1a. Roll Call (Agenda Item #1)

The meeting commenced at 4:17 PM.

Committee Members (in attendance)
1. Dr. K.S. Dasgupta (Chairman IQAC)
2. Anil Roy (Director IQAC)
3. Soman Nair (Executive Registrar)
4. Binita Desai (Chairperson, Gender Cell)
5. Suman Mitra (Dean (AP))
6. Sanjeev Gupta (Dean (R&D))
7. Ranendu Ghosh (Dean (Students))
8. Maniklal Das (faculty)
9. Asim Banerjee (faculty)
10. Sanjay Srivastava (faculty)
11. V Sunitha (faculty)
12. Yash Shah (Convener, SBG)
13. Ishita Jain (UG student)
14. Amit Kumar Shah (Alumnus)
15. Nilesh Ranpura (eINFOCHIPS-Arrow company)

Committee Members (absent)
1. Mr. Suresh Rangachar (Management Representative)
2. Shivani Thakkar (PG student)
3. Dr. Jayanthi Ravi (Sarjan Foundation NGO)
4. Mr. Paul Cherian (Morgan Stanley, Bengaluru)
5. Mr. Giridharan Surendran (FactSet Systems, Hyderabad)

1b. Welcome (Chairman IQAC) (Agenda Item #1)

Prof. Dasgupta welcomed all and started the meeting with his opening remarks.
Then he handed over to Anil Roy for further proceeding of the meeting.

Questions & Comments
No comments

2. IQAR 2017-18 (period 1 July 2017 – 3o June 2018) (Anil Roy) (Agenda Item #2)

Anil informed the committee that it was first formal meeting after the last NAAC visit. The committee was appointed on 3 July 2019. The first task on the IQAC Director was to follow up with minutes of the past meetings and then to prepare the IQAR as per the NAAC guideline. This report is for the period 1

July 2017 to 30 June 2018. It took a while longer than expected in the journey of the understanding and collection of data as required by IQAR format among the process owners. The report is ready now with some of the points still need attention, such as: 2.3.2, 3.2.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.4.1, 5.1.4, 6.2.2, 6.3.4, 6.5.5, 7.1.1, 7.1.5.

Anil suggested all to go through the report carefully and corresponding persons should provide with the suitable data of these points. He informed that the report would be posted on the website, as per requirement, on 15 Jan 2020, even if some of the points remain unattended. Because the report is already delayed by over a year.

Questions & Comments
- Manik: What are these points about? And who are their custodians?
  - Anil: Each custodian have been informed, reminded of these data in past and once you all go through the report you would know who all should provide data of these points.
- Ranendu: Still it is important to know here what are these points covering.
  - Anil: For example:
    - ✓ 6.2.2 (Implementation of e-governance in areas of operations - Planning and Development)
    - ✓ 6.3.4 (Faculty and Staff recruitment (no. for permanent/fulltime recruitment))
    - ✓ 6.5.5 (Post Accreditation initiative(s) of development programmes for support staff (mention at least three)
- Prof. Dasgupta: Pl share this presentation with all alongwith all points indicated properly what they cover and who are the persons responsible to provide the data. Also, considering the coming holidays till 14 Jan, you are suggested to change the cut-off date to 19 Jan, 2020 to complete the report and posting it.
  - Anil: Ok, It will be done as advised.

Actionable item:
1. IQAC Director will send a mail to all custodians of the above missing data. RESPONSIBILITY: IQAC Director.

3. Academic Audit 2019 (Anil Roy) (Agenda Item #3)
Anil informed that the full report has been shared with all. In summary it was conducted on 7 Aug, 2019 (Wednesday) by Prof. Sonde who met 7 faculty members in one-to-one meeting in CEP Conference Room. He expressed his overall satisfaction on delivery of course content by all. Based on his observations, following are the desirable action items:
- Most of the UG courses having no tutorials.
- Prerequisites not specified in most courses.
- Non-uniformity in assessment practiced-both in marking/grading & method followed.

Questions & Comments

- Suman (Dean-AP): His observations might be based on the elective courses, because most of the core courses have either tutorials, or labs or both. Since the size of elective courses are small, so instructor might not require tutorials for them.

  The same was voiced by other faculty members too.
- Anil: What about non-uniform grading or assessment methods?
- Yash (SBG Convenor): Students feel that many faculty do grading based on parameters they feel like using at the end of the semester with some weightage which is not declared at the beginning of the semester. He suggested that it would be nice if the students know at the beginning how they are going to be evaluated.
- Suman: Instructors have full freedom to adopt the method of evaluation and since we have continuous evaluation, instructors may use different parameters in different courses.
- Sanjay: The point of non-uniform grading is observed by an external person who is experienced and accomplished enough to figure out a problem. It is not raised by students. This should be addressed seriously.
- Anil: Unless we are open to accept there could be a problem, we won't find room for improvement. May I suggest to first collect the data in how many ways instructors evaluate the class, how we have practically been using the freedom of 'continuous evaluation' and what are the weightages we have been giving to one particular parameter. For example, if some instructor is completely ignoring the attendance and some other instructor gives 50% weightage to attendance in the final grading – then there is certainly a problem.
- Prof. Dasgupta: All three observations made by Prof. Sonde must be looked into seriously. The first two points are related to course content development and hence should be looked into by a curriculum review committee. The last BTech curriculum review was done in 2016, so it is prudent to form a BTech Curriculum Review Committee.

