

PDPM
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY,
DESIGN AND MANUFACTURING JABALPUR

A special meeting of the Senate was held on January 10, 2013 from 11.00 am in the conference hall of the Institute to consider the appeals of Mr. Abhay Kushwaha and Mr. Saurav Nayan regarding continuation of their B. Tech. programmes.

Following members were present.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Prof. Aparajita Ojha, Chairperson | 10. Dr. Asish Kumar Kundu |
| 2. Prof. Puneet Tandon | 11. Dr. Dinesh Kumar Vishvakarma |
| 3. Prof. Tanuja Sheorey | 12. Dr. Prabir Mukhopadhyay |
| 4. Prof. Vijay Kumar Gupta | 13. Dr. Dr. Sunil Agrawal (joined the meeting at 12.00 noon) |
| 5. Prof. P.N. Kondekar | 14. Dr. Lokendra Kumar Balyan |
| 6. Dr. Pritee Khanna | 15. Dr. Pavan Kumar Kankar |
| 7. Dr. Atul Gupta | 16. Shri Santosh Mahobia (Actg. Secretary, Senate) |
| 8. Dr. Prabin Kumar Padhy | |
| 9. Dr. Prashant Kumar Jain | |

Special Invitee - Dr. Sujoy Mukharjee was present in the meeting.

Following members expressed their inability to attend the meeting due to their prior commitments.

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Prof. V.K. Jain | 4. Dr. Pagag Vyas |
| 2. Prof. V.M. Gadre | 5. Dr. S. Amane |
| 3. Prof. Uday Khedkar | |

Dr. M. Amarnath, Dr. Ashutosh Shrivastav were absent from the meeting, as they were on leave.

Dean, Academic welcomed all the members of the Senate and briefed the members about the single agenda item.

Senate/2012-13/Special.1	Appeal of Mr. Saurav Nayan and Mr. Abhay Kushwaha
---------------------------------	--

B.Tech. program of Mr. Saurav Nayan and Mr. Abhay Kushwaha were terminated due to their poor academic performance in January 2012 (Vide the Senate meeting SENATE/2011-12/Special Meeting dated January 06, 2012). They challenged the decision of the Senate in the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh.

Hon'ble High Court disposed of the writ petition on 13-12-2012 with following directions:



1. Petitioners (students) may prefer a fresh appeal against the termination order to the Senate within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.
2. In case such an appeal is filed, the Senate shall reconsider the appeal in the light of subsequent decision of Senate dated 18.06.2012, without being influenced from its earlier decision dated 09.01.2012, and after considering the case of the petitioners sympathetically, the Senate shall communicate the decision to the petitioners forthwith.

(Note: Please see Annexure 1 for a reference to the Decision of the Senate mentioned in the Directions of the Hon'ble High Court of MP. This decision was taken on a later Senate meeting held on 18-6-2012, after the B. Tech. programmes of the appellants were terminated on 6-1-2012).

As per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of MP, Mr. Saurav Nayan and Mr. Abhay Kushwaha appealed to reconsider their request for continuation of their academic programmes.

Dean Academic briefed the house about their educational & family background, based on the information available in the personal files of the above mentioned appellant.

Performances of Mr. Saurav Nayan and Abhay Kushwaha at the end of Semester I, 2011-12, were as follows –

Roll No.	Name	Branch	CPI 1	CPI 2	CPI3	CPI4	CPI5	Previous Semester Performance	Performance at the end of Semester I, 2011-12
2009110	SAURAV NAYAN	ME	2.5	3.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	T(a)	T(a)
2010003	ABHAY KUSHWAHA	ECE	3.3	3.4	3.7	-	-	AP(a)	T(a)

Medium of instruction for Mr. Saurav Nayan till high school was English. Performance of Mr. Saurav Nayan at high school level and intermediate level was not so good (II division). Mr. Saurav Nayan was having 'F' grade in four courses and 'D' grade in six courses at the time of termination of his programme.

Medium of instruction for Mr. Abhay Kushwaha till high school was Hindi. Performance of Mr. Abhay Kushwaha at high school and intermediate level was not so good (II division). Mr. Abhay Kushwaha was having 'F' grade in three courses and 'D' grade in six courses at the time of termination.

Senate was requested to consider their appeals. Members were having different opinion about their appeals. Some senators were of the opinion that their appeal should not be considered because of their continuous poor academic performance at the Institute and also poor academic record up to higher secondary level. At this point of time, some Senate members suggested to workout, if it would be possible for the appellant to attain the minimum CPI of 5.0 at the end of their academic programmes. In case theoretically it worked, what would be the minimum performance level that would be expected

from the two appellants? Dean (Academic) presented a roadmap of expected performance indices for both the appellants for next one year. Based on this, some Senate members suggested considering the appeal and placing them on "Academic Break".

After long deliberations, a majority of the Senate members said that even if there is a slightest possibility that the appellant would be able to complete their B. Tech. programmes, they should be given a second chance. However, they also expressed their concern over the readiness of the appellant to take up the challenge, as the amount of hard work, sincerity and patience expected from them to complete their academic programme is enormous.

Decision: The Senate by majority accepted the appeals of Mr. Saurav Nayan and Mr. Abhay Kushwaha to continue their B. Tech. programme subject to following conditions:

- (1) The appellant will be placed on "Academic Break".
- (2) They will be required to give an undertaking, that if they fail to acquire the required CPI for continuation of their academic programme at the end of Semester I, 2013 (December 2013), their programmes will be dropped and they will not be entitled to appeal again.
- (3) Both the appellants will maintain minimum required attendance in each course, failing which their programme will be liable to be dropped again.
- (4) They will not indulge in any other activities that may harm the reputation of the Institute.
- (5) Performance of both the appellants will be reviewed after one semester.

Senate also authorized the Chairperson Senate to allow them for late registration. Senate further suggested that the appellants should be properly counseled to cope with various challenges that they have to face to continue their programmes.

The meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the Chair.



Santosh Mahobia
Acting Secretary, Senate



Aparajita Ojha
Chairperson Senate

Excerpt from the Minutes of the Senate/2011-12/3rd meeting held on 18-6-2012 referred in the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of MP.

Senate/2011-12/3.03.02 APER and Termination Cases: Convener, UGCS & PGCS presented Academic Performance Evaluation report (APER) for the Semester II, 2011-12 (SENATE/2011-12/3/Annexure II). Based on the report, academic programmes of 25 UG students were recommended for termination and they were given the opportunity to appeal as per the provisions given in the B. Tech manual. Appeals of all 25 students were placed before the Senate for consideration. At this point members expressed concern over the increasing number of termination cases in each year. Members were apprised of the fact that most of the students who come from different social and academic backgrounds find it difficult to cope with the complexities in the early years of their academic programme. This results in their poor academic performance and termination of programme. Also their performance gets affected in higher level courses due to poor understanding of concepts and methods in core courses. The matter of termination was discussed in detail amongst the members of the senate and one of the members suggested that word Academic Probation may be termed as Academic Improvement and Academic Termination may be termed as Academic Drop. It was also suggested that students be given the chance to complete their UG courses in maximum 6 years and PG courses in maximum 2.5 years. Appealed students against their termination will be placed on one year academic break and they will be allowed to clear their backlogs and improve the courses in which they obtained lower than 'C' grade. At the end of one year they should obtain a CPI \geq 5.0 before registering in the next semester.

Keeping this in view, a decision to make the following modifications in the existing rules for UG programme was taken unanimously, related to inadequate academic performance, after long deliberations.

Section 5 of the B. Tech. manual be modified as given below –

1. Academic probation be renamed as Academic Improvement.
2. If the academic performance of a student under "academic improvement" in a semester does not improve (either has not passed at least three courses or has not secured a minimum SPI of 4.5) at the end of the semester, the student will have the following two options and will be allowed to choose only one in consultation with his parents/ guardian.
 - a. Academic Drop: The student drops his programme and leaves the Institute with immediate effect without getting any degree.
 - b. Academic Break: The student will be put on academic break for one year and will be allowed to improve his performance in courses in which he scored a grade less than C (i.e. D+ or D or F). The student will also be allowed to complete the courses dropped due to his/ her poor academic



performance. A student can opt for courses up to the maximum credits of 18 (4 to 5 credits less than normal semester load). It is expected that student will improve his academic performance to get a CPI of 5.0 at the end of academic break.

3. At the end of the academic break, if a student is able to score CPI of 5.0 or more, he will be allowed to continue his programme with the junior batch as a regular student.
4. In case a student is not able to score CPI of 5.0 at the end of the academic break, his programme will be dropped with immediate effect. This will be termed as "Academic Drop".

During deliberations some of the members raised the issue of increasing the maximum duration of undergraduate programme beyond 6 years. After deliberations, the Senate unanimously concluded that the present upper limit of six years be maintained.

After passing the above modifications in rules, the Senate accepted appeals of all 25 undergraduate students by applying the rules mentioned above.

