



Appeal

ARMY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, DIGHI, PUNE ,Pune ,Maharashtra

Date of submission	12/07/2025
AISHE ID	C-42054
Institution Track ID	MHCOGN10824

Name and Address of the Institution	
Name of the Institution	ARMY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, DIGHI, PUNE
Address	Army Institute of Technology, Dighi Hills,Pune,Pune,Maharashtra,411015
Telephone	020-7249250184
Email	director@aitpune.edu.in
Location	Urban
Current Cycle	Cycle 4
Details of Head of the Institution	
Present	
Name of the Principal	Col MK Prasad
Email	director@aitpune.edu.in
Mobile	9717473840
At the time of PT visit	
Name of the Principal	Col MK Prasad
Email	director@aitpune.edu.in
Mobile	9717473840
Details of the Coordinators	
IQAC coordinator	
Name of the Coordinator	Dr Sushma A Patil
Email	naac_coord@aitpune.edu.in
Mobile	9923298051
SC coordinatorAt the time of PT visit	
Name of the Coordinator	Dr Sushma A Patil
Email	swadar@aitpune.edu.in
Mobile	9923298051

Details of the Director CDC/BCUD			
Name Of CDC College Development Council Or BCUD	Dr Parag Kalkar		
Email	provc@unipune.ac.in		
Telephone	9881000922		
UGC Center attached to in case of Recognition Under 2f and 12b	FNo8-115-2014(CPP-1-C)5-9-2014		
Date of declaration of grade	29/05/2025		
University Affiliated to			
Name of the University	Name of the Vice Chancellor	Email	Phone
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Dr Nitin Karmalkar	vc@unipune.ac.in	9823011747
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Dr Nitin R. Karmalkar	nrkarmalkar@gmail.com	9823011747
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Dr Suresh Gosami	no-reply@pun.unipune.ac.in	02025621017
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Dr Suresh Gosavi	puvc@unipune.ac.in	020-25621017
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Dr. Suresh Gosavi	puvc@unipune.ac.in	9922497839
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Dr. Suresh W. Gosavi	puvc@unipune.ac.in	020-25621017
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof. (Dr.) Karbhari Vishwanath Kale	puvc@unipune.ac.in	020-25621018
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof Dr Nitin Karmalkar	puvc@unipune.ac.in	9823011747
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof. (dr.) Nitin R. Karmalkar	nrkarmalkar@gmail.com	9823011747
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof Dr Nitin R. Karmalkar	nrkarmalkar@gmail.com	9823011747
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof. (Dr.) Nitin R. Karmalkar	nkarmalkar@gmail.com	9823011747
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof. Dr. Nitin R. Karmalkar	nrkarmalkar@gmail.com	9823011747
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof Dr N R Karmalkar	nrkarmalkar@gmail.com	9823011747
Savitribai Phule Pune	Prof (Dr) Suresh Gosavi	puvc@unipune.ac.in	020-25621017

University			
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof Dr Suresh Gosavi	puvc@unipune.ac.in	02025621017
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof. (Dr.) Suresh Gosavi	puvc@unipune.ac.in	020-25621017
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof.(Dr.) Suresh Gosavi	puvc@pun.unipune.ac.in	020 25621201
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Prof Suresh Gosavi	puvc@unipune.ac.in	02025693868
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Sppu	sppu@sppu.ac.in	9999999999
Savitribai Phule Pune University	Suresh Gosavi	puvc@unipune.ac.in	020-25621017
Savitribai Phule Pune University			

Preference for Personal Presentation

i. If the institution would like to present their case personally

NA

Payment Details

Payment Mode	Online
Paid Date	04-07-2025
Paid Amount (Including GST)	118000.00
Receipt Number	152195
Bank Name	

Nature of Grievance

On Grading

Metric Awarded Score Expected Marks Total Marks

(QIM) 1052 358 1410

(QnM) 1878 270 2148

Total After Appeal 2930 628 3558

Grievance on Metric:

1.1.1: HEI ensures effective curriculum delivery through structured process, including institutes academic calendars, departmental academic calendars, add-on-courses & industry interaction. Continuous internal assessment is rigorously implemented. Internal & External academic audits are conducted ensuring continuous improvement and accountability.

Awarded Score 3 Expected Score 4.

1.4.1: HEI systematically collected, analyzed feedback from all stakeholders, shared action plans, and uploaded all supporting documents in SSR and DVV stages. Feedback analysis and action taken report are publicly available on website. AIT has fulfilled all 5 parameters.

Awarded Score 2 Expected Score 4

2.3.1: AIT has effectively implemented student-centric pedagogies and ICT-enabled teaching. With advanced infrastructure like smart board, 3D printer, HPC server, trained faculty, and active student participation in NPTEL/MOOCs, and good industry connect, AIT has fulfilled all laid down requisites and even exceeded requirements of this metric.

Awarded Score 3 Expected Score 4

2.4.2: With less PhD faculty(23.7%) in last accreditation AIT was awarded score 2, but even after increase of PhD faculty(31.07%) AIT is awarded score 01. Submitted data was accurate, verified, and accepted during SSR and DVV stages.

Awarded Score 1 Expected Score 3

2.5.1: AIT has implemented transparent, student-centric examination system with strong adherence to university guidelines, effective online exam management, and robust grievance redressal process. Any irregularity was reported to SPPU which reflects our commitment to academic integrity and continuous improvement. Awarded Score 3 Expected Score 4

2.6.1: AIT has implemented robust, institution-wide OBE framework with clear CO-PO-PSO mapping, NBA accreditation for four programs, and strong peer team acknowledgment. Score of 2 does not reflect documented evidence and effectiveness of our practices. We request upward revision to 4 based on the SSR and re-assessment presentation.

2.6.2: AIT has implemented comprehensive, institution-wide OBE framework with NBA-accredited programs and strong assessment practices. Our faculty are invited as resource speaker on OBE to other institute who were awarded above A grade. Score of 2 does not reflect documented evidence and expert feedback.

3.3.1: AIT faculty have consistently published in UGC CARE-listed journals, with verified records submitted during SSR and DVV stages. Score

overlooks documented rise in publications in AY 2021–22. Given transparency and alignment with NAAC guidelines, we urge revision to 2 to accurately reflect our research contributions.

