KSHEC

The Kerala State Higher Education Council

REVIEW AND REFORM OF THE FOUR-YEAR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMME (FYUGP) IN KERALAM

A State-Level Evaluation, Stakeholder Consultation and Roadmap for Reform



Submitted to

Kerala State Higher Education Council (KSHEC)
Government of Keralam

Submitted by

Committee to Evaluate the Implementation of FYUGP across Universities and Colleges in Keralam

Reporting period: 1 July 2026 – 31 October 2026

Draft Report

REVIEW AND REFORM OF THE FOUR-YEAR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMME (FYUGP) IN KERALAM

A State-Level Evaluation, Stakeholder Consultation and Roadmap for Reform

Submitted to

Kerala State Higher Education Council (KSHEC)

Government of Keralam

Submitted by

Committee to Evaluate the Implementation of FYUGP across Universities and Colleges in Keralam

Reporting period: 1 July 2026 – 31 October 2026

Draft Report

Committee for Evaluation of the Implementation of the Four-Year Undergraduate Program (FYUGP)

Constituted vide *Order No KSHEC-A3/307-1/EB-1/243/2026 dated 17.07.2026*

Members

1. Prof. (Dr.) Gladston Raj S.
   Professor, Department of Computer Science — Chairperson
   Government College Kariavattom

2. Prof. (Dr.) Rajesh Komath
   Professor, School of Social Science — Member
   MG University Kottayam

3. Dr. Gigi George
   Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry — Member
   CMS College Kottayam

4. Dr. Ajesh S. R.
   Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce — Member
   KSMDB College Sasthamkotta

5. Mr. Samson Rajan
   Assistant Professor, Department of English — Member
   SES College Sreekandapuram, Kannur

6. Dr. Sasidevan V
   Assistant Professor, Department of Physics, CUSAT — Member

7. Prof. (Dr.) Abida Farooqui
   Member Secretary, KSHEC — Convenor

8. Dr. Ashkarali P.
   Associate Professor, Department of Electronics — Invitee
   Government Arts and Science College Tanur Malappuram

Draft Report

Acknowledgement

The successful realization of this comprehensive evaluation and roadmap for the FYUGP in Keralam has been a monumental collective endeavour, made possible by the visionary guidance, unwavering commitment and collaborative spirit of numerous individuals, institutions and stakeholders across the state's higher education ecosystem.

At the outset, the Committee expresses its profound gratitude to the Higher Education Department, Government of Keralam, for its steadfast commitment to academic reform and institutional excellence. We extend our deepest appreciation to the Honourable Minister for Higher Education, Sri. Roji M John, whose visionary leadership, dynamic foresight and constant encouragement provided the vital momentum necessary to navigate complex policy landscapes and shape a student-centric, future-ready higher education framework for Keralam.

We are immensely thankful to the Kerala State Higher Education Council (KSHEC) for its stellar leadership and institutional support throughout this rigorous review process. Special thanks are due to the Vice Chairman of KSHEC, Prof. Achuth Sankar S Nair and his dedicated team of academic and administrative officers. His profound scholarship, tireless coordination and intellectual rigour were instrumental in reviewing the Committee's deliberations, synthesizing diverse stakeholder perspectives and translating complex challenges into actionable, progressive policy solutions.

The Committee records its sincere appreciation to the Vice-Chancellors, Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Registrars, Controllers of Examinations and Syndicate members of our state universities. Their administrative acumen, institutional wisdom and willingness to embrace transformative structural changes ensured that the recommendations are both academically sound and operationally feasible. Special thanks are due to the University Deans, Board of Studies (BoS) Chairpersons and the FYUGP Core Committee members, whose rigorous curriculum design, dedication to educational excellence and continuous refinement shaped the foundation of this report.

A reform of this magnitude cannot succeed without the grassroots-level insights of those who implement it daily. We extend our warmest gratitude to the college principals, faculty members and teachers across government, aided, self-financing and autonomous institutions who generously opened their campuses, shared their

Draft Report

operational experiences and offered candid, constructive feedback during our state-wide consultations and field visits. Their dedication to student mentorship and academic rigour remains our greatest asset.

We are equally indebted to the non-teaching staff and various staff organizations across universities and affiliated colleges. Their silent efficiency, meticulous record-keeping, administrative cooperation and valuable representations regarding workload rationalization and institutional support systems ensured a holistic and grounded evaluation.

Finally, we acknowledge the students, research scholars, parent-teacher associations and industry partners whose aspirations for a flexible, globally competitive and inclusive higher education system inspired every recommendation contained within this document. To every individual and institution that contributed directly or indirectly to this milestone report, we offer our deepest and most sincere thanks.

FYUGP Review Committee

Draft Report

Summary

The Kerala State Higher Education Council (KSHEC) constituted a committee in July 2026 to evaluate the implementation of the FYUGP across universities and affiliated colleges in Kerala. The review was conducted between July and October 2026. Spanning 30 diverse institutions—including State Universities, Government, Aided, Autonomous and Self-financing colleges— the evaluation combined rigorous document reviews, institutional audits and extensive stakeholder consultations with academic leaders, faculty, students and administrators. The primary objective was to evaluate the Programme's implementation effectiveness, identify systemic bottlenecks and propose robust, evidence-based recommendations for academic, regulatory and administrative reform.

A major structural finding of the review is that the original nomenclature, "Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP)," has created perceptual and temporal confusion for students exiting at three years or utilizing the fourth year as a postgraduate bridge. To resolve this, the committee recommends renaming the framework as the Flexible Graduate Programme (FGP), which unifies the Undergraduate and Postgraduate continuum while emphasizing multi-entry, exit and mobility pathways. To further enhance student pacing, the Committee recommends flexible options such as the Accelerated Degree Programme (ADP)—capped at a 10% intake with screening committees to prevent burnout—and the Extended Degree Programme (EDP) which can be structured alongside fast-track summer courses for credit accumulation and backlog clearance. Additionally, it is advised to rationalize aggregate credit requirements from odd totals (133 and 177) to evenly divisible figures of 132 credits (for 3-year FYUGP) and 176 credits (for Honours/Honours with Research), eliminating semester-wise workload friction and simplifying faculty L-T-P hour mapping.

Addressing widespread student difficulties in securing desired minor courses due to institutional limits, the report recommends that only 12 credits mandatory minors (can be from disciplinary/inter-disciplinary) are needed for single major pathways. Furthermore, Minor distribution windows are recommended to be expanded from the first three semesters to span Semesters I through VIII and single-faculty department sanctions are proposed to cost-effectively introduce cutting-edge minors like Artificial Intelligence, Data Science etc. The committee observes that portability and Postgraduate alignment are

Draft Report

strengthened through uniform academic calendars, standardized CBCSS credit mapping, streamlined re-entry rules and clear eligibility divisions restricting one-year Master's degrees strictly to four-year graduates while accommodating credit deficits and SGPA recalculations for two-year tracks.

To support fourth-year implementation, institutions are advised to adopt modular acoustic partitioning, structured shift-based timetabling with midday overlap windows and inter-institutional resource-sharing clusters to mitigate spatial and laboratory deficits. Supervisory workloads for Undergraduate research may be formally capped at five students per guide using a direct teaching-hour conversion formula and annual routine faculty transfers may now be finalized by April to protect research seat allocations. It is highly recommended that Pedagogical and assessment reforms may include mandating that at least 50% of Skill Enhancement Courses (SECs) be hands-on with practical proficiency evaluations, adopting a standardized 60-mark external written question paper blueprint with a designated 'cool-off' time and strictly enforcing 30-day result publication windows alongside 45-day supplementary examination schedules. High-tier grace marks up to 25% for apex national or international representations are recommended to be rationalized by decoupling them from CGPA calculations to preserve academic ranking integrity.

Finally, equity and governance measures are proposed to resolve E-Grantz scholarship and fee-adjustment hurdles through a "One-Time Stream Migration Window" alongside dynamic per-course tuition models. Digital integration is recommended to be prioritized via interoperable API-first Enterprise Resource Management (ERM) and Centralized Learning Management System (LMS) architectures. Operational standards may be further refined by capping general course batch sizes at 75, comprehensively revising non-teaching staff patterns to match expanded workloads, instituting formal Value-Added Course (VAC) pools and integrating foundational courses covering Constitutional values, Citizenship and Comprehensive life and health education.

Draft Report

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Abbreviation	Full Form
ABC	Academic Bank of Credits
ADP	Accelerated Degree Programme
AEC	Ability Enhancement Courses
BoS	Board of Studies
CBCSS	Choice Based Credit and Semester System
CCA	Continuous Comprehensive Assessment
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DCE	Directorate of Collegiate Education
DIC	District Industrial Centers
DSC	Discipline Specific Core
DSE	Discipline Specific Elective
EDP	Extended Degree Programme
ESA	End Semester Assessment
FDP	Faculty Development Programmes
FGP	Flexible Graduate Programme
FYUGP	Four-Year Undergraduate Programme
GP	Grade Points
HEI	Higher Education Institutions
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
KSHEC	Kerala State Higher Education Council
LMS	Learning Management System
MDC	Multi-disciplinary Courses
NPTEL	National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning
SEC	Skill Enhancement Courses
SGPA	Semester Grade Point Average
SWAYAM	Study Webs of Active Learning for Young Aspiring Minds
VAC	Value Added Courses

Draft Report

Table of Contents

1. **INTRODUCTION**
   - **1.1** Background 11
   - **1.2** Objectives 12
2. **MANDATE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY**
   - **2.1.** Terms of Reference and Mandate 12
   - **2.2.** Working Methodology 13
   - **2.3.** Guiding Principles 13
   - **2.4.** Expected Outcomes and Deliverables 14
   - **2.5.** Institutions Covered by the Review 14
   - **2.6.** Stakeholder categories represented 15
3. **SYSTEMIC CHALLENGES AND ACTIONABLE FRAMEWORKS**
   - **3.1.** Programme Identity and Degree Architecture 16
   - **3.2.** Curriculum Choice, Institutional Autonomy and Academic Delivery 24
   - **3.3.** Admissions, Calendar Harmonisation and Portability 28
   - **3.4.** Fourth-Year Implementation and Progression 35
   - **3.5.** Workload, Staffing and Infrastructure 38
   - **3.6.** Pedagogy, Practical Work and Assessment 42
   - **3.7.** Experiential Learning and Industry Links 44
   - **3.8.** Equity, Inclusion and Student Support 47
4. **CONCLUSION**

APPENDIX A. Minors are Optional for Single Major Degrees 41

APPENDIX B. Model Skill Course Syllabus 44

APPENDIX C. Sample Workload Calculation 47

APPENDIX D. Interim Report 48

Draft Report

LIST OF ISSUES AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

S.No.	Issue	Page No.
1	Inappropriate and Restrictive FYUGP Nomenclature	16
2	Credit Distribution Imbalances and UGC Compliance Issues	17
3	Compulsory Minor Courses Restricting Curricular Flexibility	18
4	Lack of Clarity and Uniformity in Degree Pathway Regulations	19
5	Restrictive Minor Course Distribution Across Semesters	23
6	Legacy Degree Structure and Transition Challenges	23
7	Limited Availability of Cutting-Edge Minor Courses	24
8	Challenges in Balancing Institutional Autonomy	25
9	Limited Online Courses	26
10	OBE Alignment and Practical Skill Deficits	26
11	Lack of an Integrated VAC Curriculum	27
12	Lack of Clear Guidelines for Flexible Degree Completion Timeline	28
13	Academic Calendar Disparities and Result Delays	29
14	Challenges in Credit Transfer, Recognition and ABC Integration	30
15	Lack of Clarity and Uniformity in Fourth-Year Admission	33
16	Honours Pathways, Project Assessment and Supervision	34
17	Faculty Transfer Uncertainty Affecting Honours with Research	35
18	Internships, Local Industry Partnerships and Research Internships	36
19	Faculty Training for Advanced and Research-Oriented Courses	36
20	Inadequate Workload Assessment and Faculty Deployment	37
21	Lack of Uniform Workload Concessions	39
22	Postgraduate Enrolment Shifts and Effective Faculty Deployment	39
23	Practical Batch Sizes and Laboratory Contact Hours	40
24	Mitigating Classroom Deficits	40
25	Research Equipment, Libraries, Laboratories and Technical Support	42
26	Inconsistencies in Examination Patterns and Duration	43
27	Result, Revaluation and Sports Grace-Mark Provisions	44
28	Fee Equity and E-Grantz Stream Migration	45
29	Scholarships and Support for Fourth-Year Research	45
30	Interoperable Academic Systems and Shared Learning Platforms	46

Draft Report

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The higher education ecosystem in Keralam is currently undergoing a profound and structural transformation catalysed by the introduction of contemporary curriculum frameworks designed to foster flexibility, inter-disciplinarity, skill acquisition and student-centric learning. Originally envisioned to redefine undergraduate education through multiple entry and exit points, the seamless integration of research and fluid pathways connecting undergraduate and postgraduate trajectories, the rollout of the FYUGP across universities and affiliated colleges also exposed significant operational ambiguities and systemic challenges. Recognizing the critical need for a rigorous, empirical assessment of these unfolding dynamics, the KSHEC constituted a state-level committee in July 2026 to evaluate the implementation of the FYUGP curriculum in the state Universities and Colleges under Order No. KSHEC-A3/307-1/EB-1/243/2026. Operating between July 1 and October 31, 2026, the Committee was mandated to conduct a comprehensive, statewide evaluation of the programme's implementation efficacy, document structural bottlenecks and formulate actionable policy solutions for academic, regulatory and administrative reform.

