

REPORT ON
CHOICE BASED CREDIT AND
SEMESTER SYSTEM - 2012

THE KERALA STATE HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

Recommendations of the Executive Council on
Prof.Hridayakumari Committee Report on CBCSS

The Executive Council which met on July 19, 2012 accepted the report in principle, noting that it is comprehensive, reasonable and practical. The recommendation is that the CBCSS System should continue, but with some significant changes.

I. The Executive Council decided to make the following recommendations to the Government.

1. Mark system should be introduced instead of grading, for each question. However notional grading on the basis of marks will be indicated for each semester. Overall gradation should be on a 7 point scale and will be awarded only at the end of the programme.
2. For internal assessment, of all courses at the end of each semester, 10 marks will be awarded for test paper, 5 marks for seminar or assignment, 5 for attendance, with a total of 20 marks.
3. For external assessment, Universities will conduct examinations for core subjects and compulsory language papers to be centrally evaluated at the end of 2nd, 4th and 6th semesters. All practical examinations should also be conducted at the end of 2nd, 4th & 6th semesters.
4. The examinations for the complementary subjects, electives, open courses and additional languages, will be conducted at the end of all semesters. All question papers will be set by the Universities. Odd semester examination answer sheets will be evaluated by home evaluation and even semester examination sheets will be evaluated by centralised evaluation.
5. In addition to semester breaks for students(maximum 10 days), there will be two months summer vacation.
6. A maximum of four credits may be awarded per semester to those who are actively engaged in co curricular, extra curricular activities, such as NCC, NSS, sports and arts.
7. Universities should make provisions for transfer of credits for those who transfer inter university or Intra University, provided the student has a minimum of 20 credits in the credit bank.

8. No moderation should be awarded in any examination under CBCSS.
9. For Informatics courses, qualified teachers and appropriate laboratories may be provided.
10. Methodology course may be shifted from UG to PG.
11. The Boards of studies should rationalize and restructure the number of courses, syllabi and prescription of text books in order to make the semester system effective.

Boards of Studies should make the changes in the syllabi and text books in consultation with the teachers. At least two meetings of teachers may be held in every department in every college, one in midyear and one towards the year end. The recommendations of these meetings should be considered by the Boards of Studies.

The Boards of Studies should make sure that there is no political bias in text books, particularly mere propagandist literature.

As the language of higher education, English should receive extra attention. Graduates should be proficient in written and spoken English. Necessary changes may be made in the curriculum by the Board of Studies.

Boards of Studies have to be constantly in touch with renowned Indian Universities, and at least a few foreign universities. Subject experts have to be identified in all major fields of study and endeavour, and consulted frequently. A format for the working of Boards of Studies could be devised so that structured work is possible.

Report submitted to the Vice Chairman, Kerala State Higher Education Council by the Committee appointed by the HEC to study issues concerning the working of the Choice Based Credit and Semester System in the colleges affiliated to Universities in Kerala, and recommend improvements

- Part I Introduction and Background
- Part II Main Recommendations
- Part III Problems and Solutions
- Part IV Additional Suggestions

I Introduction and Background

- i. Mandate from HEC, including names of committee members.
- ii. Details of Procedure adopted
- iii. Information about the CBCSS in foreign universities and some Higher Education Institutions in India.
- iv. Indications of public response to CBCSS in Kerala.

II The committee's main recommendations

III Problems and solutions

- a. Number of students
- b. Available Time
- c. Language skills
- d. Nature of courses and syllabi
- e. Internal evaluation
- f. Semester exams
- g. Grading

IV. Other observations and suggestions

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

i. Mandate

The committee of experts constituted by the Kerala State Higher Education Council came into being on 21st February, 2012. The mandate from the HEC was that the committee should study the various issues that have come up in the working of the Choice Based Credit and Semester System in colleges affiliated to the Universities in the State, and make recommendations for the improvement of the system. The Vice-Chairman also specified five points (D.O. Letter No. 101/KSHEC/VC/2011-12 dtd.9/2/12 to Prof. B.Hrdayakumari) for the committee to consider. They are a common name for the new system, unification syllabi in all the universities following the system, a common

pattern of question papers and grading system, uniformity in the examination pattern and award of grades for semesters, and uniform distribution of marks to Internal and External semester examinations.

