VIGNAN'S
FOUNDATION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & RESEARCH

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND OTHER INDIAN & FOREIGN LANGUAGES

CIRCULAR

Date: 05.03.2025

Department of English and Other Indian & Foreign Languages is going to conduct Department Academic Advisory Committee (DAAC) meeting for M.A. English program on **11.03.2025** from 01.30 PM at HoD cabin 1st Floor A Block. All the members are requested to make it convenient to attend the meeting.

The members are

1. Dr. Gomatam Mohana Charyulu, Professor and Head, EOFL, VFSTR - Chairperson
2. Prof. A. Sharada, Dean International Students - Internal Member
3. Dr. Sasi Ratnakar - Internal Member
4. Dr. Baiju Krishnan - Internal Member (Off campus)
5. Dr. D. Sravana Jyothi - Internal Member
6. Dr. Gouthami Paltati - Internal Member
7. Dr. Al Mamun Sarkar - Nominee (Dean-R&D)
8. Dr. K V B Ravindra Babu - Nominee (Dean-SASH)
9. Dr. G. Nageswara Rao. Associate Professor, EOFL - Member Secretary

Agenda of the BoS Meeting:

1. To discuss and finalize the curriculum structure and credits distribution of M.A. English Programme for the regulation 2025 (R25-C25).
2. To discuss and finalize the elective courses list of M.A. English Programme for the regulation R25-C25.
3. To discuss and map the SDGs and IKS components in the syllabus.
4. To approve the R25-C25 curriculum, syllabus and assessment schemes of M.A. English Programme and recommend to the Academic council.
5. To discuss and finalize the curriculum structure of Value added Courses for M.A. English.
6. To analyse the results of formative & summative assessments and the correlation between formative & summative assessments and between theory & lab marks.
7. To analyse the feedback collecting from all the stake holders and recommend the necessary changes in the curriculum to BoS.

Member Secretary

Chairperson

VIGNAN'S
FOUNDATION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & RESEARCH
(Deemed to be University) Estd. u/s 3 of UGC Act 1956

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND OTHER INDIAN & FOREIGN LANGUAGES
SCHOOL OF APPLIED SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

Date: 11.03.2025

Minutes of DAAC Meeting

The Department of English and Other Indian & Foreign Languages was conducted the Department Academic Advisory Committee (DAAC) meeting for M. A. English program on 11.03.2025 at the HoD Cabin, First Floor, A Block, VFSTR, from 01:30 PM onwards in offline mode, under the chairmanship of the Head of the Department of EOFL.

The following members were present.

S.No	Name of the Member	Designation	Committee Role	Signature
1	Dr. Gomatam Mohana Charyulu	Professor and HoD, Dept. of EOFL, VFSTR	Chairperson	
2	Prof. A. Sharada	Professor & Dean, International Students, VFSTR	Internal Member	
3	Dr. Sasi Ratnakar	Associate Professor, Dept. of EOFL, VFSTR.	Internal Member	
4	Dr. D. Sravana Jyothi	Assistant Professor, Dept. of EOFL, VFSTR.	Internal Member	
5	Dr. Gouthami Paltati	Assistant Professor, Dept. of EOFL, VFSTR.	Internal Member	
6	Dr. Baiju Krishnan	Assistant Professor, Dept. of EOFL, (Off – Campus) Hyderabad	Internal Member (Off campus)	
7	Dr. Al Mamun Sarkar	Assistant Professor, Dept. of EOFL, VFSTR.	Internal member (Dean-R&D Nominee)	
8	Dr. K V B Ravindra Babu	Associate Professor, Dept. of EOFL, VFSTR.	Internal member (Dean-SASH Nominee)	
9	Dr. G. Nageswara Rao	Associate Professor, Dept. of EOFL, VFSTR	Member Secretary	

Agenda of the Meeting

1. To analyze feedback collected from various stakeholders including Alumni, Employers, Faculty, Parents, and Students for the academic year 2024–2025.
2. To review and propose necessary modifications to the upcoming R25 & C25 curriculum based on feedback insights.
3. To finalize recommendations for designing and structuring the upcoming R25 & C25 curriculum with enhanced relevance to the needs of industry.
4. To analyze results of **formative and summative assessments**, especially the correlation between theory and lab marks.

