



SRI SATHYA SAI INSTITUTE OF HIGHER LEARNING

(Deemed to be University)

Co-ordinator
Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC)

11 Aug 2022

Minutes of the Meeting of IQAC- 30 July 2022

Date: 30 July 2022

Time: 3.10- 4.45 pm

Venue: Online (G-Meet)

Attendees:

- 1) IQAC Chairman: Prof. C B Sanjeevi, Vice-Chancellor and
- 2) IQAC Coordinator: Dr. (Miss) Rani P L
- 3) IQAC Deputy Coordinator: Dr. S Balasubramanian

IQAC Members

- 4) Prof. B. Sai Giridhar, Registrar
- 5) Sri Sanjay Sahni, Controller of Examinations
- 6) Dr. B S Madhukar, Former NAAC advisor
- 7) Dr E. N. Prabhakaran, Alumni member
- 8) Sri Ashok Gupta, Retd Tahsildar, Local administrative body member
- 9) Prof. (Miss) N Srividya, Professor, Food & Nutritional Sciences
- 10) Dr. G Raghavender Raju, Associate Professor, Economics & Director, PSN Campus
- 11) Dr. (Miss) Deepa Seetharaman, Associate Professor & Head, Physics
- 12) Dr. Sayee Manohar K., Associate Professor & Head, Management and Commerce
- 13) Dr. B E Pradeep, Associate Professor, Associate Head, Biosciences
- 14) Dr. J Krishna Kiran Kumar, Associate Professor, Chemistry



15) Sri K J Srinivas, Doctoral Research Scholar, Management & Commerce

16) Sri K V R K Bhargav, Deputy Manager, IQAC office

17) Sri Kasi Shanmukha Rao, Deputy Manager (Examinations)

The meeting began at sharp 3 p.m. with a prayer to the Revered Founder Chancellor, Bhagawan Sri Sathya Sai Baba. The IQAC chairman and the Vice-chancellor, Prof. Carani B. Sanjeevi welcomed all to the proceedings and handed over the stage to the IQAC coordinator. IQAC Coordinator thanked the admin for providing an IQAC office with a dedicated IQAC deputy manager. She also informed the members about the recent initiatives on NAAC awareness taken up by IQAC which was well received by the faculty, HoDs, Directors and Deans. She then pointwise opened the agenda to the members and sought their comments on the same, the details of which are recorded below.

Agenda 1- The relevance of the existing programs – do they need strengthening or replacement? How to move to multidisciplinary?

The CoE, Sri Sanjay Sahni said that right from inception, SSSIHL has been multidisciplinary in nature. The multidisciplinary system was envisaged by the Revered Founder Chancellor Bhagawan Sri Sathya Sai Baba, which the former Vice chancellor, Prof. V K Gokak implemented as Sri Sathya Sai System of Integral Education. The system comprised of a pyramidal structure where students have scope for wide variety of domain knowledge. The system promotes multilingual education in the form of Sanskrit, Hindi and Telugu as second languages. The curriculum of SSSIHL is embedded in human values right from inception which is being suggested now by NEP 2020. The system, since the beginning, promoted courses in spirituality and environmental sciences. The CoE was concerned about the declining student strength now. He opined that this could be because of the pandemic which resulted in the online admission process that put applicants from the lower socio-economic strata who are our major applicants, at a disadvantage.

Prof. Prabhakaran stressed that program wise, SSSIHL is on par with any other program in the country. SSSIHL has a very good curriculum but it has to be reviewed in line with NAAC requirements for scoring high in accreditation.

Dr. Deepa concurred with the observation of Prof. Prabhakaran that the programs at SSSIHL are at par with any other program in the country. However, she also highlighted the declining number of applicants for different programs of SSSIHL. Prof. Prabhakaran highlighted that low demand ratio is a universal problem including in a premier institute like IISc. He gave an example of IISc starting an MSc program where the cut offs were quite low contrary to all expectations, and further fewer than the expected number of students joined the program even after getting selected. Dr. Deepa raised the question that that if low demand ratio was a universal problem, then where the students were going? She cited the following reasons for low demand ratio:



1. Lack of visibility of the Institute
2. Disruption in CBSE examination schedule due to the pandemic
3. Non-implementation of the NEP 4 year UG program with multiple entry and exit options
4. Residential set up with strict discipline, dress code, lack of gadgets.
5. Lower NAAC grade

Dr. Suma pointed out that it was difficult to run programs when the quality of students received is not good. She asked for a brainstorming session to identify non-negotiable and flexible parameters to smoothly run the system of integral education in SSSIHL, adapting to current trends in education.

