JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue
JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)
An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

FEEDBACK ARCHITECTURE SYSTEM FOR ENHANCE LEARNING: DESIGNING SCALABLE MULTI-SOURCE REVIEW SYSTEMS

[1]Akshat Shah, [2]Ankit Javeri
[1]Student, [2]Asst. Professor
[1]Department of Advance Computing,
[1]Nagindas Khandwala College, Mumbai

ABSTRACT :

Feedback plays a vital role in improving educational systems, serving as the primary mechanism through which institutions assess teaching effectiveness, infrastructure quality, and overall program delivery. However, conventional methods remain predominantly one-way, with students rating faculty at the end of a course or semester [1]. While useful, such approaches provide only partial insights and fail to capture the broader perspectives of other key stakeholders such as parents, administrators, and faculty-to-admin evaluations [2]. To address these limitations, this paper introduces the Feedback Architecture System for Enhance Learning, a scalable and role-based framework that empowers administrators to configure dynamic feedback flows across multiple stakeholders [3]. Unlike traditional models, the system is designed to handle flexible role-to-role mappings, parameter-driven evaluations, and real-time analytics, ensuring feedback remains both comprehensive and actionable [4]. By fostering inclusivity, accountability, and transparency, the proposed framework extends beyond conventional 360-degree feedback mechanisms and establishes a holistic feedback ecosystem that promotes student-centered learning, strengthens reflective practices among teachers, and supports institutional development through evidence-based decision-making [5][8].

INDEXTERMS :

Multi-source feedback, student-centered learning, feedback architecture, educational technology, dynamic feedback mapping, parameter-wise analytics, role-based evaluation, higher education improvement, transparency in education, institutional decision-making

1. INTRODUCTION

As education systems evolve, the demand for inclusive, transparent, and data-driven evaluation models continues to grow [1][4]. Conventional feedback mechanisms—typically end-of-semester surveys where students rate faculty—remain narrow in scope, often overlooking critical perspectives such as parents' evaluation of institutions, faculty-to-admin assessments, or infrastructure reviews [2][6]. This limitation reduces the ability of institutions to capture a holistic picture of academic and organizational performance, thereby weakening opportunities for continuous improvement [3].

Student-centered learning models emphasize the active involvement of learners and stakeholders in shaping educational experiences [4][5]. In this context, feedback is not simply a measure of teaching quality but a collaborative tool for improving learning environments, infrastructure, and administration [6]. Recent research confirms that multi-source and multi-role evaluation frameworks drive greater adoption of reflective practices among educators, enhance student engagement, and strengthen institutional accountability [1][8].

The *Feedback Architecture System for Enhance Learning* addresses these challenges by introducing a role-based and dynamic framework for feedback collection and analysis. Unlike traditional systems, it introduces multi-directional mappings that allow administrators to design feedback campaigns connecting diverse roles such as students, faculty, parents, and administrators [3] . For example, students may evaluate faculty, infrastructure, or specific programs, while faculty can provide feedback to

administrators or peers, and parents can evaluate institutional performance. This design ensures that all voices are heard, reinforcing transparency and inclusivity.

Furthermore, the system integrates parameter-driven evaluations with advanced analytics and role-specific dashboards. This enables administrators to monitor trends, analyze averages, and identify actionable insights in real time [5] . The inclusion of flexible mappings ensures scalability, making it possible to extend participation to additional groups such as alumni or external reviewers. In doing so, the proposed framework creates a holistic feedback ecosystem that not only supports student-centered learning but also fosters institutional development through evidence-based decision-making [7][8] .

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a dual methodology approach that combines conceptual framework design and prototype development, supported by qualitative insights from existing literature and quantitative modeling for system workflows.

2.1 Conceptual Framework

At the core of the system lies a dynamic from-to feedback mapping model. The administrator acts as the system architect, creating campaigns and defining which role provides feedback to which entity. Unlike traditional systems, this architecture is not static — mappings are dynamic and extendable.