Discussion and Key Points:

- Feedback analysis indicates that laboratory-based learning enhances students' technical and practical skills significantly.
- The curriculum is generally well-received, catering effectively to both the slow learners and the advanced learners.
- Suggestions emphasized the need for internship exposure, interdisciplinary learning, enhanced communication skills training, and inclusion of emerging areas such as AI, Digital Humanity and Problem Solving skills

Based on the feedback, the following points were discussed:

- R25 Syllabus: Major revisions in course outcomes and practical components are proposed to better align with industry requirements.
- C25 Curriculum: Emphasis will be placed on skill-based electives, multi-disciplinary open electives, research-oriented mini projects, and inclusion of 21st-century skill.

It was resolved that these changes and suggestions would be incorporated in the curriculum and forwarded to the BoS for review and approval.

The detailed stakeholder feedback summary is appended as Annexure-I.

The recommendations of the DAAC will be formally submitted to the Board of Studies (BoS) for further consideration and implementation.

Dr. G. Mohana Charyulu
Chair Person, DAAC
Department of EOFL

Annexure I

Alumni Feedback Summary

The alumni strongly appreciated the curriculum, reporting a high level of satisfaction with its alignment to industry standards and program outcomes.

Feedback Area	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Foundation in Basic Engineering Concepts	91.8%	8.2%	0%	0%	0%
Course Contents aligned with Program Outcomes	92.6%	7.4%	0%	0%	0%
Job-Oriented Skills	90.2%	7.8%	1%	0%	0%
Tools & Technologies analysing Case Studies	91.5%	8.5%	1%	0%	0%
Ability to compete with peers from other universities	93.9%	6.1%	1%	0%	0%
Curriculum superiority over previous curriculum	92.2%	7.8%	1%	0%	0%

Average Rating (on a scale of 5):
All questions received ratings between 4.695 to 5.0, grading as Excellent.

Suggestions: None provided.

Employer Feedback Summary

Employers provided highly positive feedback, acknowledging the curriculum's alignment with industry demands and its effectiveness in developing student competencies.

Feedback Area	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Curriculum matches Program Outcomes	88.5%	11.5%	0%	0%	0%
Scope for improving industry skills	92.5%	7.5%	0%	0%	0%
Tools & Technologies analysing Case Studies	93.5%	6.5%	0%	0%	0%
Problem-Solving & Soft Skills prepare students for placement	92.8%	7.3%	0%	0%	0%

Average Rating:
Ratings ranged between 4.875 to 5.0, all graded Excellent.

Suggestions: None provided.

Faculty Feedback Summary

Faculty feedback reflected a balanced view, appreciating curriculum structure while suggesting minor improvements.

Feedback Area	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Curriculum aligned with Program Outcomes	35%	50%	15%	0%	0%
Enhances Problem-Solving & Communication Skills	64.5%	23%	12.5%	0%	0%
Credit Allocation is Satisfactory	65.5%	25%	9.5%	0%	0%
LTP Distribution is Justifiable	50.5%	40%	9.5%	0%	0%
Curriculum supports Self-learning	77%	11.5%	11.5%	0%	0%
Course Composition (Content, Communication, Skill Development,)	80%	11.5%	8.5%	0%	0%
Laboratory sessions improve technical skills	62.5%	25%	12.5%	0%	0%
Minor Projects or Internship enhance leadership and technical competency	82.5%	15%	2.5%	0%	0%

Average Rating:
Ranged between 4.25 to 4.75, all rated Excellent.

Suggestions:

- Include internships.

