



Asha Mishra AIPSN General Secretary <gsaipsn@gmail.com>

Response from AIPSN on the recommendation made by the Expert Committee to Review the Notification on the Specification of Degrees and Suggest New Degree Nomenclature(s) placed in public domain for feedback.

Asha Mishra AIPSN General Secretary <gsaipsn@gmail.com>
To: manjusingh.ugc@nic.in, secy.ugc@nic.in
Cc: rajamanickamponniah <Rajamanickamponniah@gmail.com>

Wed, Jul 5, 2023 at 10:53 AM

ALL INDIA PEOPLE'S SCIENCE NETWORK (AIPSN)

Regd. No. PKD/CA/62/2020

AIPSN Central Secretariat,

E-mail: gsaipsn@gmail.com

E – 8/46, Akashganga colony
Arera Colony, Bhopal - 462039
Madhya Pradesh

Ph: 9425302012
Twitter: @gsaipsn
website: <https://aipsn.net>

President: Dr. Satyajit Rath General Secretary: Asha Mishra Treasurer: S. R. Azad

04 July 2023

To
Dr. Manju Singh
Joint Secretary, NEP, UGC
manjusingh.ugc@nic.in
secy.ugc@nic.in

Sub: Response on the draft recommendation from expert committee
Ref: Yr Lr D.O. No 5-1/2022(CPP-II)/NEP dt 8 Jun2023

Based on the request in your above referred letter from the UGC site, please find attached the response from AIPSN on the recommendation made by the Expert Committee to Review the Notification on the Specification of Degrees and Suggest New Degree Nomenclature(s) placed in public domain for feedback

Do acknowledge the receipt of this document.

Look forward to having all the inputs received made available publicly.

AIPSN insists that at the outset have to assure infrastructure, curriculum framework and necessary fund and bench mark for starting four year degree and multidisciplinary courses and then only we may think of nomenclature of degrees. Otherwise the quality of degrees in the new nomenclature is nothing but hypocritical and permitting the private players to commercialize education.

Yours sincerely
Asha Mishra
General Secretary, AIPSN
Mobile: 9425302012

All India People's Science Network

Response from AIPSN on the recommendation made by the Expert Committee to Review the Notification on the Specification of Degrees and Suggest New Degree Nomenclature(s) placed in public domain for feedback.

Ref: Yr Lr D.O. No 5-1/2022(CPP-II)/NEP dt 8 Jun2023

1. We wish to state that UGC recommendation on the specification of degrees and new nomenclature based on NEP-2020 is very hasty as various states have yet to implement NEP-2020. The hasty decision is nothing but promoting commercialization of higher education as many of the private universities started implementing NEP wherein states have yet to implement. It will create a great divide among students. It will help the private universities to mint money by this new generic name.
2. Four year degree with multiple entry and multiple exit and multidisciplinary courses at a stroke is not possible in a country like India where higher education enrolment is around 23% as per NEP. It is also found that many students leave their degree course at the end of third year (Delhi Experience)
3. Since many of the state universities have not evolved a curriculum framework for the four year degree it is not advisable to introduce new nomenclature which will definitely meet a failure like CBCS and OBE.
4. Four year degree course is possible when there is a minimum presence of a PG degree. But many of the colleges particularly rural colleges do not have PG courses and hence promoting four degree courses may lead to closure which will lead to denial of Higher Education and definitely dismiss the goal of 50% GER by 2030
5. On UGC recommendation on No. 2. A student may be considered for the award of a qualification (like a certificate/diploma/degree) once the required number of credits have been earned, irrespective of the minimum duration of the programme.

Awarding qualifications based solely on the accumulation of credits, regardless of the minimum duration of the program, will devalue the educational experience and the learning process itself. While the credit-based approach offers flexibility, it is crucial to strike a balance between earning credits and maintaining the integrity and quality of the educational experience. Emphasizing both credit accumulation and the minimum duration of a program can ensure that students receive a well-rounded education that prepares them for their chosen fields and fosters genuine intellectual growth. A program's rigorous curriculum and structure can be important factors in ensuring that students have adequate time to engage with the material, engage in discussions, and develop a deeper understanding of the subject matter. Focusing solely on earning credits will encourage students to prioritize quantity over quality in their academic pursuits. Instead of delving deep into subjects and acquiring a comprehensive understanding, students will be inclined to take the quickest and easiest routes to accumulate the necessary credits, potentially compromising their overall educational development. This credit-based approach may lead to students acquiring the required number of credits without fully mastering the subject matter. A rushed approach to earning credits could undermine the depth of knowledge and critical thinking skills necessary for true expertise in a particular field. It will also discourage students from taking advantage of additional learning opportunities, such as participating in research projects, internships, or other experiential learning activities. Engaging with complex concepts, grappling with challenging coursework, and having time for reflection and integration of knowledge are essential components of a robust educational experience. A sole focus on credits will hinder students' ability to develop critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and creativity. The credit-based approach may be perceived as prioritizing bureaucratic processes over the actual educational value of a program. This

could erode the public's trust in the educational system and devalue the qualifications earned, as it may be seen as a mere numerical game rather than a reflection of academic rigor and achievement. This elitism of nomenclature of degrees earned will eventually lead to unemployment and increased economic divide.

6. When BS, MS generic names are usually awarded to technical courses like engineering, medical etc., now suggested to non technical courses is not advisable. It will help the institutions to harvest money in the name of a generic name.

7. IISER (Mumbai), IISc (Bangalore) are capable of running four year and multiple disciplinary courses and awarding such degrees. Will these degrees awarded by rural colleges without such infrastructure have such quality?

8. When B.Phil and M.Phil are continuing in other countries removing M.Phil degree studies is not advisable.

9. However, simply change in nomenclature of Degrees to be awarded won't give the desired result unless finely tuned with course contents, requisite infrastructure, physical as well as academic, and improved teaching- learning process. For this paradigm shift in structural and pedagogical aspects are essential parts of change in the education system and all these demand broader discourse in the public domain which can be ensured by using different mediums of public discourse.

10. At the outset we have to assure infrastructure, curriculum framework and necessary fund and benchmark for starting four year degree and multidisciplinary courses and then only we may think of nomenclature of degrees. Otherwise the quality of degrees in the new nomenclature is nothing but hypocritical and permitting the private players to commercialize education.

11. These changes will affect severely the first generation students and lead to increase of dropout from higher education amongst them

For Contact:

Asha Mishra

General Secretary, AIPSN

Mobile: 9425302012 Email: gsaipsn@gmail.com



AIPSNresponse-UGC-Degrees-04July2023sd.pdf

62K