

(65)

Item No. 1

**MINUTES OF THE FIFTEENTH MEETING OF THE SCHOOL BOARD OF SCHOOL OF SCIENCES HELD ON MARCH 19, 1997 AT 11.00 A.M. IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF SCHOOL OF SCIENCES, IGNOU, MAIDAN GARHI, NEW DELHI-110 058**

The following were present:

1. Prof. B.S. Saraswat Chairman
2. Prof. Shakti R. Ahmed
3. Prof. V.C. Nanda
4. Prof. V.V. Mandke
5. Prof. Devesh Kishore
6. Prof. R.K. Bose
7. Prof. S.S. Hasan
8. Dr. Vijayshri
9. Dr. Poornima Mital
10. Dr. Javed A. Farooqi
11. Dr. Amrita Nigam

Prof. A.W. Joshi, Prof. I.A. Niazi, Prof. M.M.Pant and Dr. S. Peppin could not attend the meeting.

At the outset the Chairman extended a warm welcome to all the members. The Board, then, placed on record its appreciation of the contributions made by Prof. R.K. Bose as its Chairman and Dr. Masood Parveez as its member.

**Item No.1: To confirm the minutes of the 14th meeting of the School Board.**

15.1.1 The Board was informed of the comments received from three members of the Board on the minutes of the 14th meeting. The comments of Prof. A.W. Joshi pertain to signing of minutes by the out-going Chairman whereas those of Dr. Vijayshri and Dr. Amrita Nigam pertain to recording of decision regarding Item No.9. According to them, the decision was that the procedure hitherto followed in the School would be adhered to, even for this programme.

15.1.2 Prof. Joshi's comments regarding signing of minutes were accepted and noted for future.

15.1.3 In the light of the comments of Dr. Vijayshri and Dr. Amrita Nigam, a lot of discussion took place in the meeting. One of the members wanted to know the statutory position in this matter. The Chairman clarified that as per the Statute 10 A, the School Board is required to approve the course structure of programmes of the School on the recommendation of Expert Committee constituted by it. It was finally decided that the following portion from the decision regarding item No.9 be deleted.

“The Chairman of the Board concluded that there is no necessity for constituting a separate Experts Committee for this programme and that the course teams could tackle all the issues related to programme planning, designing and launching.”

With the above amendments, the minutes were confirmed.

**Item No.2: To consider the eligibility of 10+2 vocational stream students for admission into B.Sc. Programme.**

15.2.1 The Chairman informed the members that the eligibility for admission to the B.Sc. programme is 10+2 or its equivalent with Science and/or Maths. The candidates who pass their 10+2 level examination with vocational stream are being denied admission to the B.Sc. programme in the formal institutions and also in IGNOU due to deficiency of science component in their 10+2 curriculum. The MHRD, Govt. of India has approached the University to know if these candidates can be admitted into our B.Sc. programme after doing some foundation/bridge

courses. Another candidate, who passed his +2 examination with agriculture, wants to know whether he can be granted admission into the B.Sc. programme.

15.2.2 The Board was further informed that last year one candidate who had passed 10+2 exam of CBSE in vocational stream of Medical Laboratory Technology and another candidate who had completed a post matric 2 year Diploma in Medical Laboratory Technology from Karnataka State Board of Vocational Education sought permission for admission to the B.Sc. programme. The School Council examined their cases and recommended to the Vice-Chancellor to permit them admission into the B.Sc. programme. As a special case, the Vice-Chancellor permitted them.

15.2.3 The issue was discussed in detail and the following views were expressed.

- i) Scientific knowledge is hierarchical in nature and at every stage of the curriculum certain amount of prior knowledge is always assumed. Blanket permission should not be granted. Deficiencies in the curriculum should be identified and removed.
- ii) The students of 10+2 Agriculture stream, however, study enough of Physics, Chemistry and Biosciences. Therefore, they should not be treated at par with those of vocational stream. In view of the flexibility and openness of the system, they may be allowed admission into the B.Sc. programme.
- iii) Vocational programmes are biased towards development of skills. If IGNOU could develop a B.Sc. programme catering to the needs of the vocational stream students, it will be a great service to the nation.
- iv) It was emphasised that the foundation courses developed by IGNOU are not of the kind which could take care of the deficiencies in 10+2 vocational stream curriculum.

15.2.4 In the light of the above discussions, a committee comprising the following was constituted to look into the whole issue and give its recommendations:

1. Prof. S. S. Hasan, Convenor
2. Dr. Vijayshri
3. Dr. Poornima Mital
4. Dr. Javed A. Farooqi

While making recommendations, the committee may look up at other options available such as courses developed by the National Open School.

