

Opinion expressed in the faculty meeting on the recommendation of the 5th Academic Program review committee.

Many of the propositions in the said ARC falls on line with our (MME) recommendations. For example, we have accepted in an earlier faculty meeting

- (i) Credit system
- (ii) Optional B.Tech. Project
- (iii) B.Tech Honours
- (iv) APEC rules
- (v) UG research
- (vi) B.Tech in Engg Science
- (vii) Minor
- (viii) Double Major
- (ix) Dual Degree
- (x) One mid term examination
- (xi) Modular courses.

However faculty of MME does not agree with some of the propositions in the ARC which are highlighted below.

- A. **Graduating requirements:** We stick to our old decision and reiterate that the graduating CPI should not be lower than 5
- B. **Core Requirements:** If the choice lies with the students to select either of CHM 102 or CHM 103. We suggest that some elements of physical chemistry be part of both the courses. Alternative, the department of MME should be given the right to select a chemistry course for its students out of the two mentioned above. Also, the unit structure of TA 201 (MME) should be corrected. We demand 2 lectures per week and a total of 28 lectures for the efficient teaching of the course.
- C. **Communication skill:** The department is not in favour of offering communication skill courses. Institute level initiatives are required to impart effective training on communication skill. Conduct.
- D. **Transfer of credits:** We strongly oppose the criteria laid down in the ARC report under this head
- E. **Attendance:** If the graduating CPI is increased to 5, the restriction of 80% attendance can be removed

Apart from this we have noted that new insertions have been made in the ARC report on

- I. Grading scale (here we suggest that numerical value of A* be made higher than A i.e., 10 as opposed to 9)
- II. B.Tech. pass: This should be removed.