To ensure that the review captured both the overarching policy framework and the grassroots realities of institutional implementation, the Committee adopted a participatory and multi-layered working methodology. This comprehensive evaluation encompassed field visits, institutional audits and consultative sessions across 30 diverse higher education institutions—spanning state universities, autonomous colleges and government, aided and self-financing institutions across the state. The consultative framework engaged a broad spectrum of academic leaders, registrars, controllers of examinations, principals, department heads, Board of Studies chairpersons, faculty members, research supervisors, students, industry partners and administrative personnel. Guided strictly by principles of student-centredness, inclusivity, operational feasibility and evidence-based decision-making, the Committee evaluated the programme across six core dimensions: regulatory consistency, curriculum design and academic structures, teaching-learning processes, student support mechanisms, assessment and grading protocols and institutional infrastructure preparedness.

The findings and recommendations detailed in this report are designed not merely to correct immediate administrative friction, but to establish a visionary, future-ready

Draft Report

roadmap for Keralam's higher education system. By addressing critical hurdles such as programme nomenclature, credit rationalization, minor course distributions, examination uniformity and postgraduate alignment, this framework seeks to harmonize institutional autonomy with state-level and national academic standards. Ultimately, this evaluation aims to transform the undergraduate experience into a flexible, rigorous and globally competitive educational journey that empowers learners, strengthens academic institutions and ensures long-term sustainability and excellence.

1.2 Objectives

The Committee's objectives are to:

- Evaluate FYUGP implementation across universities and affiliated colleges in Keralam;
- Assess the extent to which the programme's intended objectives have been achieved;
- Identify academic, institutional, administrative and regulatory challenges; and
- Recommend practical measures to strengthen implementation.

2. MANDATE, SCOPE and METHODOLOGY OF THE REVIEW

2.1 Terms of Reference and Mandate

The mandate of the Review Committee encompasses a comprehensive evaluation of the FYUGP across regulatory, academic, pedagogical and institutional dimensions. Specifically, the evaluation is guided by the following terms of reference:

A. Regulatory Review

- Reviewing the KSHEC FYUGP guidelines, model regulations and relevant university regulations, statutes and implementation guidelines.
- Assessing the consistency between university-level provisions and KSHEC guidelines.
- Identifying provisions that require revision, clarification or harmonization.

B. Academic Review

- Evaluating curriculum design and programme structures, with a specific focus on multi-disciplinary learning.
- Examining Major, Minor, Multi-disciplinary, Ability Enhancement, Skill Enhancement and Value-Added Courses.
- Assessing curriculum choice, credit transfer mechanisms, Multiple Entry and Multiple Exit provisions and the integration of the ABC.

Draft Report

C. Teaching–Learning Process

- Reviewing faculty preparedness, orientation programmes and capacity-building initiatives.
- Evaluating student mentoring systems and academic advising frameworks.
- Examining the integration of experiential learning, internships, projects, community engagement and research.

D. Student Support Mechanisms

- Assessing academic support structures and grievance-redressal mechanisms.
- Reviewing career guidance, employability programmes and skill-development initiatives.
- Evaluating bridge courses and dedicated support systems for learners with diverse needs.

E. Assessment and Evaluation

- Reviewing CCA and ESA protocols.
- Examining examination reforms and grading systems to ensure transparency, consistency and fairness.

F. Institutional Preparedness

- Reviewing infrastructure facilities, including classrooms, laboratories, libraries, ICT resources and general learning environments.
- Assessing human-resource adequacy and administrative preparedness across institutions.

2.2 Working Methodology

To ensure a robust, empirical and participatory evaluation, the Committee adopted a multi-pronged working methodology comprising:

- A rigorous review of KSHEC and university regulations, statutes and related policy documents.
- Direct interactions and consultations with universities, affiliated colleges, faculty members, students and academic administrators.
- Stakeholder consultations with subject matter experts and educational leaders.
- Field visits and institutional audits across selected higher education institutions.
- Benchmarking against relevant national and international best practices in higher education.

Draft Report

2.3 Guiding Principles

All evaluations, findings and subsequent recommendations of the Committee are underpinned by the core principles of being student-centred, academically sound, evidence-based, operationally feasible, inclusive, equitable and directly responsive to the structural needs of universities and affiliated colleges in Keralam.

2.4 Expected Outcomes and Deliverables

- **Expected Outcomes:** The review aims to identify existing strengths and effective practices in FYUGP implementation, comprehensively document implementation gaps and operational challenges, suggest necessary amendments to regulations and procedures and propose actionable measures to enhance academic quality, student experience, institutional efficiency and regulatory consistency.
- **Deliverables:** The primary deliverable of the Committee is a comprehensive evaluation report containing well-structured, evidence-backed recommendations for regulatory, academic and administrative reform of FYUGP.

2.5 Institutions Covered by the Review

Official visits were conducted at the following colleges and universities:

No.	College	Type recorded in source
1	Marian College Kuttikkanam	Autonomous
2	St. Peter's College, Kolenchery	Aided
3	UIT, Pirappancode	Self-financing
4	WMO Imam Gazzali Arts & Science College, Koolivayal	Self-financing
5	Mary Matha College, Mananthavady	Aided
6	Nirmalagiri College, Kuthuparamba	Autonomous
7	Government Brennan College, Thalassery	Government
8	Nehru Arts and Science College, Kanhangad	Aided
9	St. Pius X College, Rajapuram	Aided
10	Government College, Kariavattom	Government
11	Assumption College, Changanacherry	Autonomous
12	SB College, Changanacherry	Autonomous
13	SN College, Cherthala	Aided
14	St. Cyril's College, Adoor	Aided
15	St. Stephen's College, Pathanapuram	Aided
16	Christ College, Irinjalakuda	Autonomous
17	Thararanellur Arts & Science College (TASC)	Self-financing

Draft Report

No.	College	Type recorded in source
18	V. T. Bhattathiripad College, Sreekrishnapuram	Aided
19	Government Arts and Science College, Kondotty	Government
20	SAFI Institute of Advanced Study	Autonomous (self-financing)
21	RUA Farook College, Kozhikode	Aided
22	St. Joseph's Devagiri	Autonomous
23	CMS College, Kottayam	Autonomous
24	PRDS College of Arts & Science, Amara	Aided
25	Maharaja's College, Ernakulam	Autonomous (Government)
26	Kannur University, Kannur	**State University**
27	University of Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram	**State University**
28	Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam	**State University**
29	University of Calicut, Calicut	**State University**
30	Sree Narayana Guru Open University, Kollam	**State Open University**

2.6 Stakeholder categories represented

The consultation framework included academic leaders (Registrars, Controllers of Examinations, principals, department heads and Board of Studies chairpersons), faculty members, research supervisors, students, industry partners, university and college administrative staff and office staff. These groups contribute to academic preparedness, curriculum delivery, student mentoring, experiential learning, employability, records management and day-to-day programme administration.

3. SYSTEMIC CHALLENGES AND ACTIONABLE FRAMEWORKS

3.1 Programme Identity and Degree Architecture

Issue 1. Inappropriate and Restrictive FYUGP Nomenclature

The existing nomenclature, "Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP)," creates conceptual and structural ambiguity, as it neither adequately reflects the flexibility of the programme nor its broader academic objectives. The explicit reference to a four-year duration is potentially misleading, since students may legitimately exit after three years with a regular bachelor's degree. Furthermore, the emphasis on "Undergraduate" does not fully convey the programme's flexibility in facilitating academic progression towards postgraduate education. Significantly, the UGC's CCFUP December 2022 does not prescribe "FYUGP" as a mandatory nomenclature, thereby providing scope for adopting a more appropriate title. Moreover, the earlier CBCS employed a generic nomenclature without explicitly restricting its identity to undergraduate or postgraduate programmes. In

Draft Report

this context, the existing title appears unnecessarily restrictive and insufficiently representative of the programme's flexible, multi-disciplinary and progressive academic framework, warranting reconsideration of its nomenclature to better reflect its underlying philosophy and objectives.

Proposed Solution(s)

To address the ambiguities associated with the existing nomenclature and better reflect the fundamental objectives of contemporary higher education reforms, it is recommended that the FYUGP be renamed the **Flexible Graduate Programme (FGP)**. The proposed designation removes the restrictive reference to a four-year duration, thereby accommodating both three-year and four-year degree pathways within a common framework. The term “Flexible” appropriately emphasizes the student-centric nature of the programme, including multiple entry and exit options, inter-disciplinary learning, academic mobility and diverse pathways for progression. Furthermore, the term “Graduate” is intended to convey a broader academic perspective, recognizing the continuity between undergraduate education and subsequent postgraduate studies, rather than confining the programme's identity to a specific duration or level. Consistent with the generic nomenclature previously adopted under the CBCS, the proposed name FGP offers a concise, inclusive and forward-looking identity that better represents the flexibility, adaptability and progressive vision of the restructured higher education framework.

Issue 2. Credit Distribution Imbalances and UGC Compliance Issues

The existing FYUGP credit framework in Keralam prescribes 133 credits for a three-year undergraduate degree and 177 credits for a four-year Honours/Honours with Research degree, exceeding the minimum requirements of 120 and 160 credits, respectively, stipulated under the UGC CCFUP December 2022. However, adopting these odd-numbered aggregate credit requirements creates practical difficulties in semester-wise credit distribution, curriculum structuring and compliance with the minimum major-credit requirements. Distributing 133 credits across six semesters or 177 credits across eight semesters results in uneven credit allocations, potentially affecting the uniformity of academic workload.

More significantly, the UGC requirement that at least 50% of the total credits be earned in the major discipline presents an arithmetic inconsistency, as 50% of 133 and 177 credits amounts to 66.5 and 88.5 credits, respectively. The existing state regulations prescribe 68 major credits for the three-year degree and 88 major credits for the four-year

Draft Report

degree. While the four-year requirement falls short by 0.5 credit, resulting in a potential inconsistency with the UGC's 50% minimum major-credit requirement. These discrepancies highlight the need for a more rationalised credit structure that ensures regulatory compliance, simplifies credit calculations and facilitates balanced curriculum planning and academic administration.

Proposed Solution(s)

To resolve the operational bottlenecks and arithmetic friction caused by odd credit totals, we propose revising the aggregate credit requirements to 132 credits (for a 3-year degree) 176 credits (for the 4-year Honours/Honours with Research pathway). Shifting to these evenly divisible figures ensures clean semester-wise distributions—such as a consistent average of 22 credits per semester across 6 or 8 semesters—thereby eliminating fractions and balancing workloads. This adjustment naturally streamlines course mapping and timetable planning, simplifies the calculation of the 50% Major credit rule without cumbersome rounding discrepancies and facilitates the direct, friction-free mapping of L-T-P hours to standard faculty workloads.

Issue 3. Compulsory Minor Courses Restricting Curricular Flexibility

A significant structural challenge has emerged in the implementation of the undergraduate curriculum concerning the selection of minor courses. Owing to the limited range of programmes offered by individual institutions, many students are unable to secure minor subjects aligned with their academic interests and career aspirations. Consequently, students are often compelled to enroll in courses that they have not voluntarily chosen, thereby undermining the student-centric and flexible objectives of the higher education reforms. Furthermore, certain programmes following a language-reduction programmes, with no compulsory second-language component, face difficulties in accommodating their prescribed core courses within the existing credit structure. Compulsory minor requirements may therefore restrict curricular flexibility, create avoidable academic constraints and adversely affect students' learning experiences.

Proposed Solution(s)

To address these challenges, it is proposed that BoS are encouraged to introduce the Single Major Degree Pathway, in accordance with the provisions of the UGC CCFUP December 2022 and Section 10.0 of the UGC (Minimum Standards of Instruction for the Grant of Undergraduate Degree and Postgraduate Degree) Regulations, 2025, if required. This pathway would enable students to pursue their degree predominantly in a single major discipline, without necessarily being required to undertake minor courses

Draft Report

that may not align with their academic interests or the courses available within their institutions.

As part of this proposal, Universities and Boards of Studies may be granted the flexibility to restructure the existing credit distribution by reallocating 12 credits currently assigned to Minor courses to the Major discipline, thereby promoting greater disciplinary depth and academic specialization. The remaining 12 credits may be allocated to disciplinary or interdisciplinary Minor courses, depending on the nature, academic requirements and objectives of the programme.

The proposed arrangement would enhance student choice, address institutional limitations in offering diverse minor courses and facilitate the accommodation of mandatory core courses in language-reduction programmes, where the study of a second language is not compulsory. It would also promote more effective utilisation of the available credit framework while preserving the flexibility and student-centric objectives envisaged under the UGC guidelines.

Furthermore, the proposal recognizes the need to accommodate discipline-specific academic and workload arrangements. In certain disciplines, particularly Commerce, the entire teaching workload has traditionally been accommodated within the respective department. Any substantial redistribution of credits or teaching responsibilities under the revised curriculum could potentially disturb these established arrangements, resulting in faculty workload imbalances and associated administrative difficulties. It is therefore proposed that universities be given adequate flexibility to retain or suitably adapt such discipline-specific arrangements while introducing the Single Major Degree Pathway, ensuring that curricular reforms do not inadvertently disrupt existing academic structures or faculty workload distribution.

Overall, the proposed pathway seeks to balance academic flexibility, disciplinary coherence, student choice and institutional feasibility, while remaining consistent with the broader objectives of the UGC framework. **[See Appendix A]**

Issue 4. Lack of Clarity and Uniformity in Degree Pathway Regulations

The existing FYUGP regulations lack comprehensive and uniform guidelines for the implementation of various degree pathways, particularly the Inter-disciplinary and Double Major pathways. The absence of clearly defined semester-wise credit distribution patterns for these pathways creates ambiguities in curriculum design, course allocation and academic progression. Additionally, the lack of standardised nomenclature for Double Major degrees may lead to variations in degree titles, certification and academic

Draft Report

recognition across universities. These regulatory gaps highlight the need for greater clarity, consistency and standardisation to ensure the effective and uniform implementation of all degree pathways.