Student Feedback Summary

Students expressed a generally positive but slightly more critical view, suggesting infrastructural and pedagogical enhancements.

Feedback Area	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Curriculum Content	62.2%	16.6%	11.6%	7%	4.5%
Problem Solving & Core Competencies	60.2%	9.6%	9.3%	9%	12%
Support for Advanced and Slow Learners	61.2%	17.3%	9.9%	8%	3.5%
Contact Hour Distribution	62.5%	18.6%	10.3%	5%	3.5%
Course Composition	67.1%	14%	5%	9.3%	4.5%

Laboratory Sessions	64.8%	10.6%	9.3%	8.3%	7%
Minor Projects	63.8%	18.6%	6.3%	5.3%	6%

Average Rating:
Ranged between 3.786 to 4.019, with most rated Very Good, and some Excellent.

Suggestions:

- Improve smart board and computer training facilities.
- Add practical and industry-aligned courses.
- Clearly define learning outcomes.
- Provide more lab facilities and hands-on practice.
- Focus more on professional communication and writing skills.

Annexure II

DAAC Recommendation on Formative Question Paper Standard and CO-PO Attainment Target Fixing

1. Formative Assessment Question Paper Standards

In light of the academic performance and student feedback for the above subject, the DAAC recommends the following for the design and implementation of formative assessments (e.g., class tests, quizzes, assignments, internal exams):

- **Cognitive Level Balance**:
  Adopt Bloom's Taxonomy to balance the cognitive levels of questions:
  - 30% of questions at **Remembering and Understanding** levels
  - 40% at **Applying and Analyzing** levels
  - 30% at **Evaluating and Creating** levels (depending on program level)
- **Coverage of Course Outcomes (COs)**:
  Each assessment must explicitly map questions to Course Outcomes (COs), ensuring:
  - All COs are evaluated at least once across the assessments
  - Each CO is tested through questions at appropriate cognitive levels
- **Difficulty Level Calibration**:
  Based on the recent difficulty experienced by students, the question paper should maintain:
  - 30% **Easy** questions (concept-based)
  - 50% **Moderate** questions (application based)
  - 20% **Difficult** questions (analytical, case-study, or open-ended)
- **Question Paper Review Process**:
  All formative question papers should undergo internal review to ensure:
  - Alignment with syllabus and COs
  - Reasonable difficulty and time-bound answerability
  - Clear instructions and grading rubrics

2. CO-PO Mapping and Attainment Target Fixing

Based on performance data and the difficulty level experienced by students in the current and previous cycles:

- **Attainment Level Thresholds**:
  - **Target Level 1 (Basic Attainment)**: $\geq$ 50% of students scoring above 40% marks in a CO
  - **Target Level 2 (Moderate Attainment)**: $\geq$ 60% of students scoring above 50% marks in a CO

- **Target Level 3 (High Attainment):** ≥ 70% of students scoring above 60% marks in a CO

- **Adjustment Based on Subject Difficulty:**
  - If **>50%** of students scored below 40% in a particular CO, re-evaluate the mapping of that CO to the assessments or revise the teaching-learning strategy.
  - For subjects identified as difficult based on trend analysis, a target level reduction by 1 can be considered after discussion and justification.
- **Corrective Actions:**
  - For COs not meeting the target level:
    - Conduct remedial sessions focused on weak COs
    - Include more practice in those areas
    - Reassess teaching strategies and content delivery
- **PO Mapping and Aggregation:**
  - Use weighted averages of CO attainment levels to compute PO attainment
  - Ensure clarity and consistency in the mapping logic across courses

3. Recommendations for Future Improvement

- Establish a **question bank repository** categorized by COs, Bloom's level, and difficulty
- Incorporate **student feedback mechanisms** to refine assessment strategies
- Regularly **review attainment targets** based on academic data trends

Approved by:

DAAC Chairperson and HoD

Dean SASH