- Current Base Mappings:
  - Student → Faculty, Infrastructure, Program, Course, College, Faculty-Subject
  - Parent → College
  - Faculty → Student, Admin, Infrastructure, Program, Course, College
  - Admin → Faculty, Student, Infrastructure, Program, Course, College
- Dynamic Extension: The system is designed so administrators can introduce new roles or destinations in future. This ensures scalability and adaptability across diverse educational institutions.

2.2 Feedback Flow and Campaign Design

- Campaign Creation: Admin creates a feedback campaign by selecting roles, feedback direction (from-to), and evaluation parameters (e.g., teaching effectiveness, infrastructure quality, course design).
- Feedback Collection: Stakeholders submit responses through web or mobile interfaces. The system enforces role-based mappings to ensure valid data collection.
- Data Processing: Responses are stored in a secure database, linked to both role and campaign metadata.

2.3 Analytics and Reporting

- Parameter-wise Analytics: Each feedback parameter (e.g., Teaching Clarity, Resource Availability) is aggregated and averaged.
- Role-Based Reporting:
  - Admins: Full access to detailed responses and averages.
  - Users (students, faculty, parents): Only see aggregated averages and overall parameter scores.
- Insights: The system generates real-time dashboards and downloadable reports for decision-making.

2.4 Implementation Strategy

- Tools & Platforms: Designed as a web and mobile-first system, ensuring accessibility.
- Database Design: Structured with relational tables (Campaigns, Mappings, Responses, Parameters) to maintain scalability.
- Security & Privacy: Anonymized submissions (when enabled), encryption of sensitive data, and strict role-based access control.

3. Literature Review

1. Teacher–Student Interaction Evaluation

Ma et al. (2023) developed a teacher–student interaction evaluation system for smart classrooms. The study provides frameworks for structured evaluation and highlights the importance of multi-dimensional feedback, directly supporting the need for parameter-wise analysis in this research.

2. Mobile-Integrated Instruction

Chen & Tsai (2021) investigated teachers' conceptions of mobile-integrated instruction. Their findings demonstrate how teacher perceptions influence the adoption of technology-driven, student-centered feedback systems, aligning with the proposed mobile-first architecture.

3. Scalable Administration Systems

Zhao et al. (2020) presented an intelligent educational administration system using mobile edge computing. Their work demonstrates the scalability and performance benefits of distributed platforms, which influence the scalability design of the proposed system.

4. Student-Centered Approaches in Distance Learning

Kerimbayev et al. (2023) promoted student-centered approaches in distance learning. The study highlights how technology-driven engagement and feedback mechanisms can motivate learners, providing strong support for incorporating multiple feedback roles.

5. Mobile Technologies for Personalized Learning

Jotsov et al. (2023) analyzed the impact of mobile applications on student-centered learning. Their research supports the role of mobile apps in personalization, interaction, and independent learning, strengthening the proposed system's mobile integration.

6. Factors Influencing Teacher Practices

Zhang et al. (2021) studied factors influencing student-centered instructional practices in U.S. classrooms. The findings confirm that student feedback and assessments drive greater teacher adoption of reflective methods, validating the feedback-driven model.

7. Mobile Technologies and Creativity in Education

Chen (2021, Thesis) examined the role of mobile technologies in enhancing creativity in education. This research illustrates how mobile platforms enable continuous engagement and reflective practices, which align with the feedback architecture's design for continuous improvement.

4. PROPOSED SYSTEM

The proposed **Feedback Architecture System for Enhance Learning** is designed as a **scalable and modular framework** that emphasizes flexibility, accessibility, and inclusivity. Unlike traditional one-way evaluation systems, this architecture supports **dynamic from-to feedback flows** between students, faculty, parents, and administrators, ensuring that feedback is holistic and multi-directional.