Proposed Solution(s)

To address the ambiguities surrounding inter-disciplinary and double major pathways, the revised framework establishes a standardized course and credit distribution across all semesters, ensuring clarity for students and academic bodies alike. Furthermore, the updated guidelines formally incorporate and define a dedicated double major pathway for the fourth year, eliminating previous nomenclature overlaps and providing a seamless, transparent progression structure for multi-disciplinary scholars. (Refer Table 1)

TABLE 1: Semester-wise credit distribution for different pathways

(a) Single Major										
	Sem 1	**Sem 2**	**Sem 3**	**Sem 4**	**Sem 5**	**Sem 6**		**Sem 7**	**Sem 8**	
Types of Courses							**Total Credits**			**Total Credits**
Major (Core)*	4	4	8	20	20	24	80	24	8	112
Minor Stream$	4	4	4				12			12
MDC	3	3	3 (KS)				9			9
AEC	3 (OL)	3 (E)	3 (E)	3 (OL)			12			12
SEC	3	3	3				9			9
VAC	2+2	2+2					6-8			6-8
Summer Internship					2-4		2-4			2-4
Research Project / Dissertation							0		12	12
TOTAL	21	21	21	23	22-24	24	132	24	20	176

$ Students will have the option to choose courses from disciplinary/inter-disciplinary minors

- ✓ VAC can be offered by all departments
- ✓ A student may declare the choice of the minor and vocational stream at the end of the second semester, after exploring various courses.

NB:- *If a Board of Studies assigns 4 credits to an internship instead of 2 credits, the two additional credits are balanced by reducing an equivalent 2 credits from the VAC course pool, thereby maintaining the strict credit cap for the semester and the overall programme without inflation.*

Draft Report

(b) Major With Minor/Vocational Minor										
	Sem 1	Sem 2	Sem 3	Sem 4	Sem 5	Sem 6		Sem 7	Sem 8	
Types of Courses							Total Credits			Total Credits
Major (Core)*	4	4	8	16	16	20	68	12	8	88
Minor/Vocational Minor **	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	12		36
MDC	3	3	3 (KS)				9			9
AEC	3 (OL)	3 (E)	3 (E)	3 (OL)			12			12
SEC	3	3	3				9			9
VAC	2+2	2+2					6-8			6-8
Summer Internship					2-4		2-4			2-4
Research Project / Dissertation							0		12	12
TOTAL	21	21	21	23	22-24	24	132	24	20	176

(c) Major With Multi-disciplinary or Inter-disciplinary										
	Sem 1	Sem 2	Sem 3	Sem 4	Sem 5	Sem 6		Sem 7	Sem 8	
Types of Courses							Total Credits			Total Credits
Major (Core)*	4	4	8	16	16	20	68	20	4	92
Minor Stream_1**	4		4		4		12	4		16
Minor Stream_2**		4		4		4	12		4	16
MDC	3	3	3 (KS)				9			9
AEC	3 (OL)	3 (E)	3 (E)	3 (OL)			12			12
SEC	3	3	3				9			9
VAC	2+2	2+2					6-8			6-8
Summer Internship					2-4		2-4			2-4
Research Project / Dissertation							0		12	12
TOTAL	21	21	21	23	22-24	24	132	24	20	176

**** The semester-wise distribution of DSC and DSE courses is determined by the concerned Board of Studies (BoS).***

***** If necessary, an additional supernumerary quota of up to 20% above the sanctioned intake may be utilized to accommodate students from other disciplines for minor courses.***

Draft Report

(d) Double Major with Project in Major 1										
	Sem 1	**Sem 2**	**Sem 3**	**Sem 4**	**Sem 5**	**Sem 6**		**Sem 7**	**Sem 8**	
Types of Courses							**Total Credits**			**Total Credits**
Major 1 (Core)*	**4**	**4**	**8**	**12**	**8**	**12**	**48**	8	4	**60**
Major 2 (Core)*	**4**	**4**	**4**	**8**	**12**	**12**	**44**	16	4	**64**
MDC	**3**	**3**	**3 (KS)**				**9**			**9**
AEC	**3 (OL)**	**3 (E)**	**3 (E)**	**3 (OL)**			**12**			**12**
SEC	**3**	**3**	**3**				**9**			**9**
VAC	**2**	**2+2**					**6**			**6**
Summer Internship			**2 (Maj 1)**		**2 (Maj 2)**		**4**			**4**
Research Project / Dissertation							**0**		**12**	**12**
TOTAL	**19**	**21**	**23**	**23**	**22**	**24**	**132**	**24**	**20**	**176**
									3 Year	**4 Year**
Total Credits (Major 1) = 48 + 12 (Project) + 2 (Internship) + 16 (MDC/SEC/VAC/Online)									66	90
Total Credits (Major 2) = 44 + 2 (Internship) + 8 (MDC/SEC/VAC/Online)									54	74

Double Major with Project in Major 2										
	Sem 1	**Sem 2**	**Sem 3**	**Sem 4**	**Sem 5**	**Sem 6**		**Sem 7**	**Sem 8**	
Types of Courses							**Total Credits**			**Total Credits**
Major 1 (Core)*	**4**	**4**	**8**	**12**	**8**	**12**	**48**	**20**	**4**	**72**
Major 2 (Core)*	**4**	**4**	**4**	**8**	**12**	**12**	**44**	**4**	**4**	**56**
MDC	**3**	**3**	**3 (KS)**				**9**			**9**
AEC	**3 (OL)**	**3 (E)**	**3 (E)**	**3 (OL)**			**12**			**12**
SEC	**3**	**3**	**3**				**9**			**9**
VAC	**2**	**2+2**					**6**			**6**
Summer Internship			**2 (Maj 1)**		**2 (Maj 2)**		**4**			**4**
Research Project / Dissertation							**0**		**12**	**12**
TOTAL	**19**	**21**	**23**	**23**	**22**	**24**	**132**	**24**	**20**	**176**
									3 Year	**4 Year**
Total Credits (Major 1) = 48 + 2 (Internship) + 16 (MDC/SEC/VAC/Online)									66	90
Total Credits (Major 2) = 44 + 2 (Internship) + 12 (Project) + 8 (MDC/SEC/VAC/Online)									54	78

Note: (i) *Students pursuing the Double Major pathway may be allowed to switch to the Major with Minor pathway in the fourth year, subject to successful completion of all 44 credits in the chosen core discipline and fulfilment of the remaining requirements prescribed for the new pathway.*

(ii) As per UGC guidelines, a 2-credit internship requires 60 hours of engagement, while a 4-credit internship requires 120 hours of engagement, calculated at the rate of 30 hours per credit.

Issue 5. Restrictive Minor Course Distribution Across Semesters

The existing implementation guidelines restrict the distribution of Minor courses exclusively to the first three semesters. This rigid restriction compresses Minor credit requirements into a narrow timeframe, creates significant semester-wise academic workload imbalances, complicates faculty timetabling and undermines the progressive, multi-disciplinary learning framework envisaged under national higher education reforms. More importantly, the disproportionate concentration of Minor courses during the initial semesters, particularly the first two, creates a perception among students that their Major discipline receives inadequate academic emphasis, thereby weakening their sense of disciplinary identity and engagement. Such an arrangement delays meaningful exposure to core disciplinary knowledge and compromises the balanced, progressive development of subject-specific competencies throughout the undergraduate programme.

Proposed Solution(s)

It is proposed to amend the existing academic guidelines in alignment with Table 3 of the UGC CCFUP framework, formally permitting the distribution of Minor courses across Semesters I to VIII (2 courses in Level 100, 4 courses in Level 200 & 2 courses in level 300). BoS are to be empowered to structure Minor pathways as a continuous and balanced credit progression, thereby alleviating semester-wise student workload, facilitating balanced faculty timetabling, ensuring seamless multi-disciplinary progression and maintaining full compliance with national standards.

Issue 6. Legacy Degree Structure and Transition Challenges

Traditional degree structures, including triple-major programmes and multi-major combinations previously offered by various universities, are not fully aligned with the contemporary credit architecture and national standardisation requirements. The absence of appropriate structural adjustments creates inconsistencies in academic regulations, restricts seamless credit transfer and student mobility and poses challenges in transitioning to the UGC-prescribed degree pathways. Furthermore, the restructuring of these conventional programmes raises concerns among academic departments regarding the protection of existing faculty workloads, instructional hours and

Draft Report

departmental autonomy, necessitating a balanced approach that ensures regulatory compliance without adversely affecting academic and institutional interests.

Proposed Solution(s)

BoS-Driven Restructuring: Respective BoS may proactively review and map legacy curricula, converting older multi-major combinations into the approved UGC-mandated pathways to eliminate redundancies and ensure national credentials as per Table 1.

Empowering Departmental Flexibility: To safeguard faculty workloads, individual departments conducting these UGC-aligned programs should be granted full autonomy to offer any number and type of courses, ensuring that departmental workload is fully protected and optimized.

3.2 Curriculum Choice, Institutional Autonomy and Academic Delivery

Issue 7. Limited Availability of Cutting-Edge Minor Courses

Students are encouraged to pursue minor specializations alongside their major degrees to broaden their skill sets and improve employability. However, a systemic bottleneck restricts this vision:

Dominance of Traditional Disciplines: The vast majority of affiliated and autonomous colleges largely offer conventional, legacy minor courses tied strictly to their existing, long-established departments.

Lack of Inter-disciplinary Agility: Emerging, high-demand fields that define modern global industries—such as Digital Humanities, Computational Linguistics, Translation Studies require specialized academic backing. Most standard colleges lack the internal faculty structure to offer these minors because their existing departments are siloed.

The "Skill Mismatch" for Students: While students desperately want futuristic credentials to match evolving market demands, they are restricted to what their home institution's faculty pool can passively support. Consequently, the flexibility promised by modern curricula is undermined by institutional rigidity.

Proposed Solution(s)

To systematically bridge this gap, the government should adopt a structural reform:

Strategic Sanctioning: Whenever approval is granted to colleges for introducing new programmes, expanding existing programmes or implementing revised curriculum frameworks, explicit provision should be made for establishing Single-Faculty Departments in emerging and inter-disciplinary fields such as Digital Humanities, Computational Linguistics, Translation Studies, Language Technology, Cultural Studies, Sociology, Public Policy, Development Studies, Behavioral Economics, Bioinformatics,

Draft Report

Robotics, FinTech and Cybersecurity. This would enable conventional academic programmes to be strengthened and promoted through inter-disciplinary integration with these emerging fields, while ensuring optimal utilisation of existing faculty and institutional resources.

Empowering Student Choice: By sanctioning single-faculty positions in emerging and inter-disciplinary fields alongside new course approvals, colleges can strengthen traditional degree programmes by integrating future-ready Minor courses. For instance, Physics can be complemented by Data Science, Mathematics by Machine Learning, Chemistry by Nanotechnology, Botany by Bioinformatics, Zoology by Biotechnology, Commerce by FinTech, Economics by Business Analytics, English by Digital Humanities, History by Digital Archaeology and Political Science by Public Policy Analytics. Such innovative combinations would revitalise conventional disciplines, expand students' academic choices, promote inter-disciplinary learning and enhance their employability and career readiness without requiring the establishment of entirely new departments.

Issue 8. Challenges in Balancing Institutional Autonomy

Institutional autonomy is increasingly recognized as a key direction for the future of higher education. Autonomous colleges require adequate academic freedom to design programmes, develop course content, revise syllabi, introduce inter-disciplinary and emerging areas of study and adopt innovative teaching–learning and assessment practices. However, such autonomy must operate within the regulatory framework of the affiliating university, Kerala State-level academic norms and applicable national regulations. Uncertainty regarding the respective powers of autonomous colleges, affiliating universities and state-level authorities may result in either unnecessary restrictions on institutional innovation or inconsistencies in programme structures, credit requirements, academic standards and student mobility.

Proposed Solution(s)

All programmes offered by autonomous colleges should comply with the mandatory provisions of the affiliating university, Kerala State-level academic regulations and guidelines and applicable UGC and other statutory regulatory requirements. Institutional autonomy should not be interpreted as an exemption from these binding provisions.

Freedom in Academic Design: Autonomous colleges should be permitted to design and revise programmes, syllabi, course content, course combinations, practical components and assessment methods through their duly constituted statutory academic bodies, within the scope of autonomy granted to them and subject to applicable regulatory requirements.

Draft Report

Within these requirements, autonomous colleges should be allowed to develop distinctive curricula, introduce new courses and adopt innovative pedagogical approaches according to their institutional strengths and local needs.

Transparent Approval and Monitoring Mechanisms: A simplified, time-bound procedure should be established for the introduction of new programmes and major curricular revisions. Periodic academic audits should assess both regulatory compliance and the effective exercise of autonomy.

Issue 9. Limited Online Courses

The availability of suitable SWAYAM/SWAYAM Plus or other recognized online courses may be limited in certain disciplines, emerging areas of study or specialized subject domains. This may restrict students' academic choices and affect the effective implementation of the prescribed credit and course requirements under FYUGP. A flexible provision is therefore necessary to enable institutions to address such gaps without compromising academic equivalence, prescribed learning outcomes or quality standards.

Proposed Solution(s)

Institutional Provision for Offline Courses: Where an adequate number of suitable SWAYAM/SWAYAM Plus or other recognized online courses is unavailable to meet students' academic requirements and specialization preferences, universities are permitted to develop and offer equivalent offline courses through their respective departments, subject to the approval of the competent academic authority. Such courses shall be appropriately mapped to the relevant NHEQF/NSQF level, prescribed credit requirements and intended learning outcomes. Clearly defined syllabi, teaching-learning hours, credit allocation and assessment procedures shall be established to ensure academic equivalence and consistency with the prescribed academic framework.