4.1.1: We respectfully request a re-evaluation of infrastructure score, as current rating does not reflect AIT's state-of-art facilities and strategic development. With ICT-enabled classrooms, barrier-free access, and extensive infrastructure used by external institutions, our efforts align with NAAC benchmarks. An expenditure of Rs. 1,489.2 Lakhs (Assessment period) was done for upgradation of infrastructure. All supporting documents were transparently submitted, and recent upgrades address previous recommendations. We appeal for upward revision to 4.

4.2.1: Current score does not reflect AIT's long-standing excellence in library automation and digital access. Fully automated since 1998 via SLIM21 ILMS and offering premier databases and remote access, our library meets global academic standards. With all documents submitted and positive PT feedback, we solicit for upward revision to 4.

4.3.1: Current score does not reflect AIT's advanced IT infrastructure and strategic investments. With a 2Gbps backbone, robust Wi-Fi, enterprise-class network, and mini data center supporting 2,000+ users, our systems enable seamless academic delivery. All evidence was transparently submitted and positively acknowledged by PT. We request upward revision to 4.

4.4.1: Current score of 1 does not reflect AIT's commitment to infrastructure maintenance and enhancement. Revised, verified data including audited statements and accurate expenditure classifications were submitted in line with NAAC guidelines. Given transparency and compliance demonstrated, we seek upward revision to 4.

5.1.1: Current score of 0 does not reflect AIT's demonstrated commitment to student welfare. With 22.98% of students receiving scholarships fully documented and submitted during SSR and DVV our efforts toward financial inclusion appears to have been overlooked.

5.1.2: AIT has consistently conducted well-documented capacity-building activities across all four mandated domains. Despite meeting all DVV requirements, current score of 3 does not reflect scale and impact of these initiatives. We request upward revision to 4, in line with our commitment to holistic student development and NAAC benchmarks.

5.1.3: Current score of 2 does not reflect AIT's sustained efforts in capacity building and career guidance. With a verified 21.53% participation rate and supporting documentation submitted during SSR and DVV stages, assigned score seems to overlook substantial evidence. In absence of clear benchmarking, we urge reconsideration and request appropriate revision to score of 3.

6.1.1: Current score does not reflect AIT's strong governance and alignment with NEP policies. With decentralized model, documented stakeholder involvement, dynamic Perspective Plans, and evidence submitted at all stages, we seek score revision to 4 that accurately acknowledges our leadership and strategic planning.

6.2.1: Current score of 3 does not fully reflect AIT's strategic planning and governance maturity. All required documents including Perspective Plans,

	<p>SOPs, and infrastructure proposals were submitted and acknowledged during the PT’s virtual visit. With verified initiatives and alignment to national priorities, we pursue upward revision to 4.</p> <p>6.3.3: Current score of 1 does not reflect AIT’s strong commitment to faculty and staff development. With 27.42% participation in relevant programs and all supporting documents submitted and acknowledged during DVV, assigned score appears inconsistent. In line with NAAC guidelines and documented efforts, we plea upward revision to 3.</p> <p>6.4.1: Score of 3 does not fully reflect AIT’s strong financial governance and transparent resource mobilization. Our practices were positively acknowledged during the PT virtual visit, with no adverse remarks. All relevant audited reports and policy documents were submitted in SSR. Given the absence of discrepancies and our alignment with NAAC guidelines, we plead upward revision to 4.</p> <p>7.2.1: Current score of 2 does not reflect the documented depth and impact of AIT’s best practices. Both initiatives Higher Package Placement Enablement and Industry Integration were positively acknowledged during the PT visit and have led to measurable outcomes. Submitted evidence and alignment with NAAC benchmarks, we advocate upward revision to 4.</p>
<p>On other Issues</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After receiving the score and grade from NAAC, series of introspecting interactions across all the strata’s of AIT were conducted by the top management and every stratum unanimously disagreed upon the awarded score and grade thereof. This has forced IQAC and top management to appeal for upgradation of the grade. 2. Systemic constraints of Online peer team visit lead to inadequate representation and relatively lower scores in several of AIT’s key strength areas, including its robust and well-maintained infrastructure (4.4.1), the expansive and vibrant 30-acre campus (4.1.1), implementation of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and CO-PO attainment (2.6.1 and 2.6.2), strong institutional vision and leadership (6.1.1), empowering faculty development strategies (6.3.3), and the documentation of best practices (7.2.1) 3. Certain valid documents submitted by the institution may not have been taken into account during the DVV process, potentially affecting the accuracy of the scores assigned by the DVV partner. Consequently, the institution has chosen to submit an appeal for a review of the relevant metrics 4. During interaction several times visiting Peer Team mentioned, online mode is not effective and it is difficult to assess the institute in such a short period. 5. AIT spent additional Rs. 1,489.2 Lakhs in last 5 years for upgradation the infrastructure. <p>Common Link for all Appeals: https://www.aitpune.com/NAACAppeal2025.aspx</p>

Criterion-Wise Grievance	
Sl.No	1
Criterion	Curricular Aspects
Grievance	<p>1. With due respect and sincere regard for the evaluation process, Army Institute of Technology (AIT), Pune, affiliated with SPPU, humbly submits this appeal for your kind reconsideration of the score awarded under QIM 1.1.1.</p> <p>2. We urge the committee to reconsider the evaluation based on the extensive and well-documented efforts undertaken by the institution, as outlined below:</p> <p>a. Robust Curriculum Engagement and Development: AIT's faculty members are actively involved in curriculum development through participation in Board of Studies (BoS) meetings and curriculum review workshops. This direct engagement ensures that the curriculum is not only academically sound but also aligned with industry expectations.</p> <p>b. Strategic Academic Calendar and Departmental Planning: The institute prepares the academic calendar aligned with SPPU's academic calendar and inputs received from each department. All the departments prepare a detailed academic calendar aligned with institute's schedule. This planning is strategic, student-centric, and outcome-driven.</p> <p>c. Faculty Preparedness and Teaching Excellence Faculty undergo orientation, training, and MOOC certifications for new courses. Teaching plans are meticulously aligned with Course Outcomes (CO), Program Outcomes (PO/PSO), and all materials are uploaded on ERP/Moodle for student access.</p> <p>d. Continuous Internal Assessment (CIA) and Monitoring CIA is rigorously implemented through assignments, tests, seminars, and tutorials. Progress is monitored by HoDs and the Principal, with regular reviews in IQAC meetings. Attendance is tracked via biometric systems, and absenteeism is addressed proactively with parental communication and remedial actions.</p> <p>e. Holistic Student Development: AIT runs a structured AICTE- and SPPU-guided Induction Program for firstyear students and supports over 25 active student clubs, fostering technical, cultural, and sports excellence. These initiatives directly contribute to enhanced placement outcomes and student readiness for higher education.</p> <p>f. Institutional Commitment to Quality: Regular academic audits are conducted as per IQAC's SOP, ensuring continuous improvement and accountability.</p> <p>3. Given the score of 3 is not only unjustified but also inconsistent with the evidence presented and the positive feedback received during the Peer Team's virtual visit. AIT unequivocally meets and exceeds the expectations for QIM 1.1.1, and therefore requests a score of 4.</p> <p>4. The complete proceedings of the Peer Team visit held on 20th and 21st May 2025 were recorded at your end, and we respectfully submit that our</p>