The list of committee members is given below

Chairperson

Prof.B.Hridayakumari, Educationalist and Retired Principal, Government College for Women, Thiruvananthapuram,.

Convenor

Prof. Lopus Mathew, HOD, Department of Physics, St.George's College, Aruvithura, EC member, KSHEC and Member, Syndicate, CUSAT

Members

Dr.Veeramanikandan, Govt.Women's College, Thiruvananthapuram, EC member, KSHEC, and Member, Syndicate, Kannur University

Dr.M.C.Dileepkumar, Cochin College, Kochi, and Member, Syndicate, MG University

Prof.John Joseph, Nirmalagiri college, Nirmalagiri, Koothuparamba, Kannur, and Member, Syndicate, Kannur University.

Dr.C.K.James, St.Thomas college, Palai

Dr.Zainul Abid Kotta, Govt.College, Perinthalmanna and Member, Syndicate, Calicut University.

ii. Procedure adopted

The committee collected views and suggestions from a large number of teachers, students, experts in education including Vice-Chancellors, and Pro-Vice Chancellors, Officials, Political activists, intellectuals, and various other members of the public. Representations from teachers and teacher organizations form the greater chunk of the documents received. In addition to the formal meetings of the committee, there were informal meetings of the committee members with the chairperson. Many teachers also took the trouble to meet the chairperson, sometimes to present their problems, and sometimes to clarify some details of how the system worked. Studying the papers received and holding discussions with the stakeholders were a learning experience, rich

beyond the expectations of the committee. The committee expresses its gratitude to every person who communicated with it, specially Sri. R.V.G.Menon, Sri.,G.Vijayaraghavan, Member of the Planning Board, Vice Chancellors, Pro-Vice Chancellors and Controllers of Examinations, and also social and political activists.

FUNCTIONING OF THE COMMITTEE

The first meeting of the committee to review the CBCSS decided to hold sittings in various regional centres of the state to collect feed back from the stake holders. On the basis of this, four open sittings were conducted at Thiruvananthapuram, Kottayam, Kozhikkode and Kannur. Prof.Hridayakumari, Chairperson of the committee led the team in the Thiruvananthapuram sitting held on 6th March 2012 whereas Prof.Lopus Mathew chaired the sittings at Kottayam and Kozhikkode which were on 18th April and 18th May respectively. Dr. Veeramanikandan was in the chair during the sitting at Kannur on 25th May, 2012.

In all the sittings the participation of various stakeholders was remarkable. Representatives of various teachers' organizations, non-teaching staff from the universities and affiliated colleges, students, parallel college associations, parents and public, experts of print and visual media and other individuals attended the sittings and submitted and shared their responses, apprehensions, suggestions and complaints. Apart from this, a large number of representations and memorandums were received by the committee by post, e-mail and in person. Different agencies and organizations submitted detailed reports about the working of the system on the basis of surveys and interviews conducted among the student and teaching community and with other stake holders. The chairperson of the committee received feed backs, proposals and suggestions from the academia of the State ranging over former and current Vice Chancellors and Pro Vicechancellors, Controllers of Examinations, members of Boards of Studies, retired teachers, intellectuals, social and political activists, student and youth leaders, bureaucrats etc. through her personal interaction with them.

iii. Some relevant details about how CBCSS works in a few foreign universities, and some institutions in India.

Sources - Websites, paper cuttings received from teachers and conversations direct or over the phone.