  For the third point I suggest the Dean (AP) to come up with some method to address this. There must be some mechanism to record if an instructor has announced the grading policy at the beginning of the semester.

Actionable item:
1. BTech Curriculum Review Committee to be constituted. RESPONSIBILITY: Dean (AP)
2. Mechanism to record the grading policy of each instructor. RESPONSIBILITY: Dean (AP)

4. Discussion on Students Exit Feedback (Anil Roy) (Agenda Item #4)

The exit feedback of UG students has been in practice. An analysis of the same based on the feedback collected in the years 2011, 2014, 2015, 2018 & 2019 was shared and discussed with all. The high concern points under "***Academic support system***" (keeping a high bar of 55-65% for achieving excellence) are:
- Usefulness of Teaching Materials (Q #2)
- Continuous Evaluation System (Q #4)
- Quality and Range of Elective Course Offerings (Q #6)

- Fairness of Evaluation (Q #8)

And the high concern areas under "***Administrative support system***" (within the bar of 45-55%) are:
- Interaction with Administration (Q #10)
- Hostel Facilities (Q #13)
- Health Care Facilities (Q #14)

Questions & Comments

Asim: Similar feedback should also be taken from graduating PG students.

Anil: Feedback of employers is an important input for effectiveness of the curriculum. Hence Asim is suggested to set up a mechanism to collect the feedback from the employers who come for campus placement.

Suman: We have added many new elective courses in last couple of years. Also with new faculty joining these days many new elective courses are expected to be added.

Ishita and Yash: Fairness in evaluation has appeared here also in the exit feedback. This has been pointed out in Academic Audit also. Institute should pay attention on this.

All: It is important to understand what students mean by 'fairness of evaluation' or 'interaction with faculty'.

Actionable item:
1. It was decided that Dean-AP, Dean-Students, UGC Convenor, PGC Convenor and Registrar will come up with actionable items to address the above. RESPONSIBILITY: Dean-AP, Dean-Students, UGC Convenor, PGC Convenor and Registrar
2. Employers Feedback to be collected and the analysis be made available to IQAC. RESPONSIBILITY: Placement Manager (Asim to ensure)

5. Discussion on effectiveness of Institute MoUs (Anil Roy) (Agenda Item #5)

Based on the data provided by the Dean (R&D), it was informed that we had MoUs with at least 20 institutions. Barring a few (like SAC-ISRO, Govt. of Gujarat, University of Hildesheim (Germany)) rest others are dormant. And that is the concern.

Questions & Comments

It was decided that Dean (R&D) will come up with some road map on how to revitalize these MoUs for their best utilization.

6. Discussion on the Institute's research output (Anil Roy) (Agenda Item #6)

Based on the data provided by Dean (R&D) on research publication by faculty and students, Anil informed that during last 8 years (2012-2019) there are 205 papers published in journals. This is at an average of 25-26 papers each year. This is low. Of them only 108 are in the journals which have reported impact factor as published by The Clarivate Analytics. Therefore only 13% of our papers are published in journal which have IF > 3.5. These numbers need to be circulated among faculty to inform them the real status of our research quality.

Questions & Comments

Dean (R&D) informed that the research output has improved in past couple of years. Though it is not so much evident in journal paper publications, but in terms of getting R&D projects and consultancy projects we have improved substantially. Also conference paper publication has grown up.

7. Grievance Redressal System of the Institute (Anil Roy) (Agenda Item #7)

Anil informed that the Institute has a Grievance Redressal Cell with Dean (AP) its Chairman, along with Dean (Students), UG and PG committee conveners and Executive Registrar as members (https://www.daiict.ac.in/institute/academic-administration/grievance-redressal-cell/). But when data and analysis of these grievances are asked, the Cell says that there are no case reported till date. This speaks that the system is not working.

Questions & Comments

- SBG Convenor and Ishita informed that the students community is not aware that a GRC has been existing there.
- Majority of faculty members also put on record their ignorance about the existence of a GRC.
- Dean (AP) was suggested to make the system transparent and functional.

Actionable item:

1. It was decided that Dean (AP) and IQAC Director will submit a process on how to make GRS effective. RESPONSIBILITY: Dean (AP) and IQAC Director.

Adjournment

Meeting concluded at 5:50 PM