	<p>claims can be verified by reviewing this official recording. The link to the presentation (PPT) for Metric 1.1.1, as shared during the virtual visit, is provided below. Additionally, all supporting documents were duly submitted during the SSR stage and are being resubmitted herewith for your kind reference.</p> <p>Link: https://www.aitpune.com/NAAC_Appeal_2025/Criteria1/Cr1_P.pdf View Evidence Document</p>		
Obtained GPA	3.15	Expected GPA	3.75
Sl.No	2		
Criterion	Teaching-learning and Evaluation		
Grievance	<p>1. Upon reviewing the grade sheet uploaded on the AIT NAAC portal, we were surprised and deeply concerned to find that Metric 2.4.2 has been awarded a score of 1 despite the submission of comprehensive data and supporting documentation during both the Self-Study Report (SSR) and DVV clarification stages. This appeal with utmost respect and a strong sense of responsibility towards AIT strongly object to the score of 1 awarded under Metric 2.4.2, which fails to reflect the substantial academic progress made by our institution. In the 2025 evaluation, 31.07% of our full-time faculty hold Ph.D. qualifications acquired within the last five years with a significant improvement of 7.5% as compared to 23.57% in the 2022 cycle. This reflects the substantial academic progress made by our institution, yet, the score has been inexplicably reduced to 1.</p> <p>2. We urge the committee to reconsider based on the following points:</p> <p>a. Improved Qualification Ratio: The rise in Ph.D. qualified faculty clearly demonstrates our strategic focus on academic excellence and research capacity.</p> <p>b. Document Integrity: All submissions were accurate, transparent, and free from duplication.</p> <p>c. Faculty Experience: Our Ph.D. holders bring an average of 12.76 years of teaching experience, enriching the academic environment of an affiliated engineering institution.</p> <p>d. DVV Clarification Acceptance: The clarifications submitted based on DVV findings were accepted, and data was updated accordingly affirming the credibility of our submission.</p> <p>e. Benchmarking Context: The NAAC manual does not provide any explicit reference values or benchmarking criteria for assigning scores under Metric 2.4.2. In the absence of transparent criteria, assigning a score of 1 despite more than one-fourth (31.07%) of the faculty with PhD qualification is not only unjustified but also undermines the efforts made by the institution to promote faculty quality. This absence of clearly defined standards creates ambiguity in evaluation and undermines the transparency of the scoring process and assignment of a score.</p> <p>3. Given the above, we firmly request an upward revision of the score to 3, which accurately reflects our institution's academic strength and commitment to continuous improvement.</p>		

	<p>4. The complete proceedings was recorded at your end during the Peer Team visit in virtual mode which was scheduled on 20th May 2025 and 21st May 2025. AY 2022 2024 Teachers % 100.25 96.72 PhD % 23.57 31.07 Score awarded 2 1 View Evidence Document</p>		
Obtained GPA	3.21	Expected GPA	3.84
Sl.No	3		
Criterion	Infrastructure and Learning Resources		
Grievance	<p>Grievance : 4.1.1</p> <p>1. With due respect, AIT humbly contests the score awarded under Criterion 4.1.1, which pertains to the adequacy and quality of infrastructure and related facilities. We sincerely believe that the score does not accurately reflect the scale, quality, and strategic development of infrastructure at the Army Institute of Technology.</p> <p>2. We respectfully urge the committee to reconsider the evaluation, taking into account the extensive and well-documented efforts undertaken by the institution, as detailed below.</p> <p>a. Comprehensive and Modern Infrastructure: AIT has consistently maintained and upgraded its physical and recreational infrastructure to meet and exceed academic and co-curricular needs. Our campus includes state-of-the-art laboratories, ICT-enabled classrooms, well-maintained sports facilities, and dedicated recreational zones clearly aligned with NAAC's quality benchmarks.</p> <p>b. Evidence-Based Submission: All relevant documents, including detailed layouts, utilization reports, and photographic evidence, were uploaded in the SSR. These documents clearly demonstrate the adequacy, accessibility, and optimal use of our infrastructure.</p> <p>c. Transparency and Re-submission: For absolute clarity and ease of verification, we are once again providing access to the same documents. There is no ambiguity in the data submitted only a need for fair and thorough consideration</p> <p>3. AIT regularly organizes inter-institute technical, cultural, and sports competitions, which clearly demonstrates the availability and adequacy of infrastructure required to host large-scale, multi-disciplinary events. This is direct evidence of our institution's capacity to support holistic development and manage high footfall activities with efficiency.</p> <p>4. AIT's infrastructure is not only sufficient for internal use but is also rented out to other schools and institutions for hosting sports competitions. This external utilization is a clear endorsement of the quality, scale, and reliability of our facilities, further validating our claim for a higher score under Criterion 4.1.1</p> <p>5. In response to the observations made during the NAAC 2022 Accreditation cycle, AIT has undertaken proactive and targeted measures to</p>		

address the suggested improvements. Barrier-free access has been ensured in buildings previously lacking such provisions, and common rooms for both boys and girls already available in hostels are now being established within academic buildings. Furthermore, existing facilities have been renovated, and additional state-of-the-art laboratories and classrooms have been developed, along with supplementary amenities, to promote inclusivity and enhance overall student welfare

6. Given the scale and quality of infrastructure in place, the score awarded is unjustifiably low and does not align with the evidence provided. AIT has met and in many areas, exceeded the expectations set forth in the NAAC manual.

