

DEPARTEMENT OF PHYSICS

Response to ARC (UG) Proposals

The Department discussed the ARC recommendations (UG part) in a special faculty meeting on Saturday. During the discussion faculty views were sought in form listing their agreement/disagreement or suggestions to various features being suggested by the report. The statistical summary is also being enclosed.

1. BS (Hons/Pass) : NO to Hons/Pass Option

The Department unanimously and strongly rejected the suggestion that the Four Year BS degree should have attachments such as Honours or Pass.

The transcript has all the performance recorded and it needs no other decorations.

In case of sciences, these terms evoke varied meaning and strong connotations elsewhere. It will be impossible to shake off those implications in usage outside.

The Department considers it wholly unnecessary and undesirable. The conversion to Four Year itself is providing for adequate exit option for uninterested students. The performance for passing should not be diluted further.

2. M.Sc Option to be Highlighted at the entry Level:

It should be highlighted at the entry level that the traditional M.Sc. or M.S. degree continues to be there as a part of the option in by third/fourth semester. Firm criteria should be approved and advertised.

3. Problems with Basic Template for FOUR YEAR PROGRAMME

a) The Department strongly believes that the first year physics be offered in the first two semesters only.

These two are basic courses and the contents are tuned in terms of level of maturity and needs to be in the first year preparing them for other courses at different levels.

b) There must be a MASTER template from which one can derive instances. Instead what is offered is an example TEMPLATE.

c) The mention TA101+LIF101 in the template is not appropriate
There was a view that LIF 101 as a half course does not appear to be rigorous enough with one lecture each on a different chapter.

d) Science Option does not make sense in a BS template.

- e) The earlier nomenclature of Science Elective and offer of special courses tailored for that need was better. This feature should be retained.
- f) **The dismemberment of Maths Core courses** was considered a loss. The idea of Theorems without Proof would rob these core courses of rigour and tend to make them service courses.
- g) First Year Core Courses (Large Classes) should retain the present DIPA and IPSA Model of tutorials.

4. **Double Major:**

The present proposals lack details such as a) Where would seats for this come from? B) Who would be eligible? C) Who would decide and how?

The provision of seats and rules should be such that all those who want to take advantage of this facility should be able to do so unlike the present branch change rules. For a student, it should be easy to figure out the probability of being able to take advantage of this feature. Detailed rules must be framed by EPC and approved by the Senate.

5. **Dual Degree :**

The detailed rules regarding eligibility, availability of seats and procedure for opting must be laid out and approved. The rules for M.Tech in IDPs also must be explicitly laid out and approved.

6. **Modular Courses:**

The Department unanimously recommends that modular courses be operated for electives, and levels beyond second year.

7. **Flexibilities, Time Table and Templates:**

It was noted that if all the flexibilities are operated, it would be well nigh impossible to set Time Tables at the Department level even with the proposed provision of slots for different types of courses.

The flexibilities would generate as many templates as students. In effect, this can jeopardize the operation of any of the flexibilities envisaged.

A Table of statistics of responses from faculty members to various proposed features is attached.