Issue 10. OBE Alignment and Practical Skill Deficits

Some syllabi lack consistent alignment with OBE principles. Practical hours in science and practice-oriented programmes have been reduced compared to older schemes (like CBCSS), risking technical competence. SECs require hands-on learning and practical proficiency assessment rather than sole reliance on written exams.

Proposed Solution(s)

A. Maximizing Practical Content via UGC CCFUP Session 3.2.5 (a) Under UGC Session 3.2.5 (a) ("All discipline-specific courses (major or minor) may be 4 credits or as

Draft Report

appropriate. An additional one to two credits may be allotted for tutorials or practicals"), BoS are empowered to:

Scale Course Credits up to 6 Credits: Design heavy-duty Major and Minor science/practice courses (like social work, hotel management etc.) as 5 or 6-credit modules by embedding dedicated practical or tutorial components.

Mandate Practical Contact Hours: Ensure core laboratory courses retain or exceed legacy CBCSS contact hours (e.g., converting a standard 4-credit lecture course into a 6-credit integrated lecture-practical course with 2–6 hours of weekly lab work).

B. Structural Overhaul of SECs

Mandatory Hands-On Hours: Decouple SECs from purely theoretical delivery. Every SEC must include at least 50% experiential, lab-based or field-based hours. **(See Appendix B)**

Proficiency-Based Assessment Framework: Shift assessment away from end-semester written theory papers. Evaluation will focus on practical demonstration, project outputs, portfolios and viva voce.

Integration of Industry-Aligned SECs: The BoS may explore the integration of SECs offered by accredited skill training institutes. This provision enables students to earn recognized diploma or certification credentials concurrently with their degree program upon successfully completing a stipulated cluster of skill-based courses, thereby bridging formal higher education with industry-aligned vocational competencies.

Issue 11. Lack of an Integrated VAC Curriculum

The lack of a sufficiently diverse pool of relevant, credit-bearing VAC options across disciplines further restricts meaningful student choice and undermines the broader objective of fostering socially responsible, ethically conscious and well-informed graduates.

Proposed Solution(s)

In accordance with the UGC CCFUP 2022, VACs are mandated as 2-credit courses designed as common offerings for all undergraduate students. Accordingly, each Board of Studies must institute a sufficient pool of tailored VAC options to meet this requirement. Develop credit-bearing course covering **h**uman rights, constitutional values, ethics, gender equality, civic duties, environmental awareness, sustainability, responsible digital citizenship and social responsibility. Incorporate age-appropriate, scientifically accurate education on reproductive health, personal safety, gender sensitivity and prevention of sexual harassment and abuse etc., delivered in an inclusive manner.

Draft Report

3.3 Flexible Progression, Admissions and Academic Mobility

Issue 12. Lack of Clear Guidelines for Flexible Degree Completion timeline

Although the ADP and EDP are intended to provide students with the flexibility to complete their undergraduate studies within shorter or extended timelines, the absence of clear and comprehensive guidelines regarding eligibility, admission, semester-wise credit distribution, minimum and maximum duration, academic progression and implementation procedures creates ambiguity and operational challenges for universities and colleges.

Proposed Solution(s)

A clear comprehension of their operational mechanics reveals the following dimensions:

1. Common Baseline Rules for Both Pathways

- **Undergraduate Scope:** Both options apply strictly at the undergraduate level.
- **Window of Selection:** Students must opt for either ADP or EDP at the end of the first or second semester only (not later).
- **Identical Curriculum:** The core syllabus, course content and total credits required for the degree remain completely unchanged; only the pacing and duration vary.

2. ADP – Fast-Track Completion

- **Mechanism:** Students take on an increased credit load per semester starting right after their entry point (from Semester II or III onwards).
- **Time Savings**
  - In a 3-year programme, duration can be shortened by 1 semester (finishing in 5 semesters instead of 6).
  - In a 4-year programme, duration can be shortened by 1 or 2 semesters (finishing in 6 or 7 semesters instead of 8).
- Committee proposed that students may accumulate a maximum of **27 credits** per semester to prevent academic burnout

3. EDP – Reduced-Load Completion

- **Mechanism:** Students take on a reduced credit load per semester, spreading their studies across a longer timeframe starting after Semester I or II.
- **Time Extension:** For both 3-year and 4-year programmes, the total duration can be extended by a maximum of 2 semesters.
- Committee proposed that students may accumulate a minimum of **18 credits** per semester to ensure continuous academic engagement without indefinite stretching.

Draft Report

Additional Guidelines

- HEIs may earmark up to 10% of sanctioned intake for ADP.
- HEIs may constitute a committee to scrutinize applications received at the end of the first or the second semester under EDP and ADP and select students accordingly.
- The Committee constituted by the HEI will evaluate the credit-completing potential of a student based on their performance in the first or the second semester and give its recommendations.
- The Committee shall recommend a reduction or an increase in the number of courses and total credits per semester, as per the duration opted by the students.
- Under the ADP and EDP, the transcripts should record only the courses the students take in a semester.

Implementation of Fast-Track Summer Courses for Academic Flexibility:- In alignment with the UGC CCFUP, 2022, it is proposed that higher education institutions be permitted to utilize the designated eight-week summer term for offering regular courses in fast-track mode, in addition to internships, apprenticeships and field-based training. This provision would enhance academic flexibility by enabling students to earn additional credits, complete selected courses ahead of schedule and accelerate their academic progression. Simultaneously, it would provide an opportunity for students with academic backlogs to complete pending courses and improve their academic standing without unnecessary delays in degree completion. The proposed arrangement would promote efficient utilisation of the academic calendar, facilitate timely progression and strengthen the student-centric flexibility envisaged under the UGC framework, subject to institutional feasibility and the availability of adequate academic resources.

Issue 13. Academic Calendar Disparities and Result Delays

Significant variations in admission calendars, allotment procedures and result-declaration timelines across universities create unequal opportunities for students and unnecessarily prolong the admission process. The lack of synchronization makes inter-university mobility difficult, particularly for students seeking to transfer between universities. Furthermore, delays in declaring examination results adversely affect academic progression and leave insufficient time to conduct supplementary examinations within the stipulated academic schedule.

Draft Report

Proposed Solution(s)

To ensure uniformity, transparency and academic continuity across universities in Keralam, the following measures are recommended:

1. Common Academic and Admission Calendar: The KSHEC, in consultation with universities, shall establish a common academic and admission calendar by 31 March every year, specifying uniform timelines for admissions, allotments, commencement of classes, examinations and result declarations.

2. Synchronized Admission and Allotment Process: All universities shall follow a common admission commencement date, coordinated allotment schedules and a uniform deadline for closing admissions, with limited flexibility for institution-specific requirements.

3. Time-Bound Declaration of Results: Universities shall declare semester examination results within 30 days of completing examinations, ensuring timely academic progression and eligibility for subsequent admissions.

4. Scheduled Supplementary Examinations: Supplementary examinations shall be conducted within 45 days of publishing regular examination results, with results declared sufficiently early to prevent delays in academic progression.

5. Facilitating Inter-University Mobility: A common transfer window shall be introduced across universities, supported by standardised credit-mapping procedures, enabling students to migrate between institutions without losing an academic semester.

6. Monitoring and Accountability: A state-level coordination and monitoring mechanism under KSHEC shall periodically review compliance with the common calendar, identify delays and recommend corrective measures.

Issue 14. Challenges in Credit Transfer, Recognition and ABC Integration

Variations across institutions in mapping credits earned under the erstwhile CBCSS to the FYUGP framework, along with inconsistent policies for recognizing credits earned through approved online platforms such as SWAYAM and NPTEL, create significant barriers to credit transfer, student mobility and inter-institutional transfers. Furthermore, considerable delays in uploading and reflecting successfully completed course credits and certificates in the ABC, in some cases extending beyond one year, undermine the effectiveness of the digital credit accumulation and transfer mechanism. These inconsistencies and delays adversely affect students' academic progression, recognition of prior learning and opportunities for seamless mobility across higher educational institutions.

Draft Report

Proposed Solution(s)

1. CBCSS–FYUGP Credit Mapping: Each legacy CBCSS course shall be mapped to its corresponding FYUGP course based on learning outcomes, syllabus content, academic level, instructional hours and credits. Where credit differences exist, students may be permitted to complete the deficit through approved bridge or online courses without repeating previously completed courses. A common digital credit-mapping portal, integrated with the ABC, may be developed to facilitate transparent, uniform and seamless credit recognition and inter-university student mobility.

2. Uniform Academic Flexibility and Re-entry Rules: All universities shall adopt a common framework permitting students to take approved academic breaks, discontinue studies and subsequently re-enter the same or an equivalent undergraduate programme without forfeiting legitimately earned credits. The framework shall prescribe uniform eligibility conditions, a maximum academic break, a seven-year credit-validity and programme-completion period, standardised credit-equivalence procedures and common semester-wise re-entry windows. Students shall be permitted to resume their studies at the appropriate academic level, subject to prerequisite requirements, curriculum equivalence and institutional capacity, thereby ensuring academic flexibility, continuity and inter-university mobility. The following rules may be adopted as a common regulatory framework across universities in Keralam, subject to applicable UGC regulations and approval by the competent academic authorities.

Provision	Proposed Uniform Rule
1. Semester Exit	Students may voluntarily exit the programme after completing any semester. However, the award of an exit qualification shall be permitted only upon satisfying the prescribed credit and other eligibility requirements.
2. Academic Break	Students may avail themselves of an academic break of up to three consecutive academic years
3. Programme Discontinuation	Students discontinuing their studies without prior approval shall retain their earned credits, subject to the prescribed credit-validity period and re-entry requirements.
4. Re-entry Eligibility	Students may re-enter the same or an equivalent programme at the appropriate semester, provided they possess the required prerequisite credits and satisfy applicable academic requirements.
5. Maximum Programme Duration	Students shall complete the undergraduate programme within a maximum period of seven years from the date of initial admission, including academic breaks, subject to applicable UGC provisions.
6. Credit Validity	Credits earned shall remain valid for seven years, subject to applicable ABC regulations and any subsequent revisions.

Draft Report

7. Inter-University Re-entry	Students may seek re-entry into another university through a standardised credit-equivalence mechanism, subject to programme compatibility and seat availability.
8. Curriculum Changes	Students returning after a curriculum revision shall be permitted to complete approved bridge courses or additional credits to address curricular deficiencies without repeating equivalent courses.
9. Re-entry Schedule	Universities shall provide a common re-entry window before the commencement of each semester, with applications processed within a prescribed period.
10. Re-entry and Seat Availability	Re-entry shall ordinarily be accommodated against available seats. Universities may permit supernumerary admissions in justified cases, subject to regulatory approval and institutional capacity.

3. Recognition of Online Courses: Core Policy Provisions

Component	Policy
Eligible platforms	SWAYAM, NPTEL and other platforms eligible under applicable regulations and specifically approved by the university.
Prior approval	Each BoS shall evaluate eligible courses; the competent university authority shall approve and publish a semester-wise list before registration.
Credit limits	Apply the prevailing UGC SWAYAM ceiling (up to 40% of courses offered in a programme in a semester under the 2021 regulations) and any subsequent amendments.
Equivalence criteria	Map learning outcomes, syllabus coverage, academic level, instructional effort, credits and assessment standards.
Course classification	Specify approved applicability as Major, Minor, MDC, SEC, VAC or elective, where permitted by the programme structure.
Assessment	Require successful completion of the platform's prescribed recognized assessment and a verifiable certificate/grade statement.
Credit and grade transfer	Recognize approved credits without repeating equivalent university courses; apply a published grade-conversion methodology.
Records and mobility	Enter approved credits in university records and, where applicable, the ABC; support inter-university transfer subject to equivalence.

Student Registration and Credit Transfer Procedure

- **Pre-registration:** Students shall select courses from the university-approved list and obtain institutional approval before enrolment.
- **Course Completion:** Students shall complete the online learning requirements and prescribed assessment within the stipulated period.
- **Certificate Submission:** Students shall submit the digitally verifiable certificate and grade or score statement to the institution.

Draft Report

- **Verification:** The designated institutional coordinator shall verify the course, certificate, credits and approved equivalence.
- **Credit Transfer:** The university shall incorporate the recognized credits and applicable grades into the student's academic record, preferably within 30 days of receiving complete verified documentation.

Issue 15. Lack of Clarity and Uniformity in Fourth-Year Admission

The absence of clear and uniform guidelines governing admission to the fourth year of undergraduate programmes and subsequent postgraduate pathways creates significant academic and administrative uncertainties. Ambiguities persist regarding the minimum credit requirements for fourth-year admission, eligibility of students from the erstwhile CBCS scheme, permissible credit deficits and treatment of backlogs in SGPA calculation and merit ranking. Furthermore, the lack of a standardised index mark calculation that appropriately recognizes Major and Minor course achievements may disadvantage students seeking postgraduate admission in either discipline. Uncertainty regarding the extension of scholarships, fellowships and educational loan facilities to four-year Honours and Honours with Research graduates further complicates academic progression and financial accessibility. These gaps necessitate a comprehensive, equitable and standardised admission framework to ensure seamless academic mobility, transparent merit assessment and equal opportunities for all eligible students.

Proposed Solution(s)

4th year admission: Open to standard 3-year undergraduate who have successfully acquired a minimum of 120 credits (in Kerala state and other state with required credit and all semester pass certificate) (old CBCS scheme students can also be considered as per issue 14(1)).

Credit Deficit Accommodation: Recognizing minor variations or academic hurdles (such as in Kerala state guidelines), students missing a maximum of 13/12(proposed) credits from their 3-year curriculum can still be considered eligible.