7. In view of the above, we firmly request a re-evaluation and upward revision of the score to 4, corresponding to a weightage of 80, which accurately reflects the institution's infrastructure capabilities and commitment to holistic development

Grievance : 4.2.1

a. Discrepancy Between Peer Team Observations and Assigned Score:

During the Peer Team's visit, a thorough inspection of our library infrastructure, ILMS systems, and digital facilities was conducted. The team expressed positive feedback throughout, and no concerns were raised regarding Criterion 4.2.1, either in verbal discussions or in the preliminary report. The final score, however, does not reflect this qualitative assessment, raising concerns about consistency and fairness.

b. Substantiated Evidence of Excellence in Library Automation:

c. AIT has consistently demonstrated leadership in library automation and digital access

- Library Automation: Fully automated since 1998 using SLIM21 ILMS, integrating all library operations
- Digital Resources: Access to premier databases including IEEE (ASPP + POP All), Springer Nature, ASME, ELSEVIER – Science Direct, McGraw Hill Access Engineering, and more

• Holdings

i. 36,370 print books

ii. 980 e-journals, 1,888 e-books

iii. 28 print journals

iv. DELNET, 129 NPTEL web-courses, 324 educational videos

• Digital Infrastructure

i. Dedicated digital library with 12 high-end PCs, printer, scanner

ii. Remote access via Knimbus e-Library

iii. Turnitin Feedback Studio + AI detection (1,348 licenses)

iv. Face Recognition Attendance System

v. Air-conditioned reading hall (Wi-Fi enabled, BYOD compliant, 156 seats)

• Student-Centric Initiatives:

i. Book Bank for meritorious students

ii. Annual Best Library User Award

iii. Average annual budget of ₹39.08 lakhs for library resources

• AIT library is a vital academic resource, actively utilized by both faculty and students. It remains accessible beyond regular college hours, including

	<p>Sundays, to support continuous learning.</p> <p>d. Transparency and Documentation</p> <p>All the above initiatives and infrastructure are clearly documented in our Self-Study Report (SSR), supporting documents, and institutional website. These were submitted in good faith and in full compliance with NAAC's quality benchmarks.</p> <p>Grievance : 4.3.1</p> <p>AIT has built an IT backbone that rivals top-tier institutions:</p> <p>a. Campus wide Enterprise class network Cisco Catalyst Switches connected by optical fibre redundant mode connectivity of 10Gbps in academic block and hostels.</p> <p>b. Backbone LAN with 2Gbps Class-A ISP lease line, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1Gbps NKN • 0.5Gbps Tata Teleservices • Campus-wide Cisco Catalyst switches with 10Gbps optical fibre redundant connectivity across academic blocks and hostels • 0.5Gbps Power Grid <p>c. Wi-Fi Infrastructure: Campus wide Cisco 9115 series routers/Access Points monitored by Cisco Wi-Fi controller 9800L to cater the need of 2000+ users</p> <p>c. State of Art Mini data center with farm of servers, next generation firewalls and network NAS storage facility</p> <p>d. 42 software which are used at various departments by the students and faculty</p> <p>e. UPS power backup and three DG-sets of 125 KVA generators are installed to ensure uninterrupted power supply</p> <p>6. IT infrastructure in AIT:</p> <p>a. HPC Server</p> <p>b. Two workstations having Intel Xeon 16 Core and Intel Xeon 6 Core CPU</p> <p>c. Deep Learning Inference Embedded Platform</p> <p>d. Thermal camera</p> <p>e. Artificial Intelligent IOT Lab</p> <p>7. This facility was demonstrated with exceptional clarity and effectiveness during the Peer Team's virtual visit. View Evidence Document</p>		
Obtained GPA	2.8	Expected GPA	4.0
Sl.No	4		
Criterion	Student Support and Progression		
Grievance	<p>Grievance 5.1.1:</p> <p>1. With utmost respect and a deep sense of responsibility towards our students and institutional values, the Army Institute of Technology (AIT) submits this appeal for a reconsideration of the score awarded under Metric 5.1.1: Scholarships and Financial Support to Students. Upon reviewing the grade sheet uploaded on the college portal, we were surprised and concerned to find a score of 0 assigned to this metric, despite the submission of comprehensive and verifiable data during</p>		

both the Self-Study Report (SSR) and DVV clarification stages.

2. AIT humbly request the committee to kindly reconsider the evaluation, taking into account the extensive and well-documented efforts undertaken by the institution, as detailed below:

a. Documented Evidence of Student Support: The institution clearly reported that 22.98% of students received scholarships, a figure that reflects our robust student support system and commitment to inclusive education. This data was backed by verifiable documentation, including scholarship lists, sanction letters, and beneficiary details.

b. Unexplained Benchmarking Criteria:

i. The NAAC manual does not provide any explicit reference values or benchmarking criteria for assigning scores under Metric 5.1.1. In the absence of transparent criteria, assigning a score of 0 despite nearly one-fourth of the student body receiving financial support is not only unjustified but also undermines the efforts made by the institution to promote equity and access. This absence of clearly defined standards creates ambiguity in evaluation and undermines the transparency of the scoring process and assignment of a score of zero despite 22.98% of students receiving scholarships appears arbitrary and inconsistent

? DVV Clarification Process Overlooked: AIT believes that some of the documents submitted during the DVV clarification process may not have been fully considered. These documents were uploaded in strict adherence to DVV findings. Their omission has led to a misrepresentation of the institution's performance. The Higher Education Institution (HEI) had submitted all the required supporting documents during the Data Validation and Verification (DVV) clarification process.

? Request for Score Revision: Based on the data submitted and the impact of our scholarship initiatives, we firmly believe that a score of 3 is justified for this metric, corresponding to a weightage of 60. This score accurately reflects our commitment to student welfare and financial inclusion. Based on the evidence and rationale provided, the HEI respectfully appeals for the revision of the awarded grade for this metric from 0 to 3, which corresponds to a weightage of 60.

? The College had previously uploaded all relevant supporting documents during both the Self-Study Report (SSR) and DVV clarification stages. AIT has consistently demonstrated its dedication to student support through structured financial aid mechanisms and national-level scholarship facilitation. The current score does not reflect the reality of our efforts and achievements. In light of the above, we strongly urge the Appeal Committee to re-evaluate the score and award the rightful grade of 3, acknowledging the genuine commitment to promoting equity, access, and student welfare.

