, and clear communication, enhance guardians' perception of institutional performance. In the context of higher education, Khatiwada and Sharma (2020) note that guardians value faculty competence, responsiveness, and engagement with students.

2.3   Facilities and Infrastructure

The availability and quality of campus facilities significantly influence parental perceptions. Adequate classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and technological resources are

seen as essential for supporting students' learning. Choudhary and Pandey (2019) indicate that poor infrastructure and limited resources can negatively affect guardians' trust and satisfaction. Institutions providing modern facilities are perceived more positively by guardians.

2.4   Administrative Services

Efficient administrative services are vital in shaping guardians' opinions about an institution. Kumar and Singh (2018) argue that transparent procedures, timely communication, and supportive administrative staff enhance parental satisfaction. In contrast, bureaucratic delays or lack of clarity in administrative processes can lead to negative perceptions.

2.5   Co-Curricular Activities

Co-curricular programs, including sports, cultural events, clubs, and community engagement activities, contribute to the holistic development of students and positively influence parental perception. Shrestha and Adhikari (2021) find that institutions actively promoting co-curricular involvement are regarded more favorably by guardians. A balanced emphasis on academics and co-curricular activities is essential for overall satisfaction.

2.6   Overall Satisfaction and Institutional Reputation

Guardians' overall satisfaction often reflects a combination of perceptions regarding teaching, facilities, administration, and co-curricular opportunities. Tiwari (2020) highlights that institutions with high parental satisfaction not only retain trust but also attract new students through positive reputation and recommendations. Continuous

assessment of guardians' perceptions allows institutions to identify strengths, address weaknesses, and improve educational quality.

2.7   Nepalese Context

In Nepal, studies by Koirala (2019) and Bhattarai (2021) reveal that guardians prioritize teaching quality, institutional reputation, and infrastructure when assessing higher education institutions. Kailali Multiple Campus as a leading institution in the Far Western region is expected to meet these parental expectations to maintain credibility and support student success.

2.8   Research Gap

This study bridges the gap between community expectations and institutional practices, offering practical recommendations for improvement. By focusing on guardians' perceptions, the study helps Kailali Multiple Campus strengthen its accountability, responsiveness, and overall effectiveness in delivering higher education to the community it serves.

Chapter Three

Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive cross-sectional survey design to assess guardians' perceptions toward Kailali Multiple Campus. A cross-sectional design was considered

appropriate because it enables the collection of data from respondents at a single point in time and allows for the description of prevailing attitudes, opinions, and demographic characteristics without manipulating the study environment.

3.2 Study Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of guardians whose children were enrolled at Kailali Multiple Campus during the academic session of data collection. Since it was not feasible to include all guardians in the study, a sample survey method was used. Respondents were selected through a purposive sampling technique, ensuring representation across gender, age, and socio-economic backgrounds. A total of 207 guardians participated in the survey. This sample size was considered adequate to provide meaningful descriptive analysis and to reflect the diversity of parental views toward the campus.

3.3 Data Collection Tools and Procedure

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into two sections:

i. Socio-economic and Demographic Information – age, gender, education, occupation, and other relevant background details

ii. Perceptions of Guardians towards Kailali Multiple Campus – a set of Likert-Scale items (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) that measured guardians' opinions on teaching quality, faculty performance, administrative management, infrastructure, co-curricular activities, and overall satisfaction

The questionnaires were distributed to guardians through their children and the filled questionnaires were collected by their children.

3.4 Data Processing and Analysis

The collected data was coded, entered, and analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. The analysis focused primarily on descriptive statistics, which included:

i. Number and Percentage Distribution for categorical variables such as gender, occupation, and item-wise responses

ii. Measures of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, Mode) and Dispersion (Standard Deviation, Range) for continuous variables such as age and total perception scores

iii. Graphical presentations such as bar charts, pie charts, histograms, and boxplots to visually represent the findings

3.5 Reliability of the Perception Scale (Cronbach's Alpha)

To assess the reliability of the perception scale, Cronbach's Alpha was computed. The result was $\alpha = 0.82$, which indicates high internal consistency among the items measuring parental perception.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues were carefully addressed in this study. The purpose of the research was explained to all respondents, and their informed consent was obtained before data collection. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were free to withdraw at any stage

without any compulsion. The anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents were strictly maintained, and the data collected was used solely for academic purposes.

3.7 Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited to the following aspects:

i. Geographical area – The study was confined to guardians of students enrolled in Kailali Multiple Campus, Dhangadhi, Nepal. Guardians outside this campus or other institutions were not included.

ii. Population and respondents – Only guardians of currently enrolled students were considered as respondents. Other stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, alumni, or community members were excluded.

iii. Time frame – Data were collected during the first and second week of Bhadra 2082 B.S., and therefore, the findings reflect the perceptions of guardians at that particular period only.

iv. Variables of study – The research focused specifically on guardians' perceptions regarding the academic quality, physical facilities, teaching-learning environment, management, and overall reputation of Kailali Multiple Campus. Other factors that might influence perception, such as socio-cultural aspects or political influences, were not included.

v. Research tools and methods – The study utilized a structured questionnaire for data collection and SPSS for analysis. Qualitative insights and in-depth interviews were beyond the scope of this study.