- a. The CBCSS is prevalent in many if not most universities in the U.S. But classes there are small, a main class 15 to 20 in strength, and the students well-qualified and most of them seriously interested in the subjects of their choice. The system has the kind of freedom and flexibility far beyond the scope of our more or less rigid system. Tutorials form the core of the system both in the U.S and the U.K.
- ✚ In U.K Cambridge University still preserves intact its 'Tripos' may be with timely changes from tradition, but the main features of the Three Year Degree course unchanged for about six centuries. It is reported that all the Cambridge colleges together have 200 students doing English Main, whereas in Kerala any college has not less than 150.
- b. Many colleges in U. K have abandoned the Credit and Semester System in the last ten to fifteen years mainly for two reasons – one, the slicing of each subject, and the prevalence of modular text books which stand in the way of in-depth knowledge, and two, over-examination which is inherent to the semester system.
- c. In India many prestigious institutes like the IITs close a semester only when the stipulated number of working days is completed. More over institutions like IITs cannot be compared with Arts and Science Colleges, for many reasons.
- d. Adopting a foreign system to the conditions of Kerala Colleges has come to mean the system's adaptation to frustrating conditions.

iv. General response in Kerala to the CBCSS

Judging from the representations the committee has received, and from articles appearing in newspapers and magazines the majority of the general public as well as of stakeholders do not favour the new system, and many frankly disapprove of it. Even those who welcome it point out that it has major faults to be corrected.

II. After reviewing the entire scenario this committee recommends to the Higher Education Council that CBCSS be maintained with some basic reforms. Reasons for favouring the continuance of this system are the two given below -

- a. The UGC, the National Accreditation Council and certain other National bodies are strongly in favour of the new system. Any deviation from a national policy or trend may create serious problems for the universities and the State Government, unless they are willing to take a pitched stand for the autonomy of universities.
- b. The old system was lacking in innovativeness and in the capacity to come to grips with fast changing global conditions. It seemed as though the old system lost somewhere on its way the potential it may have had for self-criticism and self renewal. It is in this context that this Committee opts for the CBCSS, hoping that the problems pointed out, and the solutions suggested would be given serious consideration.

III. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

A. Numbers – The teacher- student ratio the UGC has recommended is 1:30. This is available only in a few PG classes. In UG classes student number is as follows-

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| i. English Language Classes compulsory to all Departments of study (Old Part I) | – | 80 to 120 |
| ii. Additional language (Old II Language) | – | 70 to 80 or more for Malayalam and Hindi |
| iii. Core or main subject in Sciences | – | 45 to 50 (Thanks to available lab facilities) |
| iv. Core or Main Subject in Social Sciences and Humanities including Languages | – | 50 to 70 or more |
| v. Commerce | – | 50 - 70 |
| vi. Complementaries or subsidiaries approximate their core subjects in number of students | - | 60 - 80 |

The marginal increase of seats granted to each department of study goes on every year as in the days of the annual system.

These large numbers affect the Semester System in many ways. One is that the only teaching method practicable is the old explication – lecture – notes - method which

inspite of the ample use it makes of the teacher's skills, reduces the student to the role of a receptacle. The Semester system requires tutorials in which the teacher's lecture would be followed or at times even preceded by thorough discussion of a topic, ensuring participation by students and teacher. The intellectual liveliness of such a process remains an unapproachable ideal in an over crowded class, with a crowded syllabus, and limited time. Yet another disadvantage is that the teacher cannot attempt correcting the assignments and giving suggestions for improvement, because of the large number of papers. If Internal Evaluation is merely a matter of giving marks or grades it does not serve its purpose of being a learning experience. As Internal Evaluation is a major concern it is only mentioned here in the context of numbers. It will be dealt with in some detail later.

SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM OF NUMBERS

1. There is no solution except the teacher – student ratio of 1:30 suggested by the UGC.
2. Every University can identify two or three colleges as Centres of Excellence, reduce the number of students there, maintain the number of teachers as required by the Semester System, give these colleges autonomy and see how the system works. Other colleges can go back to the old system but with a wider choice of courses approximating what is offered by the Credit and Semester System.