Grievance on 5.1.3:

1. With utmost respect and in the spirit of constructive dialogue, the Army Institute of Technology (AIT) submits this appeal for a reconsideration of the score awarded under Metric 5.1.3, Capacity Building and Guidance for Competitive Examinations and Career Counselling. We would like to bring the following points to your kind attention

	<p>a. Verified Participation Rate of 21.53% As per our institutional response, 21.53% of students were actively benefitted through structured guidance for competitive examinations and career counselling services. This figure was clearly documented and substantiated through detailed reports, attendance records, and program materials.</p> <p>b. Complete Compliance with DVV Requirements The institution duly submitted all required supporting documents during both the SSR and DVV clarification stages. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Event schedules and posters o Participant lists o Feedback forms and analysis o Reports on career counselling sessions and competitive exam workshops <p>c. Lack of Transparency in Benchmarking Standards The NAAC manual does not specify the reference values or benchmarking criteria used to assign scores for this metric. In the absence of such clarity, assigning a score of 2 despite a participation rate exceeding 20% appears arbitrary and inconsistent with the principles of fair and evidence-based evaluation.</p> <p>d. Possible Oversight in Document Consideration It is our observation that some of the documents submitted during the DVV clarification process may not have been fully considered, leading to an undervaluation of our efforts. This oversight has resulted in a score that does not reflect the actual scale and effectiveness of our student support infrastructure.</p> <p>e. Justification for Score Revision Given the verified data, the comprehensive nature of our initiatives, and the institutional commitment to student development, we firmly believe that a score of 3 (weightage 30) is fully justified and appropriate for this metric.</p> <p>f. Commitment to Transparency and Re-submission of Documents To ensure complete transparency and facilitate a fair reassessment, we are resubmitting all relevant supporting documents that were originally uploaded during the SSR and DVV clarification phases. AIT has consistently demonstrated its commitment to student success through targeted career counselling and competitive exam guidance programs. Based on the verified data, comprehensive documentation, and our sustained commitment to student development the current score does not reflect the true impact and scale of these initiatives. We therefore respectfully but assertively request a revision of the score from 2 to 3 under Metric 5.1.3. View Evidence Document</p>		
Obtained GPA	2.32	Expected GPA	2.89
Sl.No	5		
Criterion	Governance, Leadership and Management		
Grievance	Grievance on 6.1.1 a. Strategic Alignment with National Education Policies AIT's governance is already defined and streamlined with the principles of		

National Education Policy/various institutional practices such as soft skill training, Dancing, Cultural Activities, Physical Fitness, Visual Arts, Painting etc. Same can be seen from attached documents that reflect its implementation. Our vision and mission are not mere statements but are actively translated into our academic and administrative frameworks

b. NEP Implementation

- Two-week FDP was conducted on NEP at institute level
- 50% Faculty have attended FDPs on NEP and OBE within and outside institute
- Faculty requirement at first year level is finalized as per NEP instructions given by SPPU Pune
- Academic Bank of Credits IDs are created for all AIT student

c. Decentralized and Participatory Governance

The college operates through a robust decentralized governance model, ensuring participatory decision-making at all levels.

- Student council for students
- IQAC for faculty and students
- Leave sanctioning committee
- Mess committee for students & staff etc

d. Decentralization of Financial Power

- ? Director
- ? Joint Director
- ? Heads of Department
- ? IQAC Coordinator

Various committees are working for decentralization of power. This is not only documented but also demonstrably practiced, as evidenced by uploaded records of committee structures, meeting minutes, and stakeholder involvement

e. Institutional Perspective Plan: AIT has developed and executed both short-term & long-term Institutional Perspective Plans, which are aligned with our mission to foster ideal citizenship and global competence. These plans are dynamic, forward-looking, and have been consistently updated to reflect evolving educational goals

f. Documented Evidence of Sustained Growth: Our institution has shown sustained academic and infrastructural growth, supported by strategic planning and leadership. All relevant documentation including strategic plans, policy documents, and performance reports has been duly uploaded for verification

Drip Irrigation, Herbal Garden, Solar lights, Waste MGT, Water Fountain, Tree Plantation, Rainwater Harvesting, Solar Power Plant are being implemented.

g. Commitment to Excellence and National Service: AIT's purpose is to produce competent global citizens who contribute meaningfully to national progress. This is not aspirational it is operationalized through our curriculum, outreach programs, & leadership development initiatives.

Grievance 6.2.1 a. Complete Evidence Was Presented and Acknowledged

During the Peer Team's virtual visit, AIT presented all required supporting documents, including a detailed PPT presentation (link provided during the visit). The Peer Team acknowledged and accepted the evidence without raising any objections. The documentation was clear, comprehensive, & aligned with NAAC's expectations.

b. Clarification Documents Were Robust and Exhaustive

AIT submitted a well-structured and evidence-backed SSR report, covering:

c. Decentralization & Participative Governance

- Functioning of AIT Governing Body, IQAC, Academic Advisory Committee, & CDC.
- Transparent budget preparation methodology.
- Decentralization of financial power upto HoD.
- Leave policy aligned with UGC/AICTE norms.
- Faculty recruitment & SOP formation processes.
- Formalised faculty recruitment process & SOP formation methodology.