SGPA Recalculation for Deficit Semesters: For semesters where a student has unearned credits or backlogs, the SGPA for evaluation and ranking purposes shall be computed by averaging the GPs of all subjects in that respective semester, rather than penalizing the cumulative score with zero-weight unearned courses. Admission to 4th year can be made based on finding the average of these SGPAs or awarded CGPA.

Financial Aid & Scholarships: Extend central scholarship schemes, fellowships and education loan portals to cover 4-year UG Honours/Honours with research graduates.

Draft Report

Hybrid Fourth-Year Admission and Equitable Seat Allocation Framework

A uniform, merit-based and student-centric fourth-year admission framework shall be introduced across universities in Kerala, incorporating the following provisions:

1. **Institutional Continuity for Honours:** Eligible students who have successfully completed the first three years in an institution shall receive first preference for admission to the fourth-year Honours programme in the same institution, subject to sanctioned intake and applicable regulations. Remaining vacancies shall be filled through institution-level common allotment.
2. **Equitable Access to Honours with Research:** Admission to Honours with Research shall be based on academic merit, prescribed eligibility, research supervision capacity and statutory reservation. A proposed distribution of 60% institutional-preference seats and 40% open-mobility seats may be considered, subject to legal and regulatory examination. Students of the host institution shall also be eligible to compete for open-mobility seats.
3. **Rationalisation of Sanctioned Intake:** The combined intake for Honours and Honours with Research shall ordinarily remain within the approved undergraduate intake and an additional intake of maximum 20% of the seats. The intake for the Honours with Research pathway shall be limited to 50% of the total approved intake or a maximum of five students per eligible research supervisor, subject to the availability of adequate research infrastructure, whichever is lower. The remaining seats shall be available for Honours.
4. **Centralised Mobility Allotment:** Universities shall establish a common admission and allotment mechanism for students seeking fourth-year admission in institutions other than their home college. This shall particularly facilitate students whose institutions do not offer the desired Honours or Honours with Research pathway.
5. **Protection of Student Preferences:** Eligible students shall be permitted to retain provisional Honours admission while participating in allotment for higher-preference Honours with Research seats. Admission upgrades shall be permitted without jeopardising their existing academic opportunities.
6. **Reservation and Academic Equity:** All admissions shall comply with applicable reservation policies, category-based eligibility relaxations and transparent merit criteria. A uniform mechanism for index-mark calculation shall be prescribed to ensure comparability among students from different institutions.
7. **Vacancy Management and Capacity Enhancement:** Unfilled seats shall be transferred to the appropriate common allotment pool. Conversion of unfilled research

Draft Report

seats into Honours seats and the creation of additional or supernumerary seats, may be permitted with prior university approval and subject to academic and infrastructural capacity.

8. **Research Collaboration:** Universities may facilitate approved collaborative arrangements among colleges, university departments and recognized research institutions to expand access to research facilities and supervision without compromising prescribed academic standards.
9. **Transparent Admission Calendar:** The entire process, including institutional continuation, research selection, common allotment, upgrades, credit transfers and grievance redressal, shall be completed within a uniform academic calendar before the commencement of Semester VII.

3.4 Fourth-Year Honours, Research and Experiential Learning

Issue 16. Honours pathways, project assessment and supervision

Operational guidance remains unclear regarding course choices, project assessment frameworks, supervisory ratios and research protocols for Honours and Honours with Research.

Proposed Solution(s)

1. Operationalizing Course Choices (Honours & Honours with Research Pathways)

Publish a centralized, university-approved repository of Level 400 (NHEQF Level 6) advanced major courses [**SIX** (Semester 7) and **TWO** (Semester 8)], minor electives and skill-based/vocational courses (**THREE**) well before the 7th-semester registration window. **Three** additional courses covering Research Methodology, Research Ethics, Academic Writing and IPR and Discipline-Specific research topics shall be designed to strengthen the research competencies of students pursuing the Honours with Research pathway.

Seamless Online Integration: Mandate the pre-approval of recognized SWAYAM/SWAYAM Plus or specialized online courses to eliminate friction in credit transfers for the 8th semester, ensuring students and faculty have transparent, upfront mapping of equivalent departmental electives.

2. Standardizing Project Assessment Frameworks

Multi-Tiered Evaluation Rubric: Replace subjective grading with a structured, transparent evaluation matrix comprising three core components:

- **Mid-Term Progress Review (20%):** Mandatory seminar and presentation evaluated by an internal departmental committee.

Draft Report

- **Dissertation / Thesis Quality (50%):** Assessed independently by an external examiner (from outside the institution) and an internal guide based on originality, methodology, literature review and outcomes.
- **Open Viva-Voce Defense (30%):** A formal defense of the major research project or dissertation before a panel consisting of the head of the department, internal guide and external expert.

3. Defining Supervisory Ratios & Workload Norms

Strict Cap on Student Load: Enforce a hard ceiling of a maximum of five undergraduate research students per faculty member at any given time to guarantee rigorous mentorship and close research oversight.

Direct Teaching-Hour Conversion Formula: Formally calculate faculty supervision workload using a standardized formula

Direct teaching hours per week = (Students supervised × Credits)/12

strictly capped at a maximum of 3 hours per week per faculty member to ensure equitable distribution of departmental teaching loads.

4. Establishing Standardized Research Protocols

Institutional Ethics and IPR Compliance: Mandate that all Honours with Research students undergo a compulsory module on Research Methodology, Ethics, Academic Writing and IPR during their 7th semester.

Standardized Documentation & Repository Submission: Establish uniform submission guidelines—including mandated formats for project proposals, progress logbooks, plagiarism check thresholds (via institutional tools like Urkund/ShodhShuddhi) and a centralized digital repository upload—prior to the final 8th-semester degree clearance.

Issue 17. Faculty Transfer Uncertainty Affecting Honours with Research

Mid-session faculty transfers threaten the mandatory requirement of two Ph.D guides needed to offer Honours with Research. Because supervision is capped at five students per guide, unexpected relocations disrupt admissions. Directives must mandate finalizing all faculty transfers by April to ensure stable research seat allocations before academic sessions begin.

Proposed Solution(s)

The mid-session transfer of permanent faculty members poses a severe threat to institutions striving to maintain the mandatory statutory requirement of at least two Ph.D.-holding faculty members required to offer the Honours with Research pathway under the

Draft Report

FYUGP. Because student supervision capacity is strictly capped at five undergraduate research students per eligible guide and official admission seat counts must be locked prior to academic rollouts, unexpected faculty relocations after the term commences can instantly strip a department of its eligibility, leaving enrolled scholars stranded and disrupting institutional planning.

To safeguard academic stability and ensure seamless intake notifications, urgent policy directions must be issued to the DCE and corporate educational managements to mandate that all routine faculty transfers and reassignments be finalized strictly by the end of April, thereby providing the administrative certainty required to accurately calculate supervision capacity and announce research admissions ahead of the new academic cycle.

Issue 18. Internships, local industry partnerships and research internships

Discipline-specific internships are limited and often accompanied by high fees from private providers, creating financial barriers. Short online modules are occasionally substituted for true internships without adequate experiential learning. Clear approval, supervision, documentation and evaluation guidelines are necessary.

Proposed Solution(s)

Instead of relying exclusively on large state-level empanelment alone that frequently bottleneck or default to classroom-style courses, individual colleges must be empowered to map and accredit local industries, registered cooperatives, DIC, Akshaya/IT hubs and local government bodies within their districts. The Government may consider introducing a policy framework requiring eligible registered industries, commercial establishments, public sector undertakings and other organizations operating in Keralam to accommodate a prescribed proportion of student interns annually, based on their workforce and operational capacity.

Research Internships as an Alternative: In accordance with UGC CCFUP 2022 (Section 2.2), students shall be permitted to undertake research internships under the mentorship of faculty members and researchers at their own or other HEIs and recognized research institutions. Such internships shall be recognized towards fulfilling the prescribed internship credit requirements, enabling students to gain hands-on research experience, strengthen practical skills and enhance their employability.

Draft Report

Issue 19. Faculty training for advanced and research-oriented courses

Faculty Training: The introduction of advanced capstone subjects and specialized research modules in the fourth year of the FYUGP requires specialized pedagogical frameworks, yet faculty members often lack adequate technical orientation. Because BoS currently focus primarily on syllabus design without institutionalized faculty development pipelines, teachers face significant challenges in delivering cutting-edge, practice-oriented content, directly impacting instructional quality and student mentorship.

Proposed Solution(s)

To bridge this capability gap, the BoS must mandate and directly coordinate comprehensive, hands-on FDPs and hands-on workshops prior to each academic semester. These specialized training sessions - conducted in collaboration with premier research institutions, industry partners and KSHEC - may equip teachers with updated technical methodologies, assessment toolkits and practical teaching strategies, ensuring seamless and standardized delivery of capstone curricula statewide.

3.5 Human Resources, Workload and Institutional Capacity

Issue 20. Inadequate Workload Assessment and Faculty Deployment

The existing pre-FYUGP baseline workload protection provisions (2024–2028) do not adequately account for the additional teaching requirements arising from the introduction of fourth-year Honours and Honours with Research programmes, including advanced courses, practical sessions, seminars and 12-credit research projects. The absence of a standardised mechanism for department-wise workload assessment and timely approval of additional guest faculty appointments creates uncertainty in faculty deployment and may adversely affect the effective delivery of fourth-year courses. Furthermore, the lack of uniform workload norms for research supervision and dissertation guidance results in inadequate recognition of faculty contributions to research mentoring. Uneven distribution of minor courses across odd and even semesters further contribute to fluctuations in teaching workload, complicating faculty allocation, guest lecturer appointments and remuneration. These inconsistencies highlight the need for a comprehensive, transparent and uniform workload assessment framework that accommodates the expanded academic responsibilities under FYUGP.

The Higher Education Department, through G.O.(Ms) No. 770/2024/HEDN dated 29.06.2024, has ensured the protection of existing sanctioned teaching workloads and posts in Government and Aided Colleges until the completion of the first FYUGP batch in 2028. The primary objective of this provision is to safeguard existing teaching posts

Draft Report

against potential workload reductions during the transition to FYUGP. However, the workload protection provision is being interpreted in certain instances as a restriction on recognising additional teaching workloads, thereby adversely affecting the appointment of guest lecturers required to meet the expanding academic demands of FYUGP. *The intention of freezing the existing workload is to prevent the loss of sanctioned posts, not to prohibit the recognition of additional workload arising from the introduction of new academic components.* With the commencement of fourth-year Honours and Honours with Research programmes, institutions will require additional faculty to offer advanced courses, practical sessions, seminars and research supervision. Deferring the recognition of these additional workload requirements until the comprehensive reassessment in 2028 would create serious faculty shortages and adversely affect the effective implementation of the fourth year.

Proposed Solution(s)

To address this issue, the Higher Education Department shall issue an explicit clarification distinguishing the protection of existing sanctioned workloads from the recognition of additional teaching requirements. While the existing workload and sanctioned posts shall remain protected until 2028, institutions shall be permitted to assess and claim additional teaching workloads arising from the implementation of FYUGP without waiting for the completion of the first batch. Accordingly, Principals of Government and Aided Colleges shall be directed to undertake an interim department-wise assessment of existing and anticipated teaching requirements approved by the FYUGP committee of the college, considering fourth-year course offerings, projected student enrolment, practical sessions, seminars, research supervision and faculty availability. The consolidated proposals specifying additional faculty requirements shall be scrutinised and validated by a competent committee constituted by the Higher Education Department. Based on the committee's recommendations, the DCE and the concerned universities shall be empowered to approve temporary guest lecturer appointments.

The appointment of guest lecturers against the additional workload identified through these interim assessments shall be treated strictly as a temporary academic arrangement and shall not prejudice, restrict or negate the future creation and sanctioning of permanent teaching posts based on the comprehensive workload reassessment after 2028. The additional workload met through guest faculty appointments shall be duly documented and considered in the final assessment of permanent faculty requirements. Thus, interim guest lecturer appointments shall neither substitute for nor diminish the eligibility of institutions to claim additional permanent teaching posts wherever justified by the actual

Draft Report

workload. This approach will ensure that immediate academic requirements are addressed without compromising long-term faculty strength or institutional development. [See **Appendix C** for sample workload calculation]

Issue 21. Lack of Uniform Workload Concessions

The absence of uniform and formally prescribed teaching workload concessions for faculty members entrusted with significant academic, administrative and institutional responsibilities creates an inequitable distribution of duties across affiliated colleges.

Proposed Solution(s)

Codify uniform, non-discretionary weekly teaching hour concessions for critical institutional roles across all affiliated colleges.

Vice-Principals, HoDs. FYUGP Coordinators & IQAC Coordinators: Grant a standard concession of 2 hours per week to manage institutional accreditation and multi-entry/exit credit tracking. In the case of HoDs, consider departments which runs major programmes only.

Exam Chief Superintendents / NSS / NCC Officers: Formalize standard workload reductions (e.g., 2 hours per week) to account for heavy statutory examination duties and community/cadet mobilization responsibilities.

- **Principals-in-Charge:** To ensure effective academic and administrative leadership, Principals-in-Charge shall be entrusted with a reduced teaching workload of 5 hours per week (or a maximum of 5 teaching hours per week). The resulting instructional deficit in their parent department shall be compensated through the appointment of additional guest faculty.
- These workloads shall be compensated by recruiting additional guest faculty.

Issue 22. Postgraduate enrolment shifts and effective faculty deployment

The introduction of four- year undergraduate programmes with the option of progressing to a one-year postgraduate programme may reduce enrolment in conventional two-year postgraduate programmes. This could affect colleges offering multiple postgraduate programmes, resulting in lower enrolment and uneven faculty workloads. A planned approach is necessary to maintain the viability of postgraduate departments and ensure the effective utilisation of existing faculty.