THE PROBLEM OF TIME

1. The division of the year into two 90 day semesters is realistic, and should give some wing-space to teacher and student alike. But the stipulated ninety days are available only on paper, the number of actual working days being shockingly low. The number of days lost owing to a variety of reasons varies from region to region, and college to college. A Quilon college has reported that last year one of its semester had 25 days only. Taking Kerala as a whole the average number of working days available to a college per semester is 45-55, luckier colleges getting around 60. Saturday special classes once so common, are no more in favour with teacher or student. After 3.30

campuses are practically empty except for a few sports teams. There is no means of making good the time lost.

2. As university exams are compulsory after each semester and results have to be published in time - though they seldom are – the teacher has no option but to hurry through the syllabus or even omit portions of it. Leaving parts of the syllabus to the student to study on his or her own, with the help of reference books and other study aids is not yet part of our college culture, with the poor language skills and study habits of the student majority. The only study-aids used by the average student are low quality market – notes now available in plenty. In this context, specially in terms of the semester system the loss of academic time is a serious threat to the quality of education.

SOLUTIONS

No solution can be envisaged in the present social and political environment. But a few changes in the course and examination pattern may improve the situation to some extent. These changes are included in the later sections of this report.

THE PROBLEM OF LANGUAGE

1. English is the language of Higher Education even after six decades of Independence. It cannot but be so because it is our channel to the global and national job markets, and also to modern knowledge in all its depth and variety. It is surprising that even after learning English for 12 years, most students from state-run or state –aided schools are not at home in it, whereas in the CBSE stream students handle the language with ease by the time they reach std IV or V. Though no scientifically collected data is available, it can be said that in the colleges affiliated to universities in Kerala only a small minority has the English Language skills necessary for Higher Education. In many classes lectures are now given in a mixture of English and Malayalam, and it is permitted to write university exams in Malayalam.

The problem of English is mentioned here for two reasons specially pertinent to the new system. They are: (a). the endless assignments and test papers for Internal Evaluation are written in bad English or a mixture of bad English and poor Malayalam.

Evaluation does not and cannot include correction at all. Bad language becomes accepted, a taken –for –granted reality, and (b). the impressive array of text books and reference books proudly displayed in every syllabus remains foreign to the students' learning experience. Malayalam and other Indian languages perhaps fare better.

It may also be pointed out here that a publishing industry providing low quality market notes is flourishing in the state.

SOLUTIONS

We have no solution to offer to a problem that has to be solved at school level. We merely stress the fact that the quality of language a student uses is an indispensable indicator of his or her educational level.

THE PROBLEMS OF SYLLABI AND TEXT BOOKS

Before going into the problems relating to syllabi and text-books, this committee desires to express its appreciation of the extensive and detailed work done by Boards of Studies.

PROBLEMS

- i. Regarding syllabi and text books, teachers of science and commerce have expressed no complaints. But some of the science teachers have suggested that more portions be included from advanced areas of contemporary science.
- ii. About Social Sciences and Humanities there are many complaints that some subjects have very heavy syllabi and some too light. This complaint extends to particular papers too. The syllabi for English (Core) and Malayalam (Core) are too extensive and heavy even for ideal students and teachers in ideal circumstances. Why dream such impossible dreams?
- iii. English teachers have complained that Kerala University's text book for English grammar for the compulsory language course (Old Part I) is too difficult to teach. It is 'Oxford Practice Grammar' (George Yule, OUP). Why go in for such advanced foreign books when excellent books suitable to Indian conditions are available?

- iv. Complaints have come, specially from Kannur University that some text books have a clear political bias. There is no harm in having a text book with a political bias because a text book in Humanities or Social Sciences is to be discussed and examined in class, not just 'taught'. It is left to the Boards of Studies to weed out merely propagandist books if there are any.
- v. We fail to understand why British History has been omitted from the Complementaries offered to English (Core). When a major programme is done on a people's literature it has to include the history of that people. We suggest that English (Core) students do a Complementary course (paper) in the social and cultural history of the British people. We draw the attention of the Board of Studies in English to the importance given to Kerala History and culture in the syllabus for Malayalam (Core).
- vi. It is surprising that a syllabus in Economics has titles like Basic Reading, Suggested Readings, Further Readings, Essential Reading, Additional References, Reading List, Additional Reading, Core Reading etc. All this could perhaps be brought under two or three heads.

SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS REGARDING SYLLABI

It is necessary to vitalize the Boards of studies. It is also necessary that teachers take a more active interest in all details of academic programmes. With these aims the following suggestions are made

- a). More frequent and formalized communication between teachers and Boards of Studies. At least two meetings of teachers be held in every department, in every college once in mid-year; once towards year-end, to discuss matters concerning syllabi, text books etc. The recommendations of these meetings should be formally communicated to the Boards by the HOD.
- b) Students have to be consulted; Board members visiting colleges at least once a year and meeting UG and PG students, not their representatives only.
- c). Boards of Studies have to be constantly in touch with renowned Indian Universities, and at least a few foreign universities. Subject experts have to be identified in all

major fields of study and endeavour, and consulted frequently. A format for the working of Boards of Studies could be devised so that structured work is possible.

PROBLEMS REGARDING COURSES (PAPERS)

1. The meritorious distinction of the new system is the variety of courses it offers. A main problem of the system is also the same – variety becomes a distraction. The old system had 13 courses, 6 being for the main or core subject. The semester system has more than 30 courses, 12 to 14 of them for the core subject. Science departments are generally satisfied with their 12 core courses and 12 practicals. Humanities and Social Sciences feel they could do with fewer papers and less of course content. The Committee favours fewer but substantial courses.
2. The rationale of some of the complementaries and open courses is not quite clear.
3. The methodology course prescribed for the first semester has come in for scathing criticism.
4. The expected wider choice in subjects whether interdisciplinary or independent is not available because of the exigencies of the time table and work load pattern of the teachers.
5. Informatics though a very useful course has certain in – built problems (a) very few computers and no repairs as and when required, (b) many students have much more practical knowledge of computers than many of the teachers, (c) there are heavy theoretical modules which most teachers are not competent to teach. Whether students are competent to learn it can be discovered when teachers come to grips with the subject.

SOLUTIONS

1. The number of papers may be reduced in consultation with teachers. This committee suggests a uniform pattern for Sciences and other subjects. Core papers can be of the same number for all departments of study, preferably 12, their content increased, if necessary, according to the requirements of the subjects. A wider choice may be made available in complementaries, open courses etc, and even in core courses but

no increase in the number of courses is suggested. As issues like the work load of the teachers are involved, we do not suggest the number of courses to be exactly so many, but certainly less than the present 30+. The variety of choices offered has to have a logical relation to academic and social realities, and may be decided after more discussion.

2. Informatics has to be a separate department with the required number of qualified teachers and IT labs. Till then it can be a compulsory course for Sciences, an elective for the others, its syllabus improved in consultation with teachers.
3. Methodology course in all subjects may be dropped unceremoniously. The UG student does not have the knowledge or maturity to study this heavy paper dealing in abstract theory. It can be included in the PG programme.

EXAMINATIONS AND THEIR PROBLEMS

Examinations, Internal and External together form the Continuous Assessment which is the hall-mark of the Credit and Semester System. Ideally Continuous Assessment keeps teacher and student involved like a twin mind in the process of study and assessment. But in practice this system is infested with problems. The more important of them are given below.

1. There are 2 assignments, 1 seminar, and 2 test papers prescribed per course per semester. Each semester has six courses. The student has to do 30 assignments in a semester of 90 days, (giving the name assignment to all the exercises), that is one assignment every three days! As 90 days are seldom available the pressure on student and teacher mounts. This is what is called over – examination, a sure method for increasing stress, and related problems.
2. The most widely prevalent problem is malpractice. The variety in malpractice is astonishing. We don't go into details of the students' innovativeness but point to something entirely different. Teachers have asked this question, " if the college next door gives high marks to its students why should I penalize my students through strict assessment? ". 25% grade points is the maximum for internal assessment and it is not easy now for a student to fall below 20%.