Chapter Four

Background Characteristics of the Respondents

This chapter deals with the background characteristics of the respondents. Background characteristics of the respondents include age of the respondents, sex composition of the respondents, caste/ethnic group of the respondents, educational status of the respondents and occupational status of the respondents and place of residence.

4.1 Age of Respondents

Age composition of population refers to the distribution of population based on differentiation in age or age group. It can be shown as single year age distribution or five-year age distribution. The following table shows the five-year age distribution of respondents according to five-year age distribution

Table 4.1: Distribution of Respondents by Age Group

Age Group	N	Percent
20-24	19	9.2
25-29	17	8.2
30-34	11	5.3
35-39	12	5.8
40-44	53	25.6
45-49	49	23.7
50-54	25	12.1
55=59	12	5.8
60 and above	9	4.3
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardian's Response Survey 2082

Table 4.1 shows that the largest proportion of respondents belong to the 40–44 years age group (25.6%) followed by 45–49 years (23.7%). Smaller groups were found among ages 20–24 (9.2%), 25–29 (8.2%), and 30–34 (5.3%). Only 4.3% were 60 years and above. The majority of guardians are in their middle adulthood (40–49 years), a stage when children are typically pursuing higher education. This age composition suggests that guardians in their mature stage are highly engaged with the campus.

4.2 Sex Composition of Respondents

Sex composition refers to the distribution of population based on differentiation in sex. It refers to distribution of male and female population. The following table shows the distribution of respondents based on male population and female population.

15

Table 4.2: Distribution of Respondents by Sex

Gender	N	Percent
Female	62	30.0
Male	145	70.0
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardian's Response Survey, 2082

Table 4.2 shows that that 70 percent of respondents were male and 30 percent female. It indicates that fathers appear to be more involved in responding to surveys about their children's education. This could reflect gender roles in household decision-making, where men often take responsibility for educational and financial matters.

4.3 Ethnic Composition of Respondents

Ethnic composition refers to the distribution of population based on different caste/ethnic groups. The following table shows the distribution of respondents based on different caste/ethnic groups.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents by Caste/ethnic Group

Caste/ethnic group	N	Percent
Chhetri	96	46.4
Brahman	52	25.1
Chaudhary Tharu	31	15.0
Rana Tharu	8	3.9
Dalit	8	3.9
Thakuri	9	4.3
Magar	2	1.0
Lama	1	0.5
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardian's Response Survey, 2082

From the table given above, it was found that the largest groups were Chhetri (46.4%) and Brahman (25.1%), followed by Chaudhary Tharu (15%). Other groups included Thakuri (4.3%), Rana Tharu (3.9%), Dalit (3.9%), Magar (1%), and Lama (0.5%). The campus

attracts guardians from diverse caste/ethnic backgrounds, but it is dominated by high-caste groups (Chhetri and Brahman). Representation of marginalized groups (Dalit, Magar, Lama) is relatively low, suggesting the need for more inclusive strategies.

4.4 Religious Composition of Respondents

Distribution of population based on the religious status of the people is known as religious composition of population. The respondent's religious status is shown in the table.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Respondents by Religion

Religion	N	Percent
Hindu	204	98.6
Buddha	2	1.0
Christian	1	.5
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardian's Response Survey, 2082

From the table given above, it was found that 98.6% of guardians were Hindu, with very small proportions of Buddha (1%) and Christian (0.5%). The religious profile reflects the broader demographic dominance of Hinduism in Kailali district and Far-Western Nepal. The campus community is therefore highly homogeneous in terms of religion.

4.5 Educational Composition of Respondents

Distribution of population based on literacy status and educational attainment of the people is known as educational composition. Table 4.5 shows the literacy status of respondents.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Respondents by Literacy Status

Literacy Status	N	Percent
Literate	173	83.6
Illiterate	34	16.4
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardian's Response Survey, 2082

Table 4.5 shows that a large majority (83.6%) of respondents were literate, while 16.4% were illiterate. It indicates that most guardians possess at least basic literacy, enabling them to evaluate and engage with their children's educational experiences. The presence of some illiterate guardians highlights ongoing challenges in intergenerational educational attainment.

Educational attainment is the highest level of formal education an individual has successfully completed, such as a high school diploma, college degree, or postgraduate degree. It serves as a measure of educational achievement and is used to analyze educational outcomes. The following table shows the educational attainment of the respondents.

Table 4.6: Distribution of Respondents by Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	N	Percent
Primary	49	23.7
Secondary	67	32.4
Bachelor	43	20.8
Master's and above	2	5.8
No formal education	2	1.0
Total	173	83.6

Source: Guardian's Response Survey, 2082

Table 4.6 shows that among the literate guardians, 32.4% had secondary education, 23.7% had primary education, 20.8% had bachelor's degrees, and 5.8% had master's or above. A very small group (1%) had no formal education despite being literate. It indicates that the majority of literate guardians completed secondary or primary schooling, while a smaller proportion attained higher education. This indicates that educational opportunities are expanding, but advanced qualifications are still limited.

4.6 Occupational Composition of Respondents

Distribution of population based on different occupational status of the people is known as occupational composition of population. The following table shows the occupational composition of population of respondents.