Proposed Solution(s)

Introduce Multiple Specializations under FYUGP: Colleges may offer additional specializations within existing major programmes, based on student demand, faculty

Draft Report

expertise and available infrastructure, subject to university and state regulations. This would broaden student choice and help utilize existing faculty resources.

1. Rationalize Faculty Workload: Faculty workload should account for teaching across relevant undergraduate and postgraduate courses, including advanced electives, practicals, projects and research supervision, in accordance with prescribed norms.

2. Provision for PG-Only Departments: In colleges where departments offer only postgraduate programmes, any decline in enrolment that affects faculty workload should be addressed by permitting eligible faculty to teach relevant undergraduate courses under FYUGP, subject to academic requirements and applicable university and state regulations.

3. Strengthen Two-Year PG Programmes: Colleges should enhance the distinct value of conventional postgraduate programmes through advanced specializations, research opportunities, laboratory training and industry-linked projects, as appropriate to the discipline.

Issue 23. Practical batch sizes and laboratory contact hours

The strict cap of a maximum of 16 students per practical batch—where any remainder triggers an additional batch—combined with the mandate to preserve practical exposure and absorb newly introduced laboratory components within existing sanctioned workloads, creates an acute operational dilemma for science and practice-oriented departments.

Proposed Solution(s)

For courses having laboratory work, batches are fixed at a maximum of 16 students. Additional batches are created for any remainder (e.g., 1–16 students = 1 batch; 17–32 students = 2 batches).

In disciplines where extensive laboratory practical work existed under the earlier three-year curriculum, practical credits and instructional hours may be reorganized under the FYUGP so that students continue to receive substantially equivalent practical exposure. Where new practical or laboratory components are introduced as part of the revised curriculum, the corresponding teaching hours may, as far as possible, be accommodated within the existing sanctioned workload.

Draft Report

3.6 Physical Infrastructure and Learning Resources

Issue 24. Mitigating Classroom Deficits

Institutions face severe spatial bottlenecks that threaten the smooth delivery of concurrent Major, Minor and research-oriented curricula unless immediate, innovative space-optimization and scheduling strategies are operationalized.

Proposed Solution(s)

To address the critical classroom shortages triggered by the introduction of the fourth year of the FYUGP—which expands student retention and introduces simultaneous Major, Minor, Research and Skill cohorts—relying solely on new construction is financially and temporally impractical. A strategic, multi-pronged infrastructure management model combining spatial re-engineering, flexible scheduling and phased resource utilization offers the most viable solution.

1. Immediate Spatial Optimization (Acoustic Partitioning & Flexible Zones)

- Convert oversized legacy lecture halls into modular learning pods using demountable acoustic partition walls.
- Equip these partitioned spaces with flexible seating and mobile whiteboards, turning single large footprints into dual 30-to-40-seater interactive seminar rooms ideal for advanced 4th-year Major and Honours-with-Research batches.

2. Synchronized Shift-Based Timetabling with a Core Overlap Window

Implement a structured dual-shift template to eradicate classroom congestion:

- **Morning Shift (8:00 AM – 1:30 PM):** Dedicated primarily to foundational courses, core theory classes and lower-semester lectures.
- **Afternoon Shift (12:00 PM – 5:30 PM):** Dedicated to specialized 4th-year Honours courses, research methodology seminars and practical laboratory sessions.
- **The Midday Overlap (12:00 PM – 1:30 PM):** Utilized jointly for common library hours, institutional dining, campus networking and shared faculty mentoring, ensuring smooth transition without student clustering.

3. Long-Term Infrastructure Expansion via State and Alumni Grants

- While shift systems and modular partitions may help address immediate space constraints, institutions should initiate phased infrastructure expansion, including vertical classroom construction, to establish permanent research laboratories and dedicated departmental libraries for the fourth-year student cohort. For this purpose, funds from State Higher Education Development Grants, alumni endowments and MP/MLA Local Area Development (LAD) funds may also be mobilized, ensuring sustainable infrastructure development and optimal utilisation of available resources.

Draft Report

- The inter-disciplinary structure of FYUGP requires students to move frequently between departments to attend classes. Carrying bags and other personal belongings throughout the day can be inconvenient, particularly for students with disabilities. Institutions should therefore provide designated, secure and easily accessible facilities for storing students' belongings, preferably at central locations on campus. Such facilities would improve student convenience, accessibility and inclusivity.

Issue 25. Research equipment, libraries, laboratories and technical support

Undergraduate-only departments and laboratory-intensive science programmes face critical shortages of specialized instruments, equipment, technical staff, research facilities and advanced library resources (such as journals and translated textbooks) to support fourth-year delivery and dissertations.

Proposed Solution(s)

1. Research Infrastructure Model

Inter-Institutional Consortia & Resource Pooling: Establish formal regional resource-sharing clusters where undergraduate-only colleges are linked to nearby university departments, research centres (such as CSIR, ICAR or biotechnology parks) or well-equipped post-graduate institutions.

Note:- *Universities may extend support to affiliated colleges by procuring essential academic softwares through bulk purchase. This would ensure affordability, uniform access and quality software for all colleges.*

Dedicated Instrument Access Pass: Create a subsidized booking framework allowing undergraduate students and faculty supervisors to schedule block-time usage on high-end analytical equipment housed at parent universities or regional hubs.

2. Digital Resource & Advanced Library Expansion

Consortium-Based E-Journal Access: Extend centralized e-resource access—traditionally reserved for university departments—to all affiliated colleges offering FYUGP Honours and Research tracks, ensuring students have unrestricted access to premium scientific journals, databases and research archives.

National Translation & Digital Repository Hub: Leverage national initiatives to rapidly curate and deploy peer-reviewed scientific textbooks, reference manuals and foundational research literature translated into regional languages.

Draft Report

3. Dedicated Capital Grants & Phased Infrastructure Upgrades

Targeted Fourth-Year Enhancement Grants: Institute a dedicated state/central capital grant specifically earmarked for upgrading undergraduate science laboratories to meet Level 400 research standards (focusing on safety gear, consumables and modular lab benches).

Industry and Alumni CSR Partnerships: Facilitate institutional linkages with CSR initiatives and alumni foundations to fund specialized equipment procurement through matching-grant models.

4. Technical Staff Augmentation & Training

Shared Technical Pool & Apprenticeships: Deploy visiting technical experts or shared instrument technicians across college clusters to maintain precision equipment and train undergraduate researchers.

Capacity Building Workshops: Conduct hands-on technical training programmes for existing laboratory assistants to handle advanced instrumentation required for 12-credit major dissertations.

3.7 Examinations, Certification and Student Equity

Issue 26. Inconsistencies in Examination Patterns and Duration

Inconsistencies in examination patterns, examination durations and evaluation timelines create disparities in academic standards and assessment practices. Variations in examination duration, with students required to attend examinations lasting one hour, one and a half hours or two hours on successive days, make it difficult for them to adapt their time-management strategies and plan their answers effectively within the examination hall. Such inconsistencies also complicate examination scheduling and administration at the institutional level. Furthermore, the absence of a uniform provision for *cool-off time* (additional time allotted for reading and understanding the question paper before commencing the examination) places students at a disadvantage, particularly in examinations requiring analytical thinking and detailed responses. These variations highlight the need for a standardised yet flexible statewide examination framework that ensures academic equity, transparency, consistency and fairness in assessment while accommodating the diverse requirements of different courses and disciplines.

Proposed Solution(s)

To seamlessly operationalize a uniform examination pattern without triggering administrative chaos in university tabulation software, the system can adopt a standardized 60-mark, 2-hour external written question paper blueprint across all

Draft Report

courses. Regardless of a course's credit, students face a predictable, uniform time-management rhythm in the examination hall, while the university backend handles evaluation out of 60 raw marks. If a university scheme requires a course to be evaluated out of a maximum of 70 ESA marks (for a 4-credit course) or 50 ESA marks (for a 3-credit course), the raw score secured out of 60 is linearly scaled:

$$\text{Final ESA Score} = \text{Raw Marks Obtained} \times \frac{\text{Target Maximum ESA Marks}}{60}$$

This approach successfully eliminates student anxiety regarding unpredictable exam durations and erratic exam formats while preserving complete mathematical and credit integrity in the final grade sheets.

Integration of Cool-Off Time: To ensure a balanced and thorough assessment across diverse categories of questions mapped to higher cognitive levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, a designated 'cool-off' time should be integrated into the commencement of all written examinations. This initial window provides candidates with the necessary time to read complex question papers, evaluate options and structure their responses thoughtfully before writing begins, thereby enhancing assessment fairness and reducing examination stress.

Issue 27. Result, revaluation and sports grace-mark provisions

Result-processing timelines, revaluation delays and supplementary examination schedules (proposed within a 45-day window) require strict enforcement. The existing grace mark policy recognizes only a student's highest achievement in a single sports event, denying additional grace marks for meritorious performances and achievements in multiple sports events.

Proposed Solution(s)

The 45-Day Result-to-Supplementary Mandate:

- Results for all ESE must be published strictly within 30 days of the final exam date through an automated digital tabulation pipeline.
- Supplementary examinations must be notified within 10 days of result publication and conducted strictly within a 45-day window to prevent academic session backlogs.

Time-Bound Revaluation SOP:

- Open applications for revaluation/scrutiny for a compressed 10-day window immediately following result declaration.
- Mandate that revaluation results be published within 20 days of application closure. If a revaluation variance exceeds 10% of the total marks, a mandatory second

Draft Report

independent digital evaluation should be triggered automatically at no extra cost to the student.

Grace marks may be awarded on a cumulative basis by aggregating all eligible achievements across different sports events, rather than considering only the highest achievement in a single event.

Issue 28. Fee equity and E-Grantz stream migration

To resolve the critical financial and administrative deadlock faced by E- Grantz beneficiaries when changing disciplines (such as switching from an arts stream with lower fee structures to a science stream with higher laboratory fees), where the state welfare portal locks the initial fee structure and rejects subsequent escalations, universities and colleges in Keralam must implement an automated, dynamic fee-reconciliation protocol.

Proposed Solution(s)

The apex higher education bodies in Keralam should coordinate with the Directorate of Scheduled Castes Development and Backward Classes Development to introduce a "One-Time Stream Migration Window" in the E-Grantz software. This dedicated window would specifically accommodate multi-disciplinary shifts under the FYUGP, permitting legally backed fee adjustments between regular and self-financing streams without penalizing scholarship recipients.

Course-Based Fee Rationalization: In campuses offering both aided and self-financing programmes, current regulations permit aided students to cross-register for courses in the self- financing stream while restricting the reciprocal option. Consequently, students enrolled in self- financing streams face barriers—such as restricted minor options despite higher tuition fees— primarily due to program-level fee structures. To ensure equity and flexibility, this rigid structure should be replaced with a per-course tuition model. Fees can be rationalized based on course categories (such as credit weightage, theory-only or theory-cum-laboratory components). Furthermore, since semester credit loads per student vary flexibly between 18 and 27 credits, a uniform program fee is inequitable; tuition should instead be assessed dynamically in proportion to the exact courses and credits selected by the student.

Issue 29. Scholarships and support for fourth-year research

Dedicated scholarships or stipends should be established for meritorious and economically disadvantaged students pursuing the intensive fourth-year Honours with Research pathway.

Draft Report

Proposed Solution(s)

Undergraduate Research Catalyst Grants: These should provide a monthly subsistence or contingency allowance (e.g., for lab consumables, software licenses or field surveys) to meritorious students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds who clear the 75% aggregate threshold.

Industry-Academia Co-Funded Fellowships: Leveraging local industry networks (such as IT parks, chambers of commerce and R&D units), institutions can establish sponsored project fellowships where partner firms fund minor research grants or monthly living stipends for students undertaking specialized industrial dissertations.

3.8 Digital Governance and Implementation Support

Issue 30. Interoperable academic systems and shared learning platforms

The lack of integrated, common statewide platforms for enterprise resource management, LMS and student tracking creates friction in course delivery, ABC integration and external credit mapping.

Proposed Solution(s)

Interoperable API-First Architecture: Ensure the ERM is built on open API standards, allowing seamless data exchange between individual university databases and the apex Higher education council without manual CSV uploads or redundant data entry.

Centralized LMS with Open Content Repository: Deploy a state-hosted, scalable LMS (such as a centralized Moodle) shared across all universities. This platform should host standard core and elective syllabi, digital resource modules and video lectures.

IX. General Guidelines

(a) **Provisional Certification Timelines:** Mandate that universities issue digital Provisional Degree Certificates and Consolidated Grade Cards via Digi Locker within 10 days of semester results publication to prevent any career or academic transition delays.

(b) **Optimizing Class Sizes:** Due to high student demand, certain courses especially AECs currently accommodate over 100 students per batch, which impacts classroom engagement and instructional quality. To safeguard pedagogical standards and ensure meaningful student choice, a strict enrolment cap of 75 students per batch is recommended. Should registrations exceed this threshold, institutions should be permitted to establish parallel batches for the course.

Draft Report

(c) **Revision of Non-Teaching Staff Pattern:** The existing staff pattern for non-teaching personnel was formulated over a decade ago. Since then, significant institutional expansion—including the introduction of new courses, additional batches and the recent implementation of the FYUGP—has substantially increased administrative and technical workloads. Consequently, the non-teaching staff pattern must be comprehensively revised and refixed in alignment with the current academic workload.

(d) **Development of Study Materials:** Due to the scarcity of standard textbooks for several newly introduced or specialized courses, the BoS must take a proactive initiative to develop and provide comprehensive study materials. Ensuring accessible, high-quality reference texts is essential to maintain academic standards, support independent learning and ensure equitable resource availability for all students.