3. Even if a teacher wants to do strict assessment it is not possible because of pressure of work.
4. Internal Evaluation is not a learning experience to the student because the teacher has no time to correct mistakes and suggest improvements. The numbers are too many. It is painful to think of the time, effort, and paper wasted in a process which would have been useful if the teacher could have worked with a group of 15 or 20.
5. The multiple – choice questions in Internal Evaluation are most of them memory tests suited to school level exams. They can be dropped, for short answer questions. More over they give room for easy plagiarism.

SOLUTIONS

1. The Vice- Chancellor of the University of Kerala has suggested just one test paper per semester for each paper. The maximum points should be only 10. This would keep testing alive, and reduce the scope of malpractice.
2. Members of the Committee suggested one assignment, one seminar, and one test paper for each semester for each paper. Maximum points should be 20, including five being given to attendance.
3. Put internal Evaluation in cold storage till a reasonable teacher-student ratio comes into existence. (This is the chairperson's view)

We place all the three suggestions before the decision – makers

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

External or university evaluation takes place at the end of each semester. The frequency of university exams creates the following problems –

1. Considerable teaching time is lost particularly for the mid – year semesters.
2. Too much of work for the examination wing of the university causes delay in the publication of results.

3. Such is the organization of courses and exams that with every university exam five courses are done with and put by. This is perhaps the most serious limitation of the system, an exam being the statement of this limitation, though not its causative factor. The principle of Higher Education is or should be that it helps a young mind grow into a subject. Time and intellectual space are synonymous in this process. Though no perfection can be aimed at, a system has to provide comfortable time for experiencing the subjects studied, the time being adjusted to the expected level of proficiency. A degree programme makes a clear distinction between the core subject chosen, and its complementaries, whatever be the name given to them. If the core subject is more important, each core course should be given a sufficient length of time. This Committee feels that slicing a paper into modules, finishing it in 90 days – in reality this 90 is hardly 60 - does scant justice to the subject. The exam is over, the student hurries into the next semester, the previous semester's lessons easily fading away.

SOLUTION

It is in response to the situation detailed above that we suggest that 180 days or two semesters together be made a study cum examining unit for core, and compulsory language papers, and the semester pattern retained for other papers. As complementaries, electives and additional languages are core subjects on their own no subject is downgraded. This adjustment would help to strengthen core learning and English and effect some reduction in the number of examinations. Semester exams for complementaries and additional languages could be conducted as at present, with the committee's suggestions considered.

GRADING

Problems

When the CBCSS was introduced in the UG level it was envisaged in practice as direct and 5 point scale grading. The system is not advisable because of the wide range on which the evaluation was made (for eg. 62.5 – 87.5 = B Grade). It helps the teachers in no way to give just and impartial evaluation. Moreover the system is not transparent and

is complicated. Therefore the Committee recommends the adaptation of a more dynamic, transparent and universally accepted indirect grading system with a 7 point range.

Performance Grading

The Performance Grading of the learner shall be on the Seven Point Ranking System. The absolute grading system of 07 points is the most popular grading system and has been accepted by the UNESCO, This Committee suggests that the over all structure of the 07 point grading system may be considered by all affiliating universities of the state.

Suggestions

- i. It should be a simple and clear method easy for the teacher to operate and the student to understand.
- ii. There should be a clear distinction between letter grades so that the assessment is as precise as possible and just to the student.
- iii. If necessary for the final grading at the end of the programme proper software could be devised to ensure exactitude as well as speed of evaluation.
- iv. Teachers should use the marking system for each question for each course. Cumulative Grading will be done during the preparation of the final mark list of the programme.

It is not claimed that the Seven Point Range Indirect Grading is the last word in grading, but it is a well thought out pattern for all the affiliating universities to consider, within the limits of the present system.