4.1 System Components

1. **Admin Panel (Dynamic Feedback Engine)**
   - Serves as the control center for administrators.
   - Enables the creation of customized feedback campaigns by defining **from-to mappings**, roles, and evaluation parameters.
   - Supports dynamic extension, allowing admins to introduce new roles (e.g., alumni, external reviewers) without structural changes.
   - Provides options for anonymity, parameter weightage, and scheduling feedback sessions.
2. **Feedback Generator (Collection Module)**
   - Offers intuitive **web and mobile interfaces** for all stakeholders.
   - Ensures that feedback forms are **role-specific** (e.g., students evaluating faculty, parents evaluating institutions).
   - Supports structured question types (Likert scale, multiple choice, open-ended) to ensure meaningful data collection.
   - Enforces role-based mappings, ensuring only valid "from-to" combinations are used.
3. **User Dashboard (Role-Specific Dashboards)**
   - Provides personalized summaries depending on the stakeholder role.
   - **Students, faculty, and parents**: View aggregated averages and parameter-wise scores.
   - **Administrators**: Gain full visibility of detailed responses, averages, and comparative analytics.
   - Ensures privacy by restricting individual-level data from being exposed to non-admin users.
4. **Analytics Engine (Reporting & Insights Module)**
   - Aggregates feedback into **parameter-wise averages** (e.g., teaching effectiveness, infrastructure quality, course relevance).
   - Generates **visualizations and trend reports** to highlight strengths and weaknesses.
   - Supports **real-time dashboards** and downloadable reports for institutional decision-making.
   - Provides drill-down capability for administrators while maintaining role-based access restrictions.

4.2 Advantages of the Proposed System

- **Holistic Evaluation**: Incorporates perspectives from all stakeholders (students, faculty, parents, administrators), ensuring balanced and multi-dimensional insights.

- **Dynamic Feedback Flow**: Goes beyond static 360-degree models by enabling **dynamic mappings** that can be extended to new roles as needed.
- **Enhanced Transparency**: Parameter-wise analytics and role-specific dashboards build trust among stakeholders.
- **Improved Teacher Reflection**: Faculty benefit from continuous, constructive insights that promote self-improvement.
- **Student and Parent Engagement**: By including students and parents, the system fosters participatory governance and inclusive education.
- **Scalability and Flexibility**: Adaptable to both small institutions and large universities, with support for diverse courses, programs, and feedback contexts.

5. DISCUSSION

The *Feedback Architecture System* directly supports the global shift toward student-centered pedagogy by enabling multi-directional and multi-role feedback flows that involve students, faculty, parents, and administrators [1][4]. Unlike conventional one-way surveys that are usually limited to student evaluations of faculty, this approach incorporates diverse perspectives, thereby fostering inclusivity and building a culture of shared responsibility in the education ecosystem [2][6].

From the student perspective, the system empowers learners to evaluate not only faculty but also infrastructure, academic programs, and courses. This broadens their role beyond passive consumers of education to active contributors in institutional development, reinforcing student agency and accountability [6][8]. Faculty members benefit from structured input provided by both students and administrators. Such multi-layered evaluations support reflective teaching practices, encourage innovation in pedagogy, and promote continuous professional growth [3][5].

Parents, who are often excluded from conventional feedback mechanisms, gain a structured opportunity to evaluate the institution's overall quality, leading to improved transparency, trust, and stronger school–parent partnerships [4]. For administrators, the system provides real-time, parameter-based insights that support informed policy-making and efficient resource allocation [7. This enables leaders to identify strengths and weaknesses at multiple levels — individual faculty performance, course design, infrastructure adequacy, and institutional governance.

Compared with existing feedback models, the proposed architecture introduces the concept of **dynamic mappings**, which significantly enhances scalability. This feature allows administrators to extend the system to new roles such as alumni, external reviewers, or industry partners, thereby ensuring the model remains adaptable to future educational needs [1][3] . Additionally, the role-specific dashboards and parameter-wise analytics provide actionable insights that are easy to interpret, thus addressing the common challenge of underutilized feedback data.