(e) **Higher Education-School Linkages:** Sufficient awareness regarding the FYUGP—including its flexible entry-exit options, multiple pathways and credit structures—must be systematically disseminated at the Plus Two (higher secondary) level, as students and parents alike often remain unfamiliar with its framework. To bridge this information gap, HEIs should proactively collaborate with nearby higher secondary schools to conduct structured orientation sessions, career counseling workshops and interactive awareness drives. In addition to expert talks, initiatives such as 'Campus Open Days' for Plus two students, distribution of multilingual FAQ booklets and dedicated digital helpdesks can be established. Engaging parents through PTA meetings will further ensure that families make informed, forward-looking academic choices aligned with contemporary higher education reforms.

(f) **Alternative Credit Replacement on Mark Lists**: In cases where a student has cleared a failed course by successfully completing an equivalent online course, a formal provision should be introduced to permit the removal or replacement of the initial failure entry from the final grade card or mark list. This measure ensures that students are not unduly penalized on their official academic transcripts for a transitory backlog that has been successfully compensated through recognized alternative credit pathways.

(g) **Professors of Practice and retired faculty:** Professors of Practice and retired professors may be engaged, wherever necessary, to address faculty shortages and meet specialized teaching, research and academic requirements, subject to applicable regulations.

(h) **Uniform workload norms for UG programmes:** Comprehensive and uniform guidelines shall be formulated for assessing and calculating faculty workload for the

Draft Report

fourth year of undergraduate programmes, ensuring consistency in workload assessment and faculty allocation across institutions.

(g) The **Interim Report** is also included as **Appendix D**.

4. CONCLUSION

The review of the FYUGP marks a defining moment in Keralam's higher education journey. The programme has introduced flexibility, inter-disciplinarity, skill acquisition and student-centric pathways. Yet, its implementation has revealed structural ambiguities, uneven practices and systemic challenges that cannot be overlooked. The committee's evaluation underscores the need for clarity in nomenclature, rationalization of credit structures, harmonization of admission calendars and stronger alignment between undergraduate and postgraduate trajectories.

The proposed transition to a Flexible Graduate Programme (FGP) is more than a change in terminology; it represents a philosophical shift toward adaptability, inclusivity and academic continuity. By addressing bottlenecks in minor course distribution, standardizing accelerated and extended pathways and reforming assessment systems, Keralam can ensure that students experience balanced workloads, transparent evaluation and equitable opportunities. Equally vital are investments in faculty development, mentoring systems, infrastructure upgrades and student support mechanisms, which together create an ecosystem that nurtures holistic growth.

This roadmap is not merely corrective but visionary. It positions Keralam to lead nationally in shaping a dynamic model of higher education that is globally relevant yet locally responsive. By embracing these reforms, the state can transform FYUGP into a sustainable framework that empowers learners, strengthens institutions and enhances academic excellence. The conclusion is clear: Keralam must act decisively to harmonize, rationalize and innovate, ensuring that its higher education system remains resilient, inclusive and future-ready.

Draft Report

APPENDIX A

Minor Credit Requirements and Flexibility under the Single Major Pathway

1. Regulatory Context and Need for Harmonisation

The UGC CCFUP, December 2022, recognizes multiple undergraduate award categories and pathways, including Single Major, Double Major, inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary programmes (Section 3.2.3). Its credit-distribution tables must be read alongside the provisions defining Major and Minor disciplines and the curricular components expected of students. The UGC Regulations, 2025, must also be considered when framing university-level ordinances and regulations.

2. Relevant Provisions of the CCFUP (December 2022)

- Section 3.2.2 (Major and Minor Disciplines): Provides for a minimum of 12 credits to qualify in a Minor discipline. The 12-credit threshold is therefore a relevant minimum when identifying and recognizing a Minor component.
- Section 5.1.2 (Disciplinary/Inter-disciplinary Minors): Provides students an option to choose courses from disciplinary or inter-disciplinary Minors and skill-based courses relating to a chosen vocational education programme. This supports flexibility in the selection and design of Minor-related learning.
- Section 5.3 (Programme/Curricular Components): States that students will undergo courses in four broad disciplines—Major, Minor and two MDCs. This provision must be addressed explicitly in the design of a Single Major curriculum rather than disregarded.
- Section 3.2.3 and Section 5 (Award Categories and Credit Requirements): The Single Major pathway is recognized, while the credit requirements and distribution tables should be interpreted consistently with the framework's stated curricular components and degree-award conditions.

3. Reading the UGC Regulations, 2025 with the CCFUP

Section 10.0 of the UGC Regulations, 2025, provides for at least 50% of total credits in a discipline to earn an undergraduate degree with a Major in that discipline and permits flexibility in the remaining credits through skill courses, apprenticeships and multi-disciplinary subjects. This establishes a minimum Major-credit threshold, but does not, by itself, conclusively dispense with the curricular expectations relating to Minors under the CCFUP. The two instruments should therefore be interpreted harmoniously, rather than treating the flexibility provision as an automatic exemption from all Minor requirements.

4. Recommended Structure for the Single Major Pathway

For regulatory clarity and to preserve both disciplinary depth and curricular breadth, the following structure is recommended:

Draft Report

- Retain a minimum of 50% of total programme credits in the Major discipline, in accordance with the applicable UGC requirements.
- Provide an identifiable Minor component of at least 12 credits, selected from approved disciplinary or inter-disciplinary Minor offerings.
- Permit Minor courses to be drawn from closely related or complementary disciplines, including inter-disciplinary areas, rather than compelling students to select an unrelated subject solely to fill a fixed credit slot.
- Allow credits beyond the prescribed minimum Minor requirement to be allocated to the Major, advanced disciplinary electives, skill courses, practical learning or other approved curricular components, subject to the overall programme-credit structure and mandatory curricular requirements.
- Ensure that the required multi-disciplinary exposure, including the two MDCs envisaged in Section 5.3, is preserved in the curriculum.

5. Implementation and Regulatory Safeguards

Universities and Boards of Studies may design flexible Single Major regulations that recognize a 12-credit Minor component without necessarily requiring a full, separately structured Minor programme extending beyond that minimum. The selected courses, their disciplinary or inter-disciplinary classification, credit mapping and transcript recognition should be clearly specified in the approved curriculum. Any reallocation of credits must not reduce the minimum Minor component or displace other mandatory requirements.

Where a university proposes a pathway without any Minor credits, the apparent tension with Section 5.3 and the Minor provisions of the CCFUP should first be resolved through a formal regulatory clarification from the competent authority, rather than inferred solely from Section 10.0 of the 2025 Regulations.

6. Concluding Recommendation

The Single Major pathway should be implemented with maximum permissible flexibility, while retaining a minimum 12-credit disciplinary/inter-disciplinary Minor component and the prescribed multi-disciplinary exposure. Minor study should be student-centered, relevant and adaptable; additional credits may strengthen the Major or other approved components. This balanced approach avoids compulsory enrolment in an unrelated, extensive Minor programme while maintaining consistency with the CCFUP provisions identified above.

APPENDIX B

MODEL SKILL COURSE SYLLABUS

Draft Report

Data Visualization with Python

Sample / Model Undergraduate Skill Course aligned to the NCrF approach

Purpose: This model illustrates how a UG skill course can be designed around demonstrable occupational/academic skills, learning outcomes, practical work, evidence of proficiency and outcome-based assessment. It is intended for adaptation by a University/HEI through its statutory academic bodies.

1. Course Identity

Component	Proposed Specification
Course Title	Data Visualization with Python
Course Type	Skill Course / Skill Enhancement Course
Broad Discipline	Computer Science / Data Science / Multi-disciplinary
Suggested UG Stage	Second Year Undergraduate
Indicative NCrF Level	Level 5.0 – to be confirmed by the affiliating University/HEI against the approved programme structure
Credits	3 Credits (model)
Suggested Learning Hours	45 hours total learner engagement
Suggested Distribution	15 hours guided theory/demonstration + 30 hours hands-on practical/experiential learning
Prerequisite	Basic computer operation and elementary mathematics; prior programming exposure is desirable
Mode	Blended: demonstration, guided lab, problem-based practice, mini-project and viva
Course Status	Sample syllabus – not a regulatory prescription

2. Rationale and Skill Focus

The course develops the ability to acquire, clean, analyze and visually communicate data using Python-based tools. The emphasis is on what the learner can actually perform: preparing datasets, selecting suitable visual forms, creating reproducible visualizations, interpreting results, communicating insights and completing a small real-world task independently.

3. Course Objectives

- Develop practical competence in handling structured datasets.
- Use Python libraries and tools to create appropriate charts and dashboards.
- Apply data-cleaning and exploratory-analysis techniques to real datasets.
- Interpret visual patterns and communicate evidence-based insights clearly.
- Demonstrate independent problem solving through a mini-project.
- Build a portfolio of verifiable practical outputs.

Draft Report

4. Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

CLO	At the end of the course, the learner will be able to…	Primary skill evidence
CLO1	Import, inspect and organize a dataset using appropriate Python tools.	Working notebook / data-preparation task
CLO2	Clean common data-quality problems such as missing values, duplicates and inconsistent formats.	Cleaned dataset + code
CLO3	Select and produce suitable visualizations for categorical, numerical and time-series data.	Chart set produced from a given dataset
CLO4	Interpret charts and identify trends, comparisons, relationships and anomalies without misleading presentation.	Written interpretation / viva
CLO5	Create a reproducible visual analytics workflow using Python and document the steps.	Reproducible notebook
CLO6	Complete and present a small real-world data-visualization project independently.	Mini-project + demonstration + viva

5. Unit-wise Skill Content

Unit	Indicative Topics	Practical Skills / Performance
I. Data & Python Foundations	CSV/Excel data; variables; data types; NumPy/Panda's basics; reading datasets; inspection.	Load a dataset; inspect shape/types; select/filter data; save processed data.
II. Data Cleaning & Preparation	Missing values; duplicates; type conversion; text/date cleaning; grouping and aggregation.	Clean a messy dataset and produce a documented clean-data file.
III. Visualization Techniques	Matplotlib/Seaborn basics; bar, line, scatter, histogram, box plot, heatmap; labels and annotations.	Construct and customize at least six appropriate visualizations.
IV. Visual Analytics & Communication	Choosing the right chart; comparison; trends; distributions; correlation; misleading graphs; accessibility.	Convert an analytical question into a visual story and explain findings.
V. Mini-Project	Problem identification; dataset selection; workflow; visual report; presentation.	Complete a reproducible mini-project and defend design choices in a viva.

6. Suggested Practical Exercises

No.	Practical	Performance Requirement	Indicative Marks
1	Dataset inspection	Import a CSV dataset, inspect dimensions, data types, missing values and summary statistics.	10
2	Data cleaning	Handle missing values, duplicates and inconsistent data types; document each decision.	10

Draft Report

No.	Practical	Performance Requirement	Indicative Marks
3	Categorical comparison	Create and interpret bar/column charts for category-wise comparison.	10
4	Trend analysis	Create a time-series visualization and identify major trends or changes.	10
5	Distribution analysis	Use histogram/box plot to examine distribution and possible outliers.	10
6	Relationship analysis	Use scatter plot/heatmap to explore relationships among variables.	10
7	Visual design task	Redesign a misleading or cluttered chart and justify the improvements.	10
8	Integrated mini-task	Answer a real-world question using data preparation + 3–5 visualizations + interpretation.	15
9	Viva / demonstration	Demonstrate code, explain decisions, troubleshoot a small change requested by assessor.	15

7. Practical Assessment Framework

The central assessment principle is direct observation of performance. Marks should be awarded for what the learner demonstrates, not merely for reproducing written theory.

Component	Weight	Assessment Evidence
Continuous Practical Skill Assessment	40%	Observed lab tasks, checklists, notebooks, code quality and troubleshooting
End-Semester Practical Performance Test	30%	Individual task completed under supervised conditions
Mini-Project / Portfolio	20%	Problem, dataset, reproducible notebook, visual report and demonstration
Viva Voce	10%	Oral defense of methods, interpretation and practical decisions
Total	100%	All components mapped to CLOs

8. Practical Performance Rubric

Criterion	Excellent (4)	Competent (3)	Developing (2)	Beginning (1)
Task execution	Completes independently and accurately; handles variations.	Completes standard task with minor support.	Completes part of task; needs guidance.	Unable to complete without substantial support.
Tool usage	Uses tools efficiently and selects appropriate functions.	Uses required tools correctly.	Uses basic tools with errors.	Unable to use tools appropriately.

Draft Report

Criterion	Excellent (4)	Competent (3)	Developing (2)	Beginning (1)
Problem solving	Diagnoses errors and selects effective solutions independently.	Solves routine errors with limited support.	Needs prompts to diagnose problems.	Cannot diagnose or correct problems.
Output quality	Accurate, clear, reproducible and professionally presented.	Accurate and adequately documented.	Some accuracy/documentation issues.	Major errors or incomplete output.
Interpretation	Explains patterns and limitations with sound reasoning.	Explains main findings correctly.	Identifies findings but explanation is limited.	Cannot adequately interpret output.
Communication	Clear, concise and confident demonstration.	Clear explanation with minor gaps.	Partly clear; relies on prompts.	Unable to explain the work adequately.

9. Sample End-Semester Practical Examination

Stage	Task	Marks	Time
A	Dataset preparation: import, inspect and clean a supplied dataset.	20	30 min
B	Create three specified visualizations using suitable methods.	25	45 min
C	Solve one unseen analytical question and produce an appropriate visual.	20	35 min
D	Interpret results and identify one limitation or possible source of bias/error.	10	15 min
E	Viva + live modification/debugging task.	15	20 min
F	Code/documentation/reproducibility check.	10	15 min
Total		100	160 min

10. Competency-Based Assessment Checklist

- ✓ Can load a dataset in an appropriate format.
- ✓ Can inspect structure, types and basic quality issues.
- ✓ Can clean common data-quality problems.
- ✓ Can choose a suitable visualization for a stated analytical purpose.
- ✓ Can create and label a chart correctly.
- ✓ Can modify a chart based on a user requirement.
- ✓ Can interpret the visualization accurately.
- ✓ Can identify a misleading visualization and improve it.
- ✓ Can reproduce the analysis from a saved notebook/code file.
- ✓ Can explain and defend practical decisions during viva.