CRITERIA FOR GRADING

Mark	Grade
90 and above	A+ Outstanding
80 to 89	A Excellent
70 to 79	B Very Good
60 to 69	C Good
50 to 59	D Satisfactory
40 to 49	E Adequate
Below 40	F Failure

Separate grading will be awarded to

1. Core and complementary courses
2. Common Course (English)
3. Other than English Languages
4. Open Courses/ Electives

Internal and External marks for all theory papers with out practicals for each semester

Internal	External
20	80

Distribution for internal

Attendance	:	5 marks
Assignment/Seminar/Viva	:	5
Test papers	:	10

Internal and External marks for theory papers with practicals

Internal	External
10	60

Distribution of Internal marks for Theory papers with practicals

Attendance	:	2 marks
Assignment/Seminar/Viva	:	3
Test papers	:	5

Distribution of marks for Project

Internal	-	20
Viva-voce	-	20
Dissertation	-	60

Internal and External marks for practical papers (annual Exam)

Internal	External
20	40

Distribution for Internal for practical papers

Attendance	:	5 marks
Record	:	10
Lab involvement	:	5

Attendance will be evaluated as below

Above 90%	:	5 marks
85 to 89%	:	4 marks

80 to 84%	:	3 marks
76 to 79%	:	2 marks
75%	:	1 mark

Pattern of questions for External Examination for each semester (theory paper only)

	Total number of questions	Number of questions to be answered	Marks for each question	Total marks
	10	10	1	10
	12	8	2	16
	9	6	4	24
	4	2	15	30
Total	35	26		80

Pattern of questions for External Examination (theory papers with practical)

	Total number of questions	Number of questions to be answered	Marks for each questions	Total marks
	8	8	1	8
	10	6	2	12
	6	4	4	16
	4	2	12	24
Total	28	20		60

CREDIT BANK AND CREDIT TRANSFER

At the time of enrolment, a credit bank will be opened for each student and his/her credit will be recorded at the end of each semester. There will be provision for Intra University and inter university credit transfer. To transfer the credit obtained from a particular course, there must be a minimum of 20 credits in the credit bank.

CREDIT FOR PROGRAMMES WITHOUT PRACTICALS

Semester	Course	Instructional hrs per week	Credit	Total
I	Common English Paper I	5	4	20
	Common English Paper II	4	3	
	Additional Language PI	4	4	
	Core-I	4	3	
	Complementary I	4	3	
	Complementary II	4	3	

II	Common English Paper III Common English Paper IV Additional Language PII Core-II Complementary III Complementary IV	5 4 4 4 4 4	4 3 4 3 3 3	20
III	Common English Paper V Additional Language PIII Core-III Complementary V Complementary VI	5 5 5 5 5	4 4 4 4 4	20
IV	Common English Paper VI Additional Language PIV Core-IV Complementary VII Complementary VII	5 5 5 5 5	4 4 4 4 4	20
V	Core V Core VI Core VII Core VIII Open Course Project	5 5 5 5 4 1	4 4 4 4 3 1	20
VI	Core IX Core X Core XI Core XII Choice Based Course	5 5 5 5 5	4 4 4 4 4	20
			120	

CREDIT FOR PROGRAMME WITH PRACTICALS

Semester	Course	Instructional hrs per week	Credit	Total credit
I	Common English Paper I Common English Paper II Additional Language P I Core – I Theory Practical Complementary I Theory Practical	5 4 4 2 2 2 2	4 3 4 2 1 2 1	20

	Complementary II Theory Practical	2 2	2 1	
II	Common English Paper III Common English Paper IV Additional Language P II Core – II Theory Practical Complementary III theory Practical Complementary IV Theory Practical	5 4 4 2 2 2 2 2 2	4 3 4 2 1 2 1 2 1	20
III	Common English Paper V Additional Language P III Core – III Theory Practical Complementary V Theory Practical Complementary VI Theory Practical	5 5 3 2 3 2 3 2	4 4 3 1 3 1 3 1	20
IV	Common English Paper VI Additional Language P IV Core – IV Theory Practical Complementary VII Theory Practical Complementary VIII Theory Practical	5 5 3 2 3 2 3 2	4 4 3 1 3 1 3 1	20
V	Core V Practical Core VI Practical Core VII Practical Core VIII Practical Open Course Project	3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 4 1	3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1	20
VI	Core IX Practical Core X Practical Core XI Practical	3 2 3 2 3 2	3 1 3 1 3 1	20