Despite its advantages, the system is not without challenges. Issues such as teacher resistance to multi-source evaluations, potential feedback fatigue among stakeholders, and privacy concerns regarding sensitive feedback data must be addressed [2][5]. These challenges can be mitigated through targeted training programs that prepare faculty and students for constructive use of feedback, the scheduling of feedback campaigns to avoid over-surveying, and the implementation of strict role-based access controls with options for anonymity [7].

Overall, the *Feedback Architecture System* represents a significant advancement in educational feedback practices. By combining inclusivity, scalability, transparency, and adaptability, it contributes not only to improved teaching and learning but also to institutional accountability and long-term educational quality improvement [4][8].

---

6. CONCLUSION

This paper presented the **Feedback Architecture System for Enhance Learning**, a conceptual framework and prototype design that redefines feedback practices in higher education. Unlike traditional evaluation systems, which are often one-directional and limited in scope, the proposed model enables **multi-source, role-based, and parameter-driven feedback**. By allowing administrators to configure dynamic **from-to mappings** between students, faculty, parents, and administrators, the system establishes a flexible and inclusive structure that better reflects the realities of educational ecosystems.

Through the integration of **role-specific dashboards** and **parameter-wise analytics**, the system ensures that each stakeholder gains meaningful insights while maintaining privacy and transparency. Students become active contributors rather than passive participants, enhancing their sense of responsibility toward the learning process. Faculty benefit from constructive feedback not only from students but also from administrators and peers, encouraging reflective teaching practices. Parents, often excluded from traditional mechanisms, gain a platform to voice their perspectives on institutional quality. Administrators, in turn, receive actionable insights to guide decision-making, resource allocation, and policy design.

The proposed system therefore **bridges critical gaps** in existing models by offering a **holistic, scalable, and dynamic architecture**. It aligns with the broader educational shift toward **student-centered learning** and **data-driven institutional improvement**, laying a strong foundation for future advancements. In essence, the Feedback Architecture System provides a promising pathway toward

building a culture of accountability, inclusivity, and continuous growth in education.

7. REFERENCES

[1] Ma, X., Xie, Y., & Wang, H. (2023). Research on the construction and application of teacher-student interaction evaluation system for smart classroom. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 78, 101286. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191491X23000524?ref=pdf_download&fr=RR-2&rr=97abe9da5e62446d

[2] Chen, W., & Tsai, C. (2021). In-service teachers' conceptions of mobile technology-integrated instruction. Computers & Education, 172, 104268. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0360131521001019?via%3Dihub

[3] Zhao, X., et al. (2020). Design and Research of Intelligent Educational Administration Management System Based on Mobile Edge Computing Internet. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1624, 032030. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356204044_Design_and_Research_of_Intelligent_Educational_Administration_Management_System_Based_on_Mobile_Edge_Computing_Internet

[4] Kerimbayev, N., et al. (2023). A student-centered approach using modern technologies in distance learning. Smart Learning Environments, 10(61). https://slejournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40561-023-00280-8

[5] Jotsov, V., et al. (2023). The use of mobile technologies in education with an emphasis on a student-centered approach. IEEE Conference on Automatics and Informatics, 140–146. https://pps.kaznu.kz/kz/Main/FileShow2/219176/89/3/16436/0//

[6] Zhang, L., Basham, J.D., Carter, R.A., & Zhang, J. (2021). Exploring factors associated with student-centered instructional practices. Teaching and Teacher Education, 99, 103273. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0742051X20314645

[7] Feng Wang, a, Yujun Hu and Lanfen Lin (2019). Real-time Interaction Platform for Classroom Teaching Based on Smart Phone APP https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/1168/6/062024/pdf

[8] E.O. Bereczki and A. Karp ´ ati (2021) Technology-enhanced creativity: A multiple case study of digital technology-integration expert teachers' beliefs and practices https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1871187121000067

[9] Weidlich, J. (2025). Highly informative feedback using learning analytics. Educational Technology Research and Development. https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-025-00539-9

[10] Qadir, H. M., et al. (2025). An adaptive feedback system for the improvement of learners. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391851714_An_adaptive_feedback_system_for_the_improvement_of_learners