Dr. Balasubramanian felt that the curriculum needs a relook. Covid-19 pandemic cannot be quoted as the reason for the low demand ratio. He emphasized that even in pre-pandemic time the demand ratio was low (4.76: 1), which has slightly declined during the pandemic to 4: 1. He suggested that SSSIHL implements the CBCS guidelines of UGC, look at the possibility of implementing a 4 year UG program and implement Academic Bank of credits (ABC). He made a reference to the deemed to be university regulations, 2019 which states that a deemed to be university should have a minimum strength of 2000 students. He also mentioned the NEP 2020 guidelines which states that the minimum student strength for a university should be around 3000. He suggested that SSSIHL be proactive and implement all the UGC/AICTE mandatory guidelines which they release from time to time. This will help in improving the visibility and perception of the University.

Agenda 2 - Evaluation of the attainment of Course objectives

Dr. Balasubramanian observed that the measure adopted to evaluate course outcome attainment is still in pilot mode since the submission of SSR for 3rd cycle of NAAC and no progress has been made. He highlighted that UGC has provided clear guidelines for evaluating attainment of course outcomes, which many universities have adopted but not SSSIHL. He felt that the office of the CoE needed to support the process. The CoE responded that the course outcome attainment should be viewed differently and referred to AICTE's perspective of outcome based education that relies on Bloom's taxonomy method of assessment. He took the example of the MFM (Master of Financial Management) program of SSSIHL which was designed by industry experts. The objective of the program was to give exposure to students to the practical aspects of Financial management, for e.g. company law, business administration etc. He said the students were trained in such a way that they were able to fill a form for incorporation of a company. He also gave the example of a malnutrition course of Food and Nutritional sciences where outcome based learning is imparted. He also added that the grade cards have numeric points and not actual marks secured which are



good indicators of outcome achieved, and these are available with the campus director's office. Dr. Balasubramaniam disagreed with this and re-emphasized on UGC's suggested means of measuring course outcome attainment.

Agenda 3 - Relook at Evaluation and Assessment Methods

Dr. Deepa opined that workshops on educating the faculty members about the evaluation and assessment methods, examination reforms and quality mandates as prescribed by UGC needs to be organized.

Dr. Balasubramanian observed that SSSIHL had not undertaken any examination reforms for many years, which UGC and AICTE expect periodically. He urged that the Institute soon go for examination reforms which focus on internal evaluation at higher classes, freedom to departments to choose their assessment methods instead of rigidly demanding uniformity, and protection of IPR by adopting complete internal evaluation for dissertations and projects.

Dr. Prabhakaran suggested that the different UGC/AICTE guidelines for examination reforms be shared with the members. He posited that interpreting these guidelines verbatim is difficult, and so care must be exercised in interpretation & implementation.

Dr. Suma mentioned the MBA syllabus revamp exercise being taken up which has one-third activity based papers and one-third focus on internships to make the program industry ready.

Agenda 4 - How to improve Quality and Quantity of Research

Sri Srinivas evinced that research scholars should be provided necessary freedom to carry out research. He requested that the roadblocks be addressed at the earliest.

Dr. Pradeep perceived that the faculty should have a passion and self-drive to do research and publish.

Prof. Srividya suggested that to improve quality and quantity of research, every faculty member should publish at least one quality paper per year which will make a big leap in our scores and quantity of research. To give it more emphasis she suggested that such publications should be considered as a part of their career advancement. She suggested that those faculty who were not comfortable with research should collaborate within the department, outside the department or other institutes which will help them to get a foothold on research and subsequently they also will be able to start doing research independently.

Dr. Prabhakaran remarked that faculty should participate in a significant number of national and International conferences for research exposure. Without participation in conferences it is difficult to know how or what to upgrade in one's research.



He explained it with a simile of spiritual aspirants- no matter how sincere a person is in his tapasya, his spiritual learning and growth cannot match the growth of a person who is constantly interacting with spiritual stalwarts who are themselves in the path of spiritual elevation. This is the same with researchers also - constant interactions in conferences is essential to improve one's creativity.

Dr. Balasubramanian commented that the number of professors in the university is very few which negatively impacts both quantity and quality of research. He also argued for the need for right research ambience wherein the decision makers understand the research needs in different disciplines and recognize top class contributions instead of being rigid about (mis-)interpreting statutory body guidelines.

Dr. Pradeep suggested that running a program in a single campus instead of replicating it across campuses can save human resource and infrastructure, which is likely to have a positive effect on quality and quantity of research. With regard to Dr. Balasubramanian's comment on the number of professors, he also suggested that the university looks at specific UGC schemes that allow for recruiting retired senior professors with provision for full financial support.

Agenda 5 - What are the NEP implementation possibilities for SSSIHL?

Dr. Rani emphasized on the need to form the NEP cell with urgency.

Dr. Pradeep mentioned that vertical integration of programs is important, and not the horizontal one. He gave an example of a 4 year program that integrates Biosciences run in the first three years with pure management in the fourth year.

Agenda 6 - What is the exact role of IQAC at SSSIHL?

Dr. Rani propounded the idea of exit interviews in the light of high attrition in the recent past, which will help in understanding the reasons.

Dr. Balasubramanian exhorted that IQAC should be allowed to function as an independent body. IQAC will not be an approving body but a body which provides recommendations on maintaining quality in the Institute. It should have the due freedom to be proactive which was also suggested by the Peer Team of NAAC in their report during the 3rd cycle of re-accreditation. He placed on record that IQAC had been allowed to be proactive in the last 3 months. He also suggested that members of IQAC should be periodically rotated, as per the guidelines of NAAC.

Any other points

Dr. Sayee Manohar stressed on the importance of quality of teaching and teachers being role models to make an impact on the students. He argued for a strict penalty for any deviation.. He also emphasized the need for orientation of teachers.



The CoE informed the members about the low pass percentage and high failure rate in the last semester which was as high as 20% in Undergraduate programs. He opined that IQAC could play an active role in setting the order of high pass percentage. For this comment of CoE, IQAC coordinator Dr. Rani added that remedial classes for this semester have been stressed upon keeping the low pass percentages in mind. Dr. Pradeep said that the probable reason for low pass percentages is the online mode of teaching and he was confident that as the physical mode of education has started, the pass percentage will improve.

The IQAC chairman asked the Registrar for his comments. Registrar said that once the recommendations of IQAC are made available to the admin, the admin will deliberate upon them.

The IQAC chairman and Vice-Chancellor, Prof. Carani B. Sanjeevi thanked all the members for their valuable inputs in the meeting and assured a follow-up action on the same. The meeting ended with a prayer to Bhagawan Sri Sathya Sai Baba.

PS: Suggestions/ comments, if any, from any member with regard to the points in the MoM may be emailed to iqacoffice@sssihl.edu.in for annexing to this document.

Signature and Seal of IQAC Coordinator

Signature and Seal of IQAC Chairman

Dr Rani P L
Associate Professor of English &
Coordinator, IQAC

COORDINATOR
Internal Quality Assurance Cell
Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning
(Deemed to be University)
Vidyagiri, Prasanthi Nilayam
Sri Sathya Sai District, A.P. - 515134
India

Annexure 1

Response of Dr Madhukar whose comments could not be captured at the meeting due to technical snag.

Prof. (Dr.) C B Sanjeevi
Vice- Chancellor &
Chairman, IQAC

VICE CHANCELLOR
Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning
(Deemed to be University)
Vidyagiri, Prasanthi Nilayam
Sri Sathya Sai District, A.P. - 515 134
India



SSSIHL

Annexure 1

IQAC Office, SSSIHL <iqacoffice@sssihl.edu.in>

Draft MoM- for your comments

Madhukar Seshadri <madhukar.seshadri@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2022 at 9:36 PM

To: "Coordinator, IQAC SSSIHL" <coordinatoriqac@sssihl.edu.in>

Cc: "IQAC Office, SSSIHL" <iqacoffice@sssihl.edu.in>

Sir,

Sai Ram,

I have gone through the Minutes with great detail and important issues have been raised which has long term implications of the institution.

I am of the considered opinion that an expert committee may be constituted to look at all the aspects of the functioning of the institution and come out with an action plan (long term and short term)

In my opinion the NAAC grade is possibly due to data mismatch and the limitations of the process. (A white paper on revision of Accreditation process available on NAAC website may be also studied.)

As indicated the role of IQAC also need review ?

Hope it is considered favorably.

Regards,

MADHUKAR

[Quoted text hidden]