Core XII	3	3	
Practical	2	1	
Choice Based Course	5	4	

MINIMUM CREDIT REQUIREMENT

Programme Duration	6 Semesters
Minimum credits required for successful completion of the programme	120
1. Minimum credits required for common (English) courses	22
2. Minimum credits required for common languages other than English	16
3. Minimum credits required for Core + Complementary courses including project	78
4. Open course - minimum credit required	4
5. Minimum attendance required	75%

Awarding of Moderation

In the context of the detailed assessment in CBCSS no moderation is to be awarded.

Part IV

OTHER OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

1. With their compulsory language and foundation courses, 5 in number, for classes 80 to 120 in strength, Internal Evaluation is too heavy for the departments of English. They have in addition to their 14 core papers and 4 common papers together, PG work also in many colleges. It is suggested that internal evaluation be dropped or minimized to just one test paper for each semester for the English courses common to all departments.
2. Exams 1,3 and 5 may be conducted by the colleges, but with university question papers. Papers should be sent to a regional centre, given false numbers and distributed to examiners. It may be made compulsory for teachers with more than three years teaching experiences to evaluate these papers, so that more teachers participate and valuation is over speedily. Home valuation has to be permitted. Exams 2, 4 and 6 are to continue centralized valuation, and all practical exams conducted along with 2, 4 and 6 exams.
3. There have been two different suggestions about vacations – one month in mid year and one month in summer, or the old pattern of two months in summer. The Committee strongly suggest two months summer vacation which would give teachers at least one month free of examination work. Summer vacation common to schools

and colleges has various advantages. The old system of two months vacation emerged out of geographical and climatic condition of Kerala.

4. Concerning the five points raised in the communication from the HEC we make the following observations. –
 - a. We suggest that the name CBCSS would do for the new system.
 - b. We would rather not aim at unification of syllabi, exam pattern in all the affiliating Universities in Kerala.
 - c. A common grading pattern is suggested to make inter university student transfers or rather PG admissions easier.
5. The staff-strength in college offices may be increased so that the burden of clerical work is reduced for teachers.
6. Academic Staff colleges may be set up in every university. In addition to arranging advanced lectures for teachers, the following courses may be made available, even compulsory.
 - a. Methods of teaching
 - b. Methods of setting question papers, and evaluation
 - c. English language skills
7. A well planned Open University has become absolutely necessary in view of the large numbers seeking higher education.
8. We don't understand why the semester system was introduced in PG programmes before trying it out at the UG level. How the system fares in PG classes has not yet been formally investigated. Any further change has to be kept in abeyance till after wide discussions. Educational experiments need a more democratic procedure and broad based discussions before they are introduced.
9. We are apprehensive about the shrinking boundaries of academic freedom. It is the sacred duty of universities to guard and augment their freedom, whatever be the intrusive forces that try to constrain them.
10. We do not consider CBCSS as a threat to freedom. In fact it aims at more freedom. But it is only an experiment in the self renewing process of education. It has flaws inherent to it and characteristics that took root and grew in other environments. In our social and educational environment it has serious limitations. We thank the Higher

Education Council for giving us a chance to study it and suggest a few improvements, and we hope our suggestions would help.

11. A maximum of 4 credits can be awarded per semester to students who are actively engaged in extra/co-curricular activities (NCC/NSS/Sports/Arts).

Signed by

1. B.Hridayakumari

2. Lopus Mathew

3. Veeramanikandan

4. M.C.Dileepkumar

5. John Joseph

6. C.K.James

7. Zainul Abid Kotta

Thiruvananthapuram
10-07-2012