11. Evidence of Learning / Student Skill Portfolio

- Practical record / digital laboratory notebook
- Source code or executable notebook
- Cleaned datasets and final visual outputs

Draft Report

- Two best practical tasks selected by the learner
- Mini-project report and presentation
- Assessor checklist and rubric
- Viva record
- Self-reflection: skills mastered, difficulties faced and next skill target

12. Suggested Grading Interpretation

Score	Performance Interpretation	Suggested Academic Record
90–100	Advanced proficiency – independent and adaptable performance	Outstanding / as per HEI grade scale
75–89	Proficient – reliable independent performance	Very Good / as per HEI grade scale
60–74	Competent – meets expected course skill standard	Good / as per HEI grade scale
50–59	Developing competence – requires limited support	Satisfactory / as per HEI grade scale
Below 50	Not yet competent – targeted remediation required	Re-assessment / as per HEI rules

Note: The labels and pass thresholds above are illustrative. The affiliating University/HEI should prescribe the official grade bands and minimum competency requirements.

13. Teaching–Learning Strategy

- 20% concept briefing and demonstration
- 50% guided and independent hands-on laboratory practice
- 15% problem-based tasks and troubleshooting
- 10% mini-project / real-world dataset work
- 5% peer review, reflection and feedback

14. Mapping of CLOs to Assessment

CLO	Continuous Practical	End Practical	Mini-Project	Viva
CLO1	✓	✓	✓	
CLO2	✓	✓	✓	✓
CLO3	✓	✓	✓	✓
CLO4	✓	✓	✓	✓
CLO5	✓	✓	✓	✓
CLO6			✓	✓

15. NCrF Alignment Notes

This model uses the NCrF principles of credit-linked learning, clearly defined learning outcomes and recognition of practical/experiential learning. The notified NCrF document distinguishes credit workload for theory, practical and experiential learning and emphasizes that skill components should be supported by appropriate assessment of proficiency. Exact credit allocation, NCrF level, qualification nomenclature and

Draft Report

certification requirements must be aligned with the approved University/HEI programme structure and any applicable UGC/NSQF/sector regulatory requirements.

For a skill-oriented course, the assessment should therefore capture demonstrated competence through observation, performance tasks, projects, portfolios and viva rather than relying only on a conventional written examination.

16. Quality Assurance and Moderation

- Prepare a common practical question/task bank with multiple equivalent tasks.
- Use a standardised rubric and assessor checklist.
- Moderate practical tasks and rubrics through the Board of Studies/competent academic body.
- Maintain evidence of student performance for internal quality review.
- Where external practical assessment is prescribed, use qualified external examiners as per university regulations.
- Provide structured remediation and re-assessment opportunities according to university rules.

17. Suggested Resources

- Python documentation and standard library references
- Pandas' documentation
- Matplotlib documentation
- Seaborn documentation
- Open datasets from government/open-data repositories for authentic practice

Draft Report

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE WORKLOAD CALCULATION

(for 7th & 8th Semester)

	7th Semester				8th Semester			
	Honors (hrs)		With Research(hrs)		Honors (hrs)		With Research(hrs)	
	Theory	With Lab	Theory	With Lab	Theory	With Lab	Theory	With Lab
Honours only								
3 Major + 3 Minor	12	18			8	12		
6 Major+ 2 Online	24	36			0	0		
6 Major + 2 Offline	24	36			8	12		
Not doing project (3 papers)	12	18						
Honours with research only								
3 Major + 3 Research + 2 online			24	36			0	0
3 Major + 3 Research + 2 offline			24	36			8	12

	Theory Only		With Lab	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
For Honours Only	12	44	18	66
For Honours with Research only	24	32	36	48
For Both	24	44	36	66

Draft Report

APPENDIX D

INTERIM REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This Interim Report presents a set of actionable recommendations arising from the Committee's evaluation of the implementation of the Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP) in the Universities and Colleges of Keralam. The recommendations are intended to strengthen academic quality, assessment practices, governance, student support and regulatory coherence, while ensuring effective and uniform implementation of the objectives envisaged under FYUGP.

1. **Evaluation of Teacher-Specific Module**

Twenty percent of the total Continuous Comprehensive Assessment (CCA) marks may be awarded based on the assessment and evaluation of the 5th/Teacher-specific module in each course.

Action required:

A. **University of Kerala:** Replace clause 4.1 with the following

   Clause 4.1: Up to 20% of the course syllabus may be designed by the faculty of the HEI offering the course. The proposed component shall constitute the 5th/Teacher-Specific module of the syllabus and shall be prepared and submitted to the Board of Studies (BoS) at least two months prior to the commencement of the semester. If no decision is communicated by the BoS before the commencement of the semester, the module shall be deemed to have been approved. Twenty percent of the total Continuous Comprehensive Assessment (CCA) marks shall be awarded based on the assessment and evaluation conducted for this module.

B. **University of Calicut:** Existing Clauses 19.9 and 19.10 are sufficient

C. **MG University:** Existing Clause 11.i is sufficient

D. **Kannur University:** Add the following sentence at the end of Clause 18.4:

   "Further, 20% of the total Continuous Comprehensive Assessment (CCA) marks shall be awarded on the basis of the assessment and evaluation of the 5th module (Teacher Specific Content) included in the syllabus."

2. **Nature of question papers**

Question papers for the FYUGP (both internal and external) shall be designed based on stated outcomes to assess a range of cognitive skills as per Bloom's Revised Taxonomy. Approximately 60% of the questions shall assess cognitive levels up to Level 4 (Analyze), 30% of the questions shall assess Level 5 (Evaluate) and the remaining 10% shall assess Level 6 (Create), ensuring an appropriate distribution of higher-order thinking skills across the assessment.

Draft Report

Each University may constitute an Assessment and Evaluation Review Committee (AERC) to periodically review both CCA and ESA question papers including assignments. The Committee shall examine the quality and appropriateness of the questions and verify their alignment with the prescribed Course Outcomes and Programme Outcomes. The Committee shall submit its recommendations for necessary improvements which should be communicated to teachers. The committee should meet at least once in a semester.

Action required:

A. University of Kerala: Revise clause 4.3.18 in line with the above recommendation

B. University of Calicut: Revise clause 19.15.a in line with the above recommendation

C. MG University: Revise clause 20.XVIII in line with the above recommendation

D. Kannur University: Revise clause 18.9.22.a in line with the above recommendation

3. **Constituting an Inter University BoS Committee**

The Higher Education Council shall constitute an **Inter University BoS Committee (IUBC)** for each discipline, comprising the Chairpersons of the respective Boards of Studies from all Universities. The Higher Education Council shall designate a Convenor for each IUBC, who shall convene and coordinate meetings at least twice in every academic year. The IUBC shall review and recommend measures for harmonizing curriculum structure, syllabus format, internship requirements, assessment practices and examination frameworks across universities and shall submit its recommendations to the Council for implementation and periodic review. The Committee shall meet at least once every semester, not later than one month before the commencement of the semester.

Action required:

A. **University of Kerala:** Revise clause 2.7.3 in line with the above recommendation

B. **University of Calicut:** Revise clause 10.11 in line with the above recommendation

C. **MG University:** Revise clause 15.VI in line with the above recommendation

D. **Kannur University:** Revise clause 24.14 in line with the above recommendation

4. **Notifying eligible online courses in advance**

Draft Report

All Board of Studies shall review, approve and notify the list of eligible online courses before the commencement of each semester. As the availability and content of online courses may vary from semester to semester, only those courses included in the approved list for the respective semester shall be considered for credit transfer and fulfillment of programme requirements. Students shall enroll only in courses appearing in the approved list.

Action required:

A. **University of Kerala:** Revise Clause 2.5.3 in line with the above recommendation
B. **University of Calicut:** Revise Clause 7.3.10 in line with the above recommendation
C. **MG University:** Revise Clause 15.iii in line with the above recommendation
D. **Kannur University:** Append clause 3.42 with the above recommendation

5. **Constituting SCAPEC to professionalize Academic Calendaring**

Constitute a State Consortium for Academic Planning and Examination Coordination (**SCAPEC**), comprising of Vice Chairman, Higher Education Council (Chairperson), representative of the State Higher Education Council, Registrars and Controllers of Examinations of universities, to prepare, finalize and publish a common Academic Calendar, including examination schedules by 31 March each year for the succeeding academic year and ensure its uniform implementation across all Universities.

6. **Enabling Honours with Research Option**

Enable departments with adequate research infrastructure, including access to libraries and journals, computer and laboratory facilities and at least two permanent faculty members with Ph.D. qualifications **(recognized by the concerned University)**, to offer the Honours with Research.

Action required:

University of Kerala: Revise Clause 2.10.e. in line with the above recommendation
University of Calicut: Revise Clause 4.8 in line with the above recommendation
MG University: Revise Clause 4.viii, ix, xi in line with the above recommendation
Kannur University: Revise Clause 3.8 in line with the above recommendation

7. **Strengthening the Internship Ecosystem**

Provide a mechanism in the internship portal, maintained by KELTRON, for recording, accessing and reviewing mentor and mentee assessments, including student feedback

Draft Report

on internship-providing organizations. The portal should enable mentors, mentees and institutional authorities to submit and view assessment reports and ratings. These evaluations should form part of a structured review process for internship providers, with organizations receiving consistently poor ratings or unsatisfactory assessments being identified for corrective action, suspension or discontinuation from future internship engagements. Mentor or organization engagement should be terminated only after the prescribed assessment, feedback and verification process has been completed and duly reviewed by the competent authority.

8. **Troubleshooting K-REAP**

Conduct an urgent technical and user-experience audit of KREAP, benchmark it against proven university examination management systems and implement corrective measures to enhance usability, reliability and data security, including safeguards against loss of examination and assessment records. A few particular issues that need urgent addressing are:

Kannur University: Digital signature integration with e-Office hierarchy for examination documents, grace mark processing with moderation logic, venue-wise nominal rolls, question paper dispatch management, course-wise takers count reporting, consolidated mark sheet generation and a front-end for programme/course creation with automated course codes and academic master configurations.

University of Kerala: Deferred fee collection module for eGrantz students, college-level approval workflows for examination registration and attendance approval mechanisms. These developments aim to strengthen institutional controls, streamline student examination processes, improve fee management and ensure accurate verification of student eligibility before examination participation.

9. **Extending Student Scholarships to Fourth year**

Extend the coverage of all undergraduate scholarship schemes offered by the Government, the Higher Education Council and other funding agencies to include the fourth year of study, ensuring uninterrupted financial support for students enrolled in four-year undergraduate programmes.

10. **External Examiners for Laboratory Exams**

Reinstate the system of appointing external examiners from other colleges and institutions for the conduct of laboratory examinations under the FYUGP, following the practice previously adopted under CBCS, in order to ensure gravity of the examinations. Where necessary, the services of retired teachers may also be utilized for this purpose, so that academic activities of regular teachers are not disturbed.

Draft Report

11. **Faculty Development, Retraining and Capacity Building for Teachers**

Initiate a comprehensive programme of re-training and capacity building for teachers on Outcome-Based Education (OBE), including programme and course outcome mapping, assessment design and skill-based pedagogy, at the earliest. This initiative should ensure that the 2028 syllabus revision is developed and implemented in strict conformity with OBE principles, with clearly defined outcomes and systematic outcome mapping across all programmes.

12. **Constitution of FYUGP Facilitation and Resolution Committee**

Constitute **FYUGP Facilitation and Resolution Committee (FFRC)** for a period of five years from the implementation of the FYUGP Regulations, with the mandate to examine and resolve issues, anomalies and difficulties identified from time to time. The Committee may recommend necessary clarifications and corrective measures. The Vice-Chancellor may approve the same and all such actions shall be reported to the subsequent Academic Council.

13. **Establish a University-Level Grievance Redressal and Support Portal**

Establish a centralized University-level Grievance Redressal and Support Portal to enable the affiliated colleges to seek clarifications, report implementation issues and obtain timely guidance on FYUGP. Implement a transparent and time-bound redressal mechanism to ensure uniform interpretation of regulations, consistency in implementation and effective monitoring of the programme.

14. **Initiating Preliminary Action towards next level of Addressing Issues**

This report has focussed on immediate action points and the Committee will now embark on next level of issues to be addressed in the coming months. It is recommended that the Universities may be advised to start ground work for the following items by appointing/ entrusting committees/ bodies to initiate discussions and actions:

i. Prepare concept notes for -
   a) 4th Year of FYUGP Guidelines
   b) 1-year and 2-year Masters programme Guidelines
   c) OBE retraining in collaboration with KSHEC
   d) Comprehensive Revision of syllabus aimed at 2028 admission.
ii. Prepare basic document on the need for re-planning / expanding physical infrastructure in view of Fourth year of FYUGP.
iii. Start consultation with stakeholders on ITEP

15. Actionable recommendations for strengthening KReaP

Draft Report

Purpose. The following consolidated measures are recommended for consideration by the Kerala State Higher Education Council (KSHEC), in consultation with the concerned Universities, affiliated colleges, academic stakeholders and the KReaP technical team. The recommendations focus on reliability, regulatory compliance, data governance, institutional usability and accountable system management.

(a) Strengthen Fee Concession Verification and Correction

Action Required: Introduce mandatory institutional verification of student-declared fee concessions during examination registration, with defined approval rights for the Tutor/mentor, Head of Department, Academic Coordinator and Principal. Provide a time-bound correction workflow through which an erroneