

ARMY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

PUNE 411015

Minutes of IQAC meeting

Date: 10 Mar 2018

Place: Conference Hall

Time: 1125 hrs-1330hrs

Agenda Points

- 1) Discussion on progress achieved as per set bench marks.
- 2) Other points from the members

The IQAC was re-constituted and the new members are:

1.	Prof. Dr BP Patil	BPP	Chairperson (Principal)
2.	Ms Tutu Singh	TS	Student Representative
3.	Mr Rammik Sharma	RS	Student Representative
4.	Mrs U L Jagtap	ULJ	Member (Librarian)
5.	Mrs. Meenal Salaskar	MS	Member (Parent Representative)
6.	Prof. Dr Sangeeta Jadhav	SJ	Member (HOD IT)
7.	Mr Gaurav Sinha	GS	Member (Employer)
8.	Prof. Dr MD Goudar	MDG	Member (External from Academia)
9.	Prof. Dr Anju Kulkarni	AK	Member
10.	Prof Khaladkar Manoj	MK	Member (TPO)
11.	Mr RP Ambike	RPA	Member
12.	Mr Baikunthnath Dwivedi	BD	Member (Alumni)
13.	Prof. Dr GR Patil	GRP	Member (HOD ETC)
14.	Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar	AD	Member (Alumni Representative)
15.	Prof. Dr Sunil Dhore	SD	Member (HOD COMP)
16.	Prof Avinash Patil	AP	Member (Rector)
17.	Prof. Dr Sujata Marathe	SM	NAAC Coordinator AIT
18.	Prof Ashok Kumar Singh	AKS	Member
19.	Prof Vijay Godbole	VG	Observer
20.	Prof Dr SA Jain	SAJ	Observer
21.	Prof. Dr Sanjiv M Sansgiri	SMS	Member (HOD Mech)
22.	Mr Vijender Yadav	VY	Member (Employer)
23.	Col Vijayan	JD	Member (Management Rep)

The NAAC coordinator welcomed the members and the meeting started at 1125hrs.

The following members could not make it to the meeting:

- a) Vijender Yadav
- b) Col Vijayan

Agenda Point1

Progress as per benchmark

Discussion took place on progress achieved since the last IQAC meeting on 08April 2017, as per set benchmarks. Benchmarks were quantified internally before the meeting.

- **Consistently good Results**

- > **95% All clear at Final year, One University rank/dept./year**

Progress – First year to final year results for the academic year 2016-17 were presented. Mr Gaurav Sinha asked why the result of SE Mechanical was low. Dr Sujata Marathe said that it was due to poor performance of students in one subject, Strength of materials. However the benchmark at final year and number of university toppers was met. Prof. Dr MD Goudar asked how the benchmarks had been fixed and whether any formula/calculation was used in arriving at the benchmarks. Dr Sujata Marathe replied that it was based on previous performance of students. Principal offered to re-calculate benchmarks based on predicted analysis for the next meeting. Prof. Dr Anju Kulkarni suggested that we set benchmarks by referring to better colleges, not results of AIT only.

It was also suggested by Mr Gaurav Sinha to include a separate column in the presentation of bench mark for the sake of comparison of actual result with benchmark. Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar and Mr Gaurav Sinha asked as to why would there be difference in marks in online and offline examinations. Dr Sujata Marathe replied that students score well in online exams but are unable to score in written theory exams.

Prof. Dr Anju Kulkarni mentioned that university has taken cognizance of the adverse effect of online exam as students take short cuts or guess answers and do not pay attention to writing answers properly which costs them during theory exams. Prof. Dr MD Goudar mentioned that online exam methods may change with use of ICT tools for assessment of subjective questions also using platforms like MOODLE.

Mr Baikunthnath Dwivedi suggested having action items for increasing university rankers, i.e., better coaching for prospective rankers. Dr Sujata Marathe informed that counselors motivate students. Prof. Dr Sanjiv M Sansgiri made the point that every student in AIT is a potential topper. He recommended incremental rather than selective guidance. Dr Sujata Marathe informed that the book bank scheme of library, has standard text books which are provided to toppers. Mr Baikunthnath Dwivedi pointed out that toppers are self motivated, it is the others who need to be motivated. The practice should not be elitist. He suggested for action items with different plans for different categories. Principal suggested that discrimination is not advised. Prof. Dr GR Patil suggested that we should not focus on bookish knowledge, batches differ. Mr Gaurav Sinha mentioned that hiring toppers indicates hard work to an employer. Also employers may base their opinion on projects. Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar mentioned that there is no denying that toppers attract placements

Dr Sujata Marathe suggested that along with benchmark at final year we should have a benchmark at third year as third year results affect placements. TPO affirmed that aggregate percentage at third year affects placement of the batch.

Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar suggested college ranking criteria used by NIRF and other ranking agencies to be used as basis of benchmarks.

- **Placements benchmark**

- > 95% with 60% in high end companies**

Placement data for the batch of 2016-17 was presented and observed that average placement was 92% with 70% in high end companies and for the current batch was at 89.6% to date. Mr AK Singh brought in the point –whether very high salary (39Lakh highest this year) put undue pressure on the candidates. It was clarified by TPO that it is not converted version of, say, dollars to rupees and the salary of Rs.39L is actual salary with stock option. Pressure is more in production units. High salaries are offered for very niche jobs and they don't entail inordinate pressure.

The average salary was Rs 5.4 Lakhs. It was suggested that instead of average salary a median salary will give a better idea of placements. TPO said that the median salary was also close to the average value. It was suggested that range of salaries with percent placed in a bar chart would give better information.

Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar suggested showing trends graphically, on niche placements or placements in general.

Mr Baikunthnath Dwivedi suggested that the trend should be shown dept wise also. Prof. Dr GR Patil mentioned that for Mechanical and E&TC niche placements will be lower, TPO mentioned that AIT candidates will be offered niche placements, even for Mechanical and E&TC. Mr Baikunthnath Dwivedi suggested for department wise benchmarks in placements as noncore companies like ZS, Deloitte are also choice of E&TC and Mechanical students. Mr Ramnik mentioned that students are also getting jobs in cyber security irrespective of branch. Mr Baikunthnath Dwivedi mentioned that core sector initially offers low salary but it jumps later. Prof. Dr Sanjiv M Sansgiri mentioned that jobs in the services sector has a positive slope. Jobs in core industries are showing negative trend. AIT should change its perception of providing mass recruitments/placements by a few companies. TPO mentioned that good profile of our students lands them jobs in core industry. Ms Tutu mentioned that for recruitment in defense, a student who is the right fit is selected.

Dr Sujata Marathe suggested that the number of students getting their dream job could be one of the benchmarks regarding placement.

- **Motivate students for higher studies and entrepreneurship**

- conduct one workshop/seminar, > 5% students enrolling for higher studies**

Progress: It was observed that required number of seminars were held to motivate students for higher studies, however the percentage of students actually enrolled for higher studies was only about 3%. Mr Gaurav Sinha suggested not having benchmark for higher studies. Principal said that this was a criteria considered by accreditation agencies like NBA and NAAC. Progress of activities under the incubation center was presented. Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar remarked that a good number of startups were being incubated at AIT in this last year. Mr Gaurav Sinha opined that the number could be more.

- **Value added courses, MOOC**

One per student by Third year

Progress: It was observed that at least 98% students had done a MOOC or value added course by third year. Mr Gaurav Sinha wanted to know if valued added courses helped and whether mapping after placement been done. TPO mentioned that no such mapping has been done but feedback from companies is taken which helps in deciding the value added courses to be conducted. Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar suggested that mapping will help, and he can help with the analysis.

- **Promote extra and co-curricular activities**

CCCBAS: B grade average by Third year

Progress: The number of cultural, technical and sports activities conducted at college at inter and intra college level were presented. CCCBAS will be calculated at the end the academic year.

- **ICT**

50% of instruction

Progress: Status of existing e-learning facilities was presented. Dr Sujata Marathe said that teachers are using ICT tools like MOODLE and power point presentations in addition to chalk and board.

- **Infrastructure up gradation**

Continuous

Progress: Details of various infrastructure up gradation works carried out in the last year was presented.

- **Green Environment Initiatives**

one per year

Progress: Complete waste disposal initiative taken up by college this year was discussed.

- **Promotion of Research and consultancy culture**

Faculty with PhD – 20%

Research papers in journals – each year to be equal to number of faculty members in department.

Patents – one / Dept./ year

Consultancy- Rs 1 lakh / Dept./ year

Progress: Data regarding ongoing and completed R&D projects was presented. Total number of research papers published in last two years was 105, however the number of patents and consultancy figures were far below the benchmarks. Prof. Dr Anju Kulkarni mentioned that the college had small amount allocated for R and D with low bench marks. Dr Sujata Marathe asked for suggestions / guidance in this regard. Prof. Dr Anju Kulkarni suggested undertaking defense consultancy, training, and more paper publications. There was scope to offer more consultancies. Prof. Dr Anju Kulkarni mentioned that along with journal publications faculty should try for international patents. Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar suggested that potential for consultancy needs to be identified and consultancy provided.

Prof. Dr Anju Kulkarni suggested starting PG courses in all branches to increase the research activities. Prof. Dr GR Patil mentioned about the difficulty in getting students admitted in PG courses.

- **Outreach Activities**

01 NSS Camp, 02 visits to orphanage, 02 Blood donation camps, 01 visit to paraplegic ward, 02 Awareness activities

Progress: The NSS activities conducted in the last year were presented and observed that all activities had been conducted as per benchmark.

- **Industry Institute Interaction**

One Industry sponsored lab./ Dept.

Progress: Discussion on industry sponsored projects: Industry sponsored project problems- Bharat Forge did not provide sufficient support. Prof Dr S Dhore mentioned that good projects are available but students may not be interested, project is decided by company priority, Mr Gaurav Sinha shared his experience of students expecting everything readymade. Prof Dr S Dhore mentioned that the purpose was to have industrial feel. Mr Abhijeet Deogirikar suggested good IOT startup for internship and tie up to department which may change student attitude. Prof Dr S Dhore agreed and conveyed he had similar ideas in mind. Action plan for consultancy-from industry, must we have such benchmark. Dr Sujata Marathe suggested having a separate HOD meeting to decide on setting benchmarks and make action plan.

- **Feedback from stakeholders**

Student feedback- less than 5% Faculty to have feedback less than 7.0 out of10

Parent feedback – should be greater than 80%

Administrative feedback – Dissatisfaction level to be less than 20%

Progress: Mrs. Salaskar stressed that better hygiene is needed in the hostels, commensurate with AIT standards and name. Mr Ramnik commented that the new hostels were good and older ones are okay. Mrs. Salaskar suggested raising benchmark in the administrative feedback. Dissatisfaction was mostly with laundry. Dr Sujata Marathe read out few other areas of concern from the administrative feedback. Mrs Salaskar said that availability of hot water from solar water heaters was a problem sometimes and feedback on this should also be taken.

Agenda Point 2: Any other points from members-

AK Singh commented on improvement needed on administrative processes. Principal and Prof Dr S Dhore remarked that this was not under the preview of IQAC. Mr AK Singh mentioned that it is very much the concern of IQAC. Prof. Dr MD Goudar mentioned that issues of administrative problems can be taken up in CDC. Mr AK Singh brought out that we ought not to slip here also in view of NAAC accreditations and intention of the institute to attain autonomy.

The NAAC coordinator thanked the members and the meeting concluded at 1330 followed by working lunch.