d. Academic Perspective Plan Deployment

AIT Growth Plan (2013–2023) and AIT Academic Growth Plan (2023–2028), both are

dynamic in nature and continuously updated. 100% achievement of AGP (2023-2028) e. Infrastructure Milestone Achievements • Construction of 214 new student accommodations (increase from 1,279 to 1,492). • ₹88 crore project proposal for 848 accommodations submitted to AHQ. • Ongoing expansion: classrooms, labs, faculty rooms for additional requirement. • Feasibility study for a 15,942 sq.m new academic block with a 1,000-seat auditorium on top. f. Institutional Rules and Regulatory Framework • College Rule Book & 96 SOPs (21 for staff, 43 institutional, 32 for students). • Fully functional grievance redressal mechanisms for staff and students. • Internal Complaint Committee and comprehensive student support systems to address diversity and hand holding. g. Strategic Alignment and Institutional Maturity The scale, scope, and strategic alignment of AIT's governance and development activities are undeniable. The institution has demonstrated maturity in planning, execution, and monitoring of its academic and infrastructural goals. These are not aspirational claims—they are substantiated by hard evidence. Like pictures in presentation supported by expert as project. AIT was awarded 4 in the last accreditation process (2022), but after spending Rs. 7716.16 Lakhs for renovation of classrooms, Laboratories, Faculty rooms, toilets, offices etc. AIT is awarded score of 3 which seems to be unjustified. AIT respectfully submits that the grade of 3 awarded under Metric 6.2.1 may not accurately reflect the institution's strategic governance and planning efforts. Grievance 6.4.1 a. Peer Team Feedback Was Positive – No Justification for Downgrade During the Peer Team's virtual visit, the institution received no adverse remarks regarding this criterion. On the contrary, the team acknowledged the institution's sound financial practices. The decision to reduce the score appears to be a precautionary downgrade without basis, despite the availability of complete documentation in the Self-Study Report While student fees remain the primary source of revenue, the institution ensures judicious and transparent use of all funds, supported by detailed financial records. b. Comprehensive Financial Documentation Was Submitted • AIT has consistently maintained detailed and verifiable records of: • Fund mobilization from both government and non-government sources. • Transparent utilization of student fees, our primary revenue stream. • Incentive mechanisms for faculty and staff involved in research and project completions. 1. Regular internal and external audits, as per institutional policy. All of this was clearly documented and uploaded in the SSR, leaving no room for ambiguity or doubt. All audit objections were addressed and settled in time. No abnormality was reported by any agency. 2. Well-Defined Resource Mobilization Policy in Place The institution has a clearly articulated policy for resource mobilization and fund utilization. This is not a theoretical framework it is functioning, monitored, and regularly audited system that ensures financial discipline and strategic alignment with institutional goals. 3. Unjustified Downgrade Undermines Institutional Integrity • Reducing the score despite: • Positive peer feedback • Complete documentation, and • Alignment with NAAC's own guidelines is not only unjustified but also undermines credibility of the evaluation process. 4. Given the strength of our financial systems, the clarity of our documentation, and

	the absence of any View Evidence Document		
Obtained GPA	2.65	Expected GPA	3.43
Sl.No	6		
Criterion	Institutional Values and Best Practices		
Grievance	<p>Grievance on 7.2.1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AIT respectfully submit this appeal for reconsideration of the score awarded under Criteria 7.2.1, which pertains to the evaluation of our institution’s “Best Practices” as outlined in the Self-Study Report (SSR). Despite receiving positive feedback from the Peer Team during their virtual visit, a score of 2 out of 4 (50%) was allotted, which we believe does not fully reflect the impact and effectiveness of our initiatives. 2. AIT humbly request the committee to kindly reconsider the evaluation, taking into account the extensive and well-documented efforts undertaken by the institution, as detailed below: The Peer Team acknowledged and appreciated the two best practices implemented by our institution. AIT believes that the depth, innovation, and measurable impact of our initiatives particularly in the areas of Higher Package Placement Enablement and Industry Integration for Innovation and Entrepreneurship merit a more favourable assessment. 3. Best Practice I: Comprehensive Efforts for Higher Package Placement of Students AIT has implemented a multi-dimensional, outcome-driven strategy to ensure our students are not only employable but are also equipped to secure high-value placements. Our approach is not limited to routine placement activities but is a comprehensive ecosystem involving: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Skill Development Programs tailored to industry needs, including AMCAT assessments and aptitude training b. Internships and Work Experience that provide real-world exposure and enhance employability c. Professional Networking and Branding initiatives that empower students to build industry connections and personal visibility d. Quantitative and Qualitative Aptitude Training to prepare students for competitive recruitment processes Evidence of Success <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consistent increase in high CTC placements over the past five years b. Documented participation in AMCAT 2022 and other skill benchmarking platforms c. Tangible outcomes in terms of internship-to-placement conversion rates d. Despite challenges such as limited networking access and industry volatility, AIT has proactively mitigated these barriers through strategic partnerships and alumni engagement 4. Best Practice II: Industry Integration to Foster Innovation and Entrepreneurship AIT has gone beyond conventional academia-industry interaction by building a robust, scalable, and inclusive innovation ecosystem. Our 		

	<p>initiatives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Establishment of an Innovation and Entrepreneurship Cell under the MHRD’s IIC framework b. Mentorship-driven startup ecosystem supported by alumni entrepreneurs and domain experts c. Hackathons, coding competitions, and industry-sponsored challenges that address real-world problems d. Collaborative research and IP generation through industry-academia partnerships e. Skill optimization programs like the KPIT training initiative, directly aligned with industry expectations <p>Evidence of Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. 456 project-based internships, 90+ companies offering “dream” and “super-dream” jobs g. 18 industrial expert lectures, 40+ workshops, and 8 startups incubated h. Prestigious scholarships awarded to students by Google, Reliance Foundation, and Deutsche Bank, reflecting national-level recognition of our talent grooming <p>5. AIT believes the breadth, depth, and measurable outcomes of these practices align strongly with NAAC’s emphasis on quality enhancement, innovation, and stakeholder engagement. The practices are not only well-documented and sustained but have also led to transformational outcomes for our students and the broader academic community All relevant documentary evidence, duly signed and verified by the institution, was submitted as part of the SSR. To further substantiate our claim, we have uploaded additional supporting documents in the designated section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The complete proceedings of the Peer Team visit held on 20th and 21st May 2025 were recorded at your end and we respectfully submit that our claims can be verified by reviewing this official recording. 2. In light of the above, we earnestly request NAAC to kindly review the assessment and consider a revision of the score awarded under Criteria 7.2.1, in alignment with the documented outcomes and peer team observations <p>View Evidence Document</p>		
Obtained GPA	3.2	Expected GPA	3.8

Extended Profile Data Recommendations			
--	--	--	--

Metric Level Data Recommendations	
Sl.No	1
Ref.No	2.4.2
Description	<i>Percentage of full time teachers with NET/SET/SLET/ Ph. D./D.Sc. / D.Litt./L.L.D. during the last five years (consider only highest degree for count)</i>
Comments by HEI	<p>1. We were surprised and deeply concerned to find that Metric 2.4.2 has been awarded a score of 1 despite the submission of comprehensive data and supporting documentation during both the Self-Study Report (SSR) and DVV clarification stages. This appeal with utmost respect and a strong sense of responsibility towards AIT strongly object to the score of 1 awarded under Metric 2.4.2, which fails to reflect the substantial academic progress made by our institution. In the 2025 evaluation, 31.07% of our full-time faculty hold Ph.D. qualifications acquired within the last five years with a significant improvement of 7.5% as compared to 23.57% in the 2022 cycle. This reflects the substantial academic progress made by our institution, yet, the score has been inexplicably reduced to 1.</p> <p>2. We urge the committee to reconsider the evaluation based on the extensive and well-documented efforts undertaken by the institution, as outlined below:</p> <p>a. Improved Qualification Ratio: The rise in Ph.D. qualified faculty clearly demonstrates our strategic focus on academic excellence and research capacity:</p> <p>b. Document Integrity: All submissions were accurate, transparent, and free from duplication.</p> <p>c. Faculty Experience: Our Ph.D. holders bring an average of 12.76 years of teaching experience, enriching the academic environment of an affiliated engineering institution.</p> <p>d. DVV Clarification Acceptance: The clarifications submitted based on DVV findings were accepted, and data was updated accordingly affirming the credibility of our submission.</p> <p>e. Benchmarking Context: The NAAC manual does not provide any explicit reference values or benchmarking criteria for assigning scores under Metric 2.4.2. In the absence of transparent criteria, assigning a score of 1 despite more than one-fourth (31.07%) of the faculty with PhD qualification is not only unjustified but also undermines the efforts made by the institution to promote faculty quality. This absence of clearly defined standards creates ambiguity in evaluation and undermines the transparency of the scoring process and assignment of a score</p> <p>3. Given the above, we firmly request an upward revision of the score to 3, which accurately reflects our institution's academic strength and commitment to continuous improvement.</p>

	4. In spite of repeatedly addressing us as “Premier Institute” we were not awarded full score. View Document
Sl.No	2
Ref.No	1.4.1
Description	<i>Institution obtains feedback on the academic performance and ambience of the institution from various stakeholders, such as Students, Teachers, Employers, Alumni etc. and action taken report on the feedback is made available on institutional website</i>
Comments by HEI	<p>Grievance : With due respect and sincere regard for the evaluation process, Army Institute of Technology (AIT), Pune, affiliated with Savitribai Phule Pune University (SPPU), humbly submits this appeal for your kind reconsideration of the score awarded under QIM 1.4.1</p> <p>AIT wish to highlight the following points in support of appeal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback is systematically collected from all the stakeholders, students, faculty, employers, and alumni. 2. All relevant supporting documents, uploaded in the Self-Study Report (SSR) and again during the DVV clarification process. 3. The website link of feedback analysis along with the action taken report is was shared. (https://www.aitpune.com/NAACReports.aspx). 4. The feedback is shared with all the stakeholders. 5. AIT has fulfilled all required options under this metric. <p>As all options are fulfilled, and in light of the above, the HEI respectfully appeals for a reconsideration and upward revision of the score for this metric, from 2 to 4 carrying a weightage of 80, based on the evidence provided reflecting the institution’s commitment to continuous improvement and stakeholder engagement.</p>
Sl.No	3
Ref.No	4.4.1
Description	<i>Percentage expenditure incurred on maintenance of physical facilities and academic support facilities excluding salary component, during the last five years (INR in Lakhs)</i>
Comments by HEI	<p>Request for Grade Revision – Metric 4.4.1: Expenditure Incurred on Maintenance of Infrastructure (Physical and Academic Support Facilities)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As per the grade sheet uploaded on the college portal by NAAC, the

institution has been awarded a score of 1 with a corresponding weightage of 20 under Metric 4.4.1.

2. The Higher Education Institution (HEI) expresses concern regarding the score awarded for this metric and respectfully requests a re-evaluation, as the institution believes it qualifies for the full score of 4 based on the supporting data and documentation submitted.

3. Following the DVV clarification, the HEI verified and resubmitted the required data in the prescribed format, including audited statements.

4. In line with the DVV team's suggestions, the following details were uploaded:

a. A detailed breakup of expenditures incurred on the maintenance of both physical infrastructure and academic support facilities.

b. Total Expenditure Incurred on Maintenance of Infrastructure on Physical and Academic Support Facilities during assessment period (5 years) is Rs. 660.33 Lakhs

c. A clarification that in the context of AIT, revenue primarily comprises tuition fees collected from students, which contribute to the college's operating budget.

d. In the previously submitted expenditure sheet, the source of income/fund was mentioned as "Dept Revenue Expenditure." As per DVV instructions, this was revised to reflect the correct head as "expenditure met from the revenue."

e. The "Grant-in-Aid" referenced in the initial submission refers to funding received from the parent body, Army Welfare Education Society (AWES), New Delhi, for supporting academic infrastructure. This has been correctly renamed as "Academic expenditure met from AWES Grant-in-Aid" in the revised submission.

f. The revised academic expenditure sheet was duly corrected and resubmitted for evaluation.

5. The audited statements of income and expenditure for the last five years duly certified by the Principal and a Chartered Accountant (CA) have been provided, explicitly showing the expenditure incurred on maintenance of physical and academic facilities.

6. All necessary supporting proofs were submitted during the DVV clarification stage. However, it appears that these may not have been fully considered during the evaluation.

7. Based on the revised data, clarity of income/expenditure classification, and full compliance with NAAC's prescribed documentation standards, the HEI strongly believes that the institution merits a grade of 4 for this metric.

8. The previously uploaded documents, now resubmitted for convenience and transparency, reinforce the institution's commitment to infrastructure maintenance and student support.

9. Accordingly, the institution anticipates a revised score of 4, with a corresponding weightage of 80, based on the comprehensive data and aligned financial practices.

10. In view of the above, the HEI respectfully appeals for a revision of the awarded grade from 1 to 4 for Metric 4.4.1.

[View Document](#)

Sl.No	4
Ref.No	5.1.2
Description	<p><i>Following capacity development and skills enhancement activities are organised for improving students' capability</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Soft skills</i> <i>2. Language and communication skills</i> <i>3. Life skills (Yoga, physical fitness, health and hygiene)</i> <i>4. ICT/computing skills</i>
Comments by HEI	<p>With utmost respect and in the spirit of constructive engagement, the Army Institute of Technology (AIT) submits this appeal for a reconsideration of the score awarded under Metric 5.1.2: Capacity Building and Skill Enhancement Initiatives.</p> <p>AIT has consistently demonstrated its commitment to holistic student development through well-structured and documented activities across all mandated domains</p> <p>1. We respectfully request the esteemed committee to kindly re-evaluate the score in light of the comprehensive evidence and sustained efforts outlined below:</p> <p>a. Comprehensive and Well-Documented Activities The institution has consistently conducted a wide range of structured activities across all four mandated domains:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Soft Skills ii. Language and Communication Skills iii. ICT Skills iv. Physical Fitness and Wellness <p>These activities were clearly documented and submitted during the SSR stage, with event posters, attendance records, detailed reports, and feedback summaries.</p> <p>b. Full Compliance with DVV Requirements: During the DVV clarification process, the institution submitted all required supporting documents in accordance with NAAC's guidelines. These included year-wise activity logs, photographs, and participant data, ensuring transparency and traceability.</p> <p>c. Possible Oversight in Evaluation: It appears that some of the submitted documents may not have been fully considered during the evaluation. This oversight has led to an undervaluation of the institution's efforts, despite clear evidence of sustained and impactful student development programs.</p> <p>d. Justification for Score Revision: Given the breadth, frequency, and quality of the initiatives conducted, and the meticulous documentation provided, the institution strongly believes</p>

	<p>that a score of 4 (weightage 40) is fully justified. This score would more accurately reflect the institution's proactive and holistic approach to student capacity building.</p> <p>e. Commitment to Transparency: To facilitate a fair reassessment, we are resubmitting all relevant documents and providing open access to the same. These materials clearly demonstrate the institution's sustained commitment to enhancing student competencies in alignment with NAAC's quality benchmarks. AIT has gone beyond routine compliance to create a vibrant, student-centric ecosystem that fosters skill development, personal growth, and employability. The current score does not do justice to the depth and impact of our initiatives. We therefore respectfully but assertively request a revision of the score from 3 to 4 under Metric 5.1.2.</p>
Sl.No	5
Ref.No	6.3.3
Description	<p><i>Percentage of teaching and non-teaching staff participating in Faculty development Programmes (FDP), Management Development Programmes (MDPs) professional development /administrative training programs during the last five years</i></p>
Comments by HEI	<p>1. With utmost respect and in the spirit of constructive dialogue, the Army Institute of Technology (AIT), Pune, submits this appeal for a reconsideration of the grade awarded under Metric 6.3.3: Professional Development and Faculty Empowerment Initiatives. While we deeply value the NAAC evaluation process, we humbly express our concern regarding the grade of 1 (weightage 15) reflected in the uploaded grade sheet. Based on the comprehensive documentation, strategic alignment of initiatives, and the acknowledged submissions during the DVV clarification stage, we respectfully request the esteemed committee to kindly re-evaluate the score in light of the verifiable evidence and the institution's sustained commitment to faculty and staff development.</p> <p>2. We humbly request the esteemed committee to kindly reconsider the evaluation, taking into account the extensive, well-documented, and sustained efforts undertaken by the institution, as detailed below</p> <p>a. Complete and Compliant Documentation Was Submitted During the DVV clarification process, AIT submitted all required documents, strictly adhering to NAAC's guidelines. The DVV team acknowledged and</p>

accepted the evidence without reservations.

b. Clarifications Were Precise and Aligned with DVV Requirements

The institution provided:

? A revised list of FDPs and training programs for faculty exceeding five days, as per DVV instructions.

? 246 E-copies of participation certificates for both teaching and non teaching staff for the assessment period.

? Annual reports detailing all development programs conducted over the last five years.

? Specific examples of faculty participation, including:

Dr. Rajashree Suryawanshi (22-08-2022 to 27-08-2022)

Dr. G.R. Patil (11-07-2022 to 15-07-2022) were shared in response to DVV findings.

c. Non-Teaching Staff Development Was Extensive and Technically Relevant

AIT conducted technical training programs for knowledge upgradation of non

teaching staff also for giving them better career prospectus.

? Linux

? Cyber Security

? CCNA

? Open Power ISA RISC

These programs are directly aligned with academic subjects such as System Programming, Operating Systems, Network Security, Cloud Computing, and Mobile Computing, including contributions from the Mechanical Engineering

Department. Provision are there to promote them if required qualification are acquired by lab assistant.

d. Strategic Alignment with Institutional Goals

The number of programs, level of participation, and the strategic relevance of

these initiatives clearly demonstrate that AIT meets the high standards for this

metric.

e. Demand for Immediate Grade Revision

Given that:

? The DVV team accepted the clarifications,

? The documentation is complete and compliant,

? The programs are extensive and strategically aligned,

3. The NAAC manual does not provide any explicit reference values or benchmarking criteria for assigning scores under Metric 6.3.3. In the absence of transparent criteria, assigning a score of 1 despite 27.42% of teaching and non-teaching staff attending in FDP is not only unjustified but also undermines the efforts made by the institution to promote equity and access. In absence of clearly defined standards, keeping in mind the efforts put in by staff and institute which resulted in 27.42% faculty with FDP, the score of 1 is fully unjustified and appears to be arbitrary and inconsistent.

	4. In light of the comprehensive and verifiable evidence submitted, AIT respectfully requests a reassessment and upward revision of the grade awarded under Metric 6.3.3 from 1 to 3, corresponding to a weightage of 45. For your kind consideration, all relevant supporting documents and links are being resubmitted.
Sl.No	6
Ref.No	3.3.1
Description	Number of research papers published per teacher in the Journals notified on UGC care list during the last five years
Comments by HEI	<p>1. With utmost respect, AIT humbly contests the score awarded under the criterion related to faculty research output. We sincerely believe that the evaluation does not fully capture the depth and breadth of the research contributions made by our faculty over the past five years. 2. We urge the committee to reconsider the evaluation based on the extensive and well-documented efforts undertaken by the institution, as outlined below: a. Consistent and Quality Research Output: Our faculty have maintained a good research record, with a substantial number of publications in UGC CARE-listed journals, demonstrating our commitment to academic excellence and scholarly contribution. b. DVV Oversight: Despite uploading all relevant documents during the DVV clarification process including a detailed, verified list of publications with indexing the score awarded suggests that this evidence was either overlooked or not adequately considered. This has led to a clear misjudgement of our research output. It appears that the response submitted by the HEI may not have been considered, as the DVV-suggested input replicates the original DVV findings. The figures remain unchanged despite the submission of clear, documented evidence based on DVV guidelines, by the HEI indicating a decline in the number of publications during AY 2020–21, followed by a significant increase in AY 2021–22. 3. Transparent and Verified Submission: The documentation provided was comprehensive, accurate, and aligned with NAAC criteria. It included publication details across five academic years, with indexing and verification clearly presented 4. Justified Score Revision: Based on the volume, quality, and indexing of our research publications, we firmly request that our institution deserves a score of 2, corresponding to a weightage of 20, which accurately reflects our faculty’s research contributions. 5. In light of the above, we assert that our institution has fully met the requirements of this metric and strongly urge a revision of the score to 2</p>