**Item No.3 :** To consider the implementation of the Research Degree Ordinance.

15.3.1 The Chairman apprised the members of the proposals of the School to operationalise the Research Degree Programmes in the discipline based areas with regards to procedures for registration and supervision, programme/course design, and evaluation and award of degrees.

15.3.2 The members welcomed the proposals and suggested that the proposals should be designed in such a way that these could serve as a model for other institutions also. One of the members observed that other Universities are winding up their M.Phil. programmes, as M.Phil is not a requirement for admission to any programme or employment. The following suggestions were made:

- i) The period for completing the programmes may be curtailed or extended preferably with the approval of the Research Council and not the Vice-Chancellor.
- ii) There is no need to specify the word limit for reports on dissertation by examiners.
- iii) After award of degree, copies of reports of examiners may be given to the candidates.

15.3.3 With the above suggestions, the proposals were approved by the Board.

**Item No.4: To approve the syllabus of the Physics Elective courses PHE-10 and PHE-11.**

15.4.1 Members were informed that PHE-10 and PHE-11 courses are third level B.Sc. elective courses. The course PHE-11 has been edited by the content editor. One block has been printed, another is in the press and the remaining two are under composing stage and will be printed soon. The course PHE-10 is still with the editor.

15.4.2 The Board perused the syllabus of PHE-11 course and gave its approval of the same. For PHE-10, it was decided that the syllabus be brought before the Board once again after clearance from the editor.

**Item No.5: To recommend the names of the Course Writers for the LSE-14(L) Part-B and an additional name for the LSE-09 course to the Vice-Chancellor.**

15.5.1 The names of Course Writers for the LSE-14(L) Part-B and an additional name for the LSE-09 course were approved as proposed.

15.5.2 While approving the names, a point was made that all the Course Writers are from Delhi only. The Board advised that as far as possible the national character of the University should be reflected in the composition of the course teams also.

**Item No.6: To report on the development of Aquaculture Courses.**

15.6.1 On being requested by Chairman, Prof. S.S. Hasan informed the members that the Life Sciences discipline has decided to develop application oriented courses in the area of aquaculture, which may provide an opportunity of self-employment to the learners. The Board was informed that an Expert Committee was constituted to design the curriculum for the courses. The Committee met on February 4 and 5, 1997 and recommended that three courses of eight credits each be developed, which can be offered on a modular basis. The courses are Basics of Aquaculture, Freshwater Aquaculture and Coastal Aquaculture. The Committee also recommended that the course entitled Basics of Aquaculture may be offered as an AOC to the BDP students. A choice can be made available between Freshwater Aquaculture and Coastal Aquaculture so that either of these in combination with the AOC, could lead to a Certificate in either Freshwater Aquaculture or Coastal Aquaculture. The Committee also suggested the names of Course Writers to write these courses.

15.6.2 While taking note of the above, the Board suggested that the learners should be made aware of the adverse effects which the Aquaculture activities can have on the environment of the country. The learners should be sensitised to take adequate measures so that the Aquaculture activities do not damage environment.

15.6.3 It was observed that the list of suggested Course Writers for these courses consists of persons associated with only three institutions. It was felt that it would have been better to associate people from more institutions such as the Agricultural Universities and State Fisheries Departments.

15.6.4 The Board further advised that action should be initiated well in advance to identify work centres for imparting practical training to the learners.

**Item No.7: To report on the feedback survey of the PMT-1 course.**

15.7.1 On request from the Chairman, Prof. R.K. Bose apprised the Board of the action initiated by the Mathematics discipline for revising this course. He informed the Board that the discipline is undertaking a feed back survey of the course material by sending questionnaires to the

62

students and counsellors of this course. The Board perused the questionnaires and made the following observations:

- i) Pre-testing of the instruments of survey, i.e., the questionnaires should have been done on a controlled and representative sample at Delhi and nearby Study Centres before embarking upon the survey in a big way.
- ii) Methodology of handling and evaluating the instruments should have been decided before hand. For guidance in the matter, the relevant NIEPA publication may be consulted.

**Item No.8:** To recommend the names of additional Course Writers for the Environmental Chemistry Course AEC-1 to the Vice-Chancellor.

15.8.1 The Board was informed that some of the Course Writers have not written units assigned to them. The Board was therefore, requested to recommend names as additional Course Writers. The Board recommended the names of additional Course Writers as proposed by the faculty.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

*BS*  
17/4/97

(B.S. Saraswat)  
Chairman