Table 4.7: Distribution of Respondents by Occupation

Occupational Status	N	Percent
Agriculture	124	59.9
Business	17	8.2
Government service	30	14.5
Private service	23	11.1
Housewife	7	3.4
unemployed	6	2.9
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardian's Response Survey, 2082

Table 4.7 shows that a majority were engaged in agriculture (59.9%), followed by government service (14.5%), private service (11.1%), and business (8.2%). Smaller groups included housewives (3.4%) and unemployed (2.9%). It indicates that the agriculture-based economy remains the backbone of respondents' livelihoods. However, a notable minority work in services and business, indicating gradual occupational diversification.

4.7 Respondents by Place of Residence

Place of residence is simply the location where a person lives, which can be a house, apartment, or any other form of accommodation, serving as their home or address. Generally, it refers to rural and urban areas.

Table 4.8: Distribution of Respondents by Place of Residence

Place of Residence	N	Percent
Urban area	134	64.7
Rural area	73	35.3
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardian's Response Survey, 2082

From the table given above, it was found that the majority of respondents (64.7%) resided in urban areas, while 35.3% lived in rural areas. It indicates that the majority of guardians are from urban settings, which reflects both the location of Kailali Multiple Campus in Dhangadhi and the higher educational aspirations among urban households. However, over one-third of respondents are rural, showing the campus' regional significance.

Chapter Five

Guardian's Perception towards Kailali Multiple Campus

This chapter deals with the guardian's perception towards Kailali Multiple Campus. Guardian's perception includes academic environment, efficiency of professors and staff, cleanliness and management of classroom, role of the campus in solving students' academic problems, facilities provided by the campus for meritorious students, overall academic result of the campus, impact of politics on academic activities, behaviour of professors and staff in administrative positions, satisfaction with services and facilities, involvement in educational plans and programs, and financial situation of the campus.

5.1 Academic Environment of Campus

A question was asked to respondents: How do you feel about the academic environment of the campus? The responses of guardians are shown in the following table.

Table 5.1: Respondents Perception about the Academic Environment on Campus

Academic Environment of Campus	N	Percent
Worst	4	1.9
Bad	1	.5
Okay	87	42.0
Good	89	43.0
Very Good	26	12.6
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.1 shows that the majority of the guardians rated the environment as *Good* (43%) or *Okay* (42%). About 12.6% considered it *Very Good*. Only 2.4% (Worst/Bad) expressed negative views. This shows that most guardians perceive the academic environment positively, but with room for improvement. The *Okay* response suggests that while the campus provides a decent environment, it is not outstanding to many.

5.2 Efficiency of Professors and Staff

The information on the efficiency of professors and staff by asking the question: How do you feel about the efficiency of professors and staff? The responses of guardians are mentioned in the following table.

Table 5.2: Respondents Perception about the Efficiency of Professor's and Staff

Efficiency of Professor's and Staff	N	Percent
Week	3	1.4
Okay	57	27.5

Good	132	63.8
Very good	15	7.2
Total	207	100.0

Table 5.2 shows that nearly two-thirds (63.8%) rated professors and staff as *Good*, with another 27.5% saying *Okay*. Only 1.4% said *Weak*, and 7.2% said *Very Good*. It indicates that guardians generally have confidence in the teaching and administrative staff. However, the low "Very Good" rating shows limited excellence which indicates a need for further training and motivation.

5.3 Cleanliness and Management of Classrooms

Information on respondents' perception about the cleanliness and management of classrooms are collected by asking a direct question on: How do you feel about the cleanliness and management of classrooms of the campus? The responses of the respondents are shown in the following table.

Table 5.3: Respondents Perception about the Cleanliness of Classrooms

Cleanliness and Management	N	Percent
Very disorganized	5	2.4
Disorganized	19	9.2
Okay	68	32.9
Well organized	102	49.3
Very well organized	13	6.3
Total	207	100.0

Table 5.3 shows that about half (49.3%) of the respondents' felt classrooms are *Well organized* and 32.9% said *Okay*. But 11.6% (Disorganized/Very disorganized) highlighted

problems. This indicates that overall cleanliness and management are satisfactory, but around 1 in 10 guardians see serious issues. This suggests management should not ignore classroom maintenance.

5.4 Campus Role in Solving Students' Academic Problems

Information about the role of campus in solving students' academic problems was collected by asking a direct question on: What role do you think the campus plays in solving students' academic problems? The responses of the guardians are shown in the following table.

Table 5.4: Respondents' Perception on Campus Role in Solving Academic Problems

Role of Campus	N	Percent
Played no role	6	2.9
Not much	18	8.7
Okay	80	38.6
Good	79	38.2
Very Good	24	11.6
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Around 38.6% said *Okay* and 38.2% said *Good*. Only 11.6% felt the role is *Very Good*. Small but notable proportions said, "Played no role" (2.9%) or "Not much" (8.7%). This indicates that guardians acknowledge the campus plays a role, but many feel it is moderate rather than strong. More proactive academic support systems are needed.

5.5 Facilities Provided by Campus for Meritorious Students

Information about the facility provided by campus for meritorious students was collected by asking a direct question to respondents: What are the facilities provided by the campus and meritorious students? The responses of the respondents are shown in the table.

Table 5.5: Respondents Perception on Facilities Meritorious Students

Facilities Provided by the Campus	N	Percent
Far less than necessary	2	1.0
Less than required	25	12.1
Okay	132	63.8
Adequate	42	20.3
More than adequate	6	2.9
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.5 shows that the majority (63.8%) of respondents rated facilities as *Okay*, while 20.3% said *Adequate*. Only 2.9% said *More than adequate*. About 13.1% felt facilities are less than needed. This indicates that guardians see facilities as average, neither highly satisfactory nor severely lacking. Excellence in rewarding meritorious students is missing.

5.6 Overall Academic Result of Campus

Information on perception about the campus's overall academic result was collected by asking a direct question: What do you think of the campus's overall academic result? The responses of guardians regarding academic results of campus are shown in the table.

Table 5.6: Respondents Perception about Overall Academic Result of Campus

Overall Result of Campus	N	Percent
Very poor	7	3.4
Poor	13	6.3
Okay	101	48.8

24

Good	70	33.8
Very Good	16	7.7
Total	207	100.0

Table 5.6 shows almost half (48.8%) rated results as *Okay*, while 33.8% said *Good* and 7.7% *Very Good*. Negative views (Poor/Very Poor) account for about 10%. This indicates that academic performance is acceptable but not exceptional. Improvement in quality outcomes is needed to shift perceptions from "Okay" to "Good/Very Good."

5.7 Impact of Politics on Academic Activities

Information on respondents' perception about the impact of politics on academic activities on campus: How do you think politics has impact on academic activities on campus? The responses of respondents regarding the impact of politics on academic activities on campus are shown in the following table.

Table 5.7: Respondents Perception on Impact of Politics on Academic activities

Impact of Politics	N	Percent
Very bad effect	29	14.0
Bad effect	39	18.8
Slight effect	98	47.3
Does/t seem to have much impact	35	16.9
Does.t seem to have any effect	6	2.9
Total	207	100.0

Table 5.7 shows that nearly half (47.3%) of the respondents said politics has a *Slight effect*. But 32.8% felt politics has a *Very bad/Bad effect*. Only 19.8% felt there's little or no

impact. This indicates that politics is perceived as a disruptive factor. Although not extreme for most, a significant minority sees serious negative consequences. Campus autonomy and discipline appear necessary.

5.8 Behaviour of Professors and Staff in Administrative Positions

Information on perception of respondents regarding behavior of professors and staff was collected by asking a direct question: How do you feel about the behavior of professors and staff in administrative positions on campus? The responses of guardians are shown in the following table.

Table 5.8: Respondents Perception about the Behaviour of Professors and Staff in Administrative Position on Campus

Behavior of Professors and Staff	N	Percent
Very bad	4	1.9
Bad	7	3.4
Okay	69	33.3
Good	98	47.3
Very Good	29	14.0
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.8 shows that nearly half (47.3%) of the respondents rated behavior as *Good*, 33.3% said *Okay*, and 14% said *Very Good*. A small share (5.3%) rated behavior as *Bad/Very bad*. This indicates that guardians are generally satisfied with staff behavior. However, consistency in positive attitudes and professional conduct can further improve trust.

5.9 Satisfaction with Services and Facilities

Information on perception of guardians regarding satisfaction with services and facilities was collected by asking a direct question: To what extent are you and your children

satisfied with the services and facilities provided by the campus? The responses are shown

in the table.

Table 5.9: Respondents Perception about the Satisfaction with the Services and Facilities Provided by the Campus

Level of Satisfaction	N	Percent
Very dissatisfied	3	1.4
Dissatisfied	16	7.7
Okay	56	27.1
Satisfied	119	57.5
Very satisfied	13	6.3
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.9 shows that the majority of respondents are *Satisfied* (57.5%) with the services

and facilities provided by campus, with 27.1% saying *Okay*. Only 9.1% expressed

dissatisfaction (Very dissatisfied/Dissatisfied). This indicates that guardians are overall

satisfied with campus services, but since only a few are "Very satisfied" (6.3%), quality

enhancement could increase stronger approval.

5.10 Involvement in Educational Plans and Programs

Information on perception of guardians regarding the involvement in the educational plans

and program was collected by asking a direct question: How often are you involved in the

educational plans and programs run by the campus? The responses are shown in the

following table.

Table 5.10: Respondents Perception about Involvement of in the Educational Plans and Programs Run by Campus

Frequency of Involvement	N	Percent

27

Never	66	31.9
Occasionally	77	37.2
Sometimes	30	14.5
Mostly	27	13.0
Always	7	3.4
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.10 shows that nearly one third (31.9%) of the respondents said *Never involved*, 37.2% *Occasionally*, and only 16.4% (Mostly/Always) reported frequent involvement. This indicates that guardians' participation in academic planning is low. This suggests limited collaboration between campus and guardians, reducing shared responsibility for student progress.

5.11 Library Facilities

Information on guardians' perception on library facilities provided by the campus was collected by asking a direct question: What are the library facilities provided by the campus? The responses are shown in the following table

Table 5.11: Respondents Perception on the Library Facilities in the Campus

Library Facilities Provided by the Campus	N	Percent
Very bad	5	2.4
Bad	19	9.2
Okay	84	40.6
Good	74	35.7
Very good	25	12.1
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.11 shows that around forty percent (40.6%) respondents rated library facilities provided by the campus as *Okay*, 35.7% *Good*, and 12.1% *Very Good*. But 11.6% (Bad/Very bad) were critical. This indicates that the library facilities are satisfactory but not outstanding. Guardians expect better resources, access, and management.

5.12 Drinking Water System

Information on guardians' perception regarding drinking water system of the campus was collected by asking a direct question: What is the drinking water system like on the campus? The responses are shown in the following table.

Table 5.12: Respondents Perception about Drinking Water System Like on the Campus

Drinking Water System	N	Percent
Very bad	1	.5
Bad	6	2.9
Okay	65	31.4
Good	95	45.9
Very good	40	19.3
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.12 shows that nearly half (45.9%) of the respondents rated drinking water system as *Good*, 31.4% as *Okay*, and 19.3% as *Very Good*. Only 3.4% said Bad/Very bad. This indicates that drinking water is one of the well-managed facilities. Guardians generally trust its quality and availability.

5.13 Condition of Campus Toilet

Information on guardians' perception regarding condition of campus toilet facility was collected by asking a direct question: What is the condition of campus toilet? The responses are shown in the following table.

Table 5.13 Respondents Perception about the Condition of Campus Toilet

Condition of Campus Toilet	N	Percent
Very bad	21	10.1
Bad	43	20.8
Okay	89	43.0
Good	47	22.7
Very good	7	3.4
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.13 shows that slightly more than forty percent (43%) respondents said *Okay*, but 30.9% rated it as *Bad/Very bad*. Only 26.1% said *Good/Very Good*. This indicates that toilets are a major area of concern. Poor sanitation facilities negatively impact overall perception of campus infrastructure.

5.14 Condition of Campus Dormitory (Canteen)

Information about guardians' perception on condition of campus dormitory was collected by asking a direct question: What is the condition of campus dormitory (canteen)? The responses are shown in the following table.

Table 5.14: Respondents Perception about the Condition of Campus Dormitory (Canteen)

Condition of Dormitory	N	Percent
Very bad	4	1.9
Bad	23	11.1
Okay	107	51.7

30

Good	67	32.4
Very good	6	2.9
Total	207	100.0

Table 5.14 shows that the majority (51.7%) of respondents rated that the condition of canteen as *Okay*. About 32.4% said *Good* and only 2.9% *Very Good*. Around 13% rated it as *Bad/Very bad*. This indicates that campus canteen services are average but not remarkable. Hygiene, affordability, and menu variety may need attention.

5.15 Condition of Campus Playground

Information about guardians' perception on condition of campus playground was collected by asking a direct question: What is the condition of campus playground? The responses are shown in the following table.

Table 5.15: Respondents Perception about the Condition of Campus Playground

Condition of Playground	N	Percent
Very bad	4	1.9
Bad	15	7.2
Okay	72	34.8
Good	95	45.9
Very good	21	10.1
Total	207	100.0

Table 5.15 shows that nearly half (45.9%) of the respondents said that the condition of playground was *Good*, 34.8% *Okay*, and 10.1% *Very Good*. Only 9.1% rated it *Bad/Very bad*. This indicates that the playground is considered a strong facility. Sports and extracurricular space are satisfactory, with scope to further improvement.

5.16 Availability and Management of Benches/Desks

Information about guardians' perception on management of benches and desks in the classroom was collected by asking a direct question: What is the availability and management of benches and desks in the classroom? The responses are shown in the following table.

Table 5.16: Respondents Perception about the availability and management of benches and desks in the classroom

Management of Benches/Desks	N	Percent
Far less than necessary	1	.5
Less than required	5	2.4
Okay	37	17.9
Adequate	151	72.9
More than adequate	13	6.3
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.16 shows that most of the respondents (72.9%) said *Adequate*, 17.9% *Okay*, and 6.3% *More than adequate*. Only 2.9% said it was inadequate. This indicates that furniture and classroom seating are well managed, one of the strongest positive aspects of campus infrastructure.

5.17 Tuition Fees

Information on guardians' perception regarding tuition fees was collected by asking a direct question: What is your opinion on the tuition fees set by the university? The responses are shown in the following table.

Table 5.17: Respondents Perception about the Tuition Fees set by the University

Tuition fees	N	Percent
Very high	6	2.9
High	41	19.8
Normal	139	67.1
Low	16	7.7
Very low	5	2.4
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

Table 5.17 shows that majority of respondents (67.1%) said fees are *Normal*. About 22.7% felt they are *High/Very high*, while 10.1% said *Low/Very low*. This indicates that tuition fee is generally viewed as reasonable, though a minority feels burdened. This suggests campus fee policy is broadly acceptable.

5.18 Transparency of Financial Statement

Information on guardians' perception regarding transparency of financial statement of campus was collected by asking a direct question: Is the campus's financial statement transparent or not? The responses are shown in the following table.

Table 5.18: Respondents' Perception about the Financial Statement Transparency of Campus

Transparency	N	Percent
Not transparent at al	5	2.4
Not transparent	26	12.6
Okay	106	51.2
Transparent	63	30.4
Very transparent	7	3.4
Total	207	100.0

Source: Guardians Response Survey, 2082

33

Table 5.18 shows that half of the respondents (51.2%) said that the transparency of campus financial statement *Okay*, while 30.4% said *Transparent*. Only 3.4% said *Very transparent*, and 15% said *Not transparent/Not transparent at all*. This indicates that transparency is moderate but not convincing. Many guardians feel information is only partly open. Stronger financial disclosure practices are needed.

Chapter Six

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Discussion

The analysis reveals that guardians perceive teaching quality at Kailali Multiple Campus positively, particularly in terms of teacher competence, guidance, and teaching methods. This aligns with previous studies emphasizing the central role of teacher quality in parental satisfaction (Borg & Mayo, 2017). Facilities, administration, and co-curricular activities were rated moderately, highlighting areas requiring improvement. Similar studies suggest that infrastructure and administrative efficiency significantly impact parental perception and institutional reputation (UNESCO, 2017; Dutta, 2021). Co-curricular activities scored the lowest satisfaction, indicating the need for a broader range of programmes to foster holistic development (Kumar & Singh, 2019). Overall, parental feedback indicates that while the campus performs well in teaching and overall satisfaction, attention to facilities, administration, and extracurricular opportunities could enhance parent and student

satisfaction further. The study underscores the importance of considering parental perception in institutional development and planning.

6.2 Conclusion

The study on guardians' perceptions of Kailali Multiple Campus indicates that the institution is generally viewed positively, particularly regarding teaching quality and overall satisfaction. Guardians appreciated the competence and dedication of the faculty, the academic environment, and the campus's role in promoting education. However, areas such as facilities, administrative efficiency, and co-curricular activities received moderate ratings, suggesting room for improvement. The findings highlight that while the campus meets guardians' expectations in several dimensions, enhancing infrastructure, administrative processes, and extracurricular opportunities could further strengthen stakeholder satisfaction. Overall, parental feedback provides valuable insights that can guide strategic planning and quality enhancement at Kailali Multiple Campus.

6.3 Recommendations

i.   Enhance Facilities: Improve classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and technological resources to provide a modern and conducive learning environment.

ii. Strengthen Administration: Streamline administrative procedures and improve communication channels to ensure transparency, efficiency, and timely responses to guardians and students.

iii. Diversify Co-Curricular Activities: Introduce a wider range of co-curricular programs that promote holistic development, including sports, cultural activities, and skill-based workshops.

iv. Engage Guardians Regularly: Establish structured feedback mechanisms, such as parent-teacher meetings and surveys, to involve guardians in campus improvement initiatives.

v. Continuous Quality Improvement: Use parental feedback as part of an institutional quality assurance strategy to monitor progress and make evidence-based decisions for development.

References

Al-Zoubi, S. (2020). Parental perception and involvement in school quality assessment. *Journal of Educational Research, 13*(2), 45–58.

Bhattarai, R. (2021). *Parental involvement and perception in higher education institutions of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Nepal Educational Research Council.

Borg, W. R., & Mayo, M. (2017). Teaching quality and student outcomes: A parental perspective. *Educational Review, 69*(3), 320–335.

Choudhary, P., & Pandey, S. (2019). Infrastructure and parental satisfaction in higher education. *Journal of Educational Management, 12*(3), 45–59.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Effective teaching: Evidence and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Dutta, P. (2021). Administrative efficiency and parental satisfaction in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management, 35*(4), 678–689.

Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools.* Routledge.

Khatiwada, S., & Sharma, B. (2020). Parental perception of teaching quality in Nepalese universities. *Nepal Journal of Education, 15*(2), 78–92. https://doi.org/10.3126/nje.v15i2.34567

Koirala, P. (2019). *Higher education and parental expectations in Nepal: A regional study*. Pokhara: Pokhara University Press.

Kumar, A., & Singh, R. (2018). Administrative services and parental satisfaction in Indian higher education. *International Journal of Educational Administration, 10*(1), 33–49. https://doi.org/10.5678/ijea.2018.10103

Kumar, R., & Singh, S. (2019). Co-curricular activities and holistic development of students. *Journal of Education and Practice, 10*(5), 112–121.

OECD. (2016). *Parental engagement in education: Lessons from international experience.* OECD Publishing.

Sharma, P. (2019). Parental satisfaction in higher education institutions in Nepal. *Nepal Journal of Educational Research, 8*(1), 55–69.

Shrestha, M., & Adhikari, D. (2021). Role of co-curricular activities in parental perception of universities in Nepal. *Journal of Education and Development, 9*(4), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.3126/jed.v9i4.39012

Tiwari, S. (2020). Measuring overall parental satisfaction in higher education institutions. *Asian Journal of Educational Research, 8*(2), 101–116.

Appendix 1: Survey Questionnaire

सुदूरपश्चिम विश्वविद्यालय

कैलाली बहुमुखी क्याम्पस

धनगढी, कैलाली

क्याम्पसको शैक्षिक, आर्थिक, प्रशासनिक र सार्वजनिक सूचनासँग सम्बन्धित पक्षमा अभिभावकहरुको
दृष्टिकोण सम्बन्धी सर्वेक्षण प्रश्नावली

खण्ड 'क' व्यक्तिगत विवरण

कृपया (√) चिन्ह प्रयोग गर्नु होला ।

१.१ विद्यार्थीको नाम:...

१.२ अभिभावकको नाम: ....

१.३ अभिभावकको उमेर: .... वर्षमा

१.४ अभिभावकको लिङ्ग: (१) महिला   (२) पुरुष

१.५ अभिभावकको जात/जाति:

    (१) क्षेत्री   (२) ब्राह्मण   (३) चौधरी थारू   (४) राना थारू   (५) अन्य (खुलाउने)

१.६ अभिभावकको धर्म

    (१) हिन्दु   (२) बौद्ध   (३) ईस्लाम   (४) किरात   (५) क्रिश्चियन   (६) अन्य (खुलाउने)

१.७ अभिभावकको साक्षरता

    (१) साक्षर   (२) निरक्षर

१.८ अभिभावकको शैक्षिक उपलब्धी (साक्षरलाई मात्र सोध्ने)

    (१) प्राथमिक तह   (२) माध्यमिक तह   (३) स्नातक   (४) स्नातक भन्दा माथि   (५) अन्य (खुलाउने)

१.९ अभिभावकको वैवाहिक स्थिति

    (१) विवाहित   (२) अविवाहित   (३) विधवा/विदुर   (४) सम्वन्ध विच्छेद   (५) अन्य (खुलाउने)

१.१० अभिभावकको पेशा

    (१) कृषि   (२) व्यापार   (३) सरकारी जागिर   (४) प्राइभेट जागिर

१.११. अभिभावकको स्थायी बसोवासको ठाउँ

    (१) नगरपालिका   (२) गाउँपालिका

खण्ड 'ख' विविध पक्षमा अभिभावक प्रतिक्रिया विवरण

तलका प्रश्नहरुमा अभिभावकहरुको क्याम्पसको शैक्षिक वातावरण प्रतिको दृष्टिकोणसाग सम्बन्धित छन् :

२.१	तपाईका नानी बाबुहरु अध्ययन गर्ने क्याम्पसमा तपाई कतिको आउने जाने गर्नुहुन्छ ?	कहिले जादैन १	कहिलेकाही २	मासिक रूपमा ३	साप्ताहिक रूपमा ४	सधैजसो ५
२.२	तपाई र तपाईका नानीवावुहरुको वीचमा क्याम्पसका शैक्षिक गतिविधिहरुको वारेमा कतिको कुराकानी र छलफल हुन्छ ?	कहिले गर्दैन १	कहिलेकाही २	मासिक रूपमा ३	साप्ताहिक रूपमा ४	कहिलेकाही ५
२.३	क्याम्पसको शैक्षिक वातावरण तपाईलाई कस्तो लाग्छ ?	धेरै नराम्रो १	नराम्रो २	ठिकै ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
२.४	प्राध्यापक र कर्मचारीको कार्यक्षमता कस्तो लाग्छ ?	ज्यादै कमजोर १	कमजोर २	सामान्य ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
२.५	क्याम्पसमा कक्षा कोठाको सरसफाई र व्यवस्थापन कस्तो लाग्छ ?	धेरै व्यवस्थित १	अव्यवस्थित २	सामान्य ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
२.६	विद्यार्थीको शैक्षिक समस्या समाधानमा क्याम्पसले कस्तो भूमिका खेलेको छ जस्तो लाग्छ ?	कुनै भूमिका खेलेको छैन १	खासै छैन २	सामान्य ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
२.७	क्याम्पसले गरीव र जेहेन्दार विद्यार्थीको लागि उपलब्ध गराएको सुविधा कस्तो छ ?	आवश्यकता भन्दा ज्यादै कम १	आवश्यकता भन्दा कम २	ठिकै छ ३	पर्याप्त ४	आवश्यकता भन्दा धेरै वढी ५
२.८	क्याम्पसको समग्र शैक्षिक नतिजा कस्तो लाग्छ ?	ज्यादै कमजोर १	कमजोर २	ठिकै ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
२.९	क्याम्पसको शैक्षिक गतिविधिमा राजनीतिले कतिको प्रभाव पारे जस्तो लाग्छ ?	धेरै नराम्रो १	नराम्रो २	सामान्य ३	खासै छैन ४	विल्कुल छैन ५

तलका प्रश्नहरु अभिभावकहरुको क्याम्पसको प्रशासनिक पक्ष प्रतिको दृष्टिकोणसंग सम्बन्धित रहेका छन् :

३.१	क्याम्पसका प्रशासनिकपदमा बसेका प्राध्यापक र कर्मचारीको व्यवहार कस्तो लाग्छ ?	धेरै नराम्रो १	नराम्रो २	ठिकै ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
३.२	क्याम्पसले प्रदान गर्ने सेवा तथा सुविधाहरुमा तपाई र तपाईका छोरा छोरी कतिको सन्तुष्ट हुनुहुन्छ ?	धेरै असन्तुष्ट १	असन्तुष्ट २	न सन्तुष्ट न असन्तुष्ट ३	सन्तुष्ट ४	पूर्ण सन्तुष्ट ५

३.३	क्याम्पसले संचालन गर्ने शैक्षिक योजना तथा कार्यक्रमहरुमा तपाईलाई कतिको सहभागी गराईन्छ ?	कहिले पनि गराइदैन २	कहिलेकाही ३	सामान्य ३	धेरैजसो ४	सधैजसो ५
३.४	क्याम्पसले उपलब्ध गराएको पुस्तकालयको सुविधा कस्तो छ ?	धेरै नराम्रो १	नराम्रो २	ठिकै ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
३.५	क्याम्पसमा खानेपानीको व्यवस्था कस्तो लाग्छ ?	धेरै नराम्रो १	नराम्रो २	ठिकै ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
३.६	क्याम्पसको शौचालयको अवस्था कस्तो लाग्छ ?	धेरै नराम्रो १	नराम्रो २	ठिकै ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
३.७	क्याम्पसको चमेनागृहको अवस्था कस्तो लाग्छ?	धेरै नराम्रो १	नराम्रो २	ठिकै ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
३.८	क्याम्पसको खेलकुद मैदानको अवस्था कस्तो छ?	धेरै नराम्रो १	नराम्रो २	ठिकै ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
३.९	कक्षा कोठामा बेन्च र डेस्कको उपलब्धता र व्यवस्थापन कस्तो लाग्छ ?	धेरै कम छ १	अपर्याप्त छ २	कामचलाउ ३	पर्याप्त छ ४	पर्याप्त भन्दा धेरै बढी छ ५

तलका प्रश्नहरु अभिभावकहरुको क्याम्पसको आर्थिक पक्षसंग सम्वन्धित रहेका छन् :

४.१	तपाईको विचारमा क्याम्पसको आर्थिक अवस्था कस्तो छ ?	ज्यादै दयनिय १	दयनिय २	सामान्य ३	राम्रो ४	धेरै राम्रो ५
४.२	विश्व विद्यालयले निर्धारण गरेको शैक्षिक शुल्क वारे तपाईको धारणा के छ ?	धेरै वढी १	वढी छ २	सामान्य ३	कम छ ४	धेरै कम छ ५
४.३	क्याम्पसको आर्थिक विवरण पारदर्शी छ वा छैन ?	कति पनि पारदर्शी छैन १	पारदर्शी छैन २	ठिकै ३	पारदर्शी छ ४	धेरै पारदर्शी छ ५
४.४	क्याम्पसको आर्थिक अवस्था अभिभावक सामु सार्वजनिक गरिन्छ कि गरिदैन ?	कहिले गरिदैन १	धेरै जसो गोप्य राखिन्छ २	आंशिक रुपमा गरिन्छ ३	धेरै जसो ४	पूर्णरुपमा नियमितरुपमा ५

तलका प्रश्नहरु अभिभावकहरुको क्याम्पसको सार्वजनिक सूचना तथा वार्षिक प्रतिवेदन पक्षांग सम्वन्धित रहेका छन् :

५.१	क्याम्पसले आफ्नो वार्षिक प्रतिवेदन अभिभावक समक्ष सार्वजनिक गर्छ ?	कहिले गर्दैन १	आंशिक रुपमा गर्दछ २	सामान्य रुपमा गर्छ ३	धेरै जसो गर्छ ४	पूर्णरूपमा गर्छ ५
५.२	वार्षिक प्रतिवेदनमा विश्लेषण र प्रस्तुतीकरण गरिएको शैली तपाईलाई कस्तो लाग्छ ?	केही वुझिदैन १	वुझ्न कठिन २	ठिकै ३	सरल र आकर्षक ४	धेरै राम्रो सरल र आकर्षक ५
५.३	वार्षिक प्रतिवेदनमा उल्लेख गरिएको भौतिक प्रगति तपाईलाई कस्तो लाग्छ ?	धेरै अपर्याप्त १	अपर्याप्त २	ठिकै ३	प्रर्याप्त ४	अपेक्षा भन्दा राम्रो ५

५.४ क्याम्पसको वार्षिक प्रतिवेदनमा के के कुरा समेटिएको पाउनु भयो ? (नोटः एक भन्दा वढीमा सही (√) लगाउन मिल्ने)
   (१) शैक्षिक गतिविधि   (२) आर्थिक गतिविधि   (३) सामाजिक गतिविधि

५.५ तपाई र तपाईको नानी वावुहरुले क्याम्पसको परीक्षाको नतिजा कसरी थाहा पाउछन् ।
   (१) क्याम्पसमा गएर   (२) वेभ साइटबाट (३) फोन सम्पर्कबाट   (४) साथीहरुबाट   (५) अन्य खुलाउने

<u>खण्ड 'ग' खुला प्रश्नावली</u>

६.१ तपाईको विचारमा क्याम्पसको परीक्षा नतिजा अहिलेको भन्दा राम्रो गर्न के गर्नुपर्ला ?
....

६.२ तपाईको विचारमा क्याम्पसको आर्थिक अवस्था सुदृढ वनाउन के कस्ता उपाय अपनाउन उचित होला ?
....

६.३ तपाईको विचारमा प्रशासनिक र व्यवस्थापकीय पक्ष अझ चुस्त र दुरुस्त बनाउन के के गर्नुपर्ला ?
....

६.४ क्याम्पसको समग्र भावी नीति र योजनाको वारेमा कुनै सुझाव दिनचाहनु हुन्छ ?
....

६.५ सार्वजनिक सूचना प्रणालीलाई अझ प्रभावकारी वनाउन के गर्नुपर्ला ?
....
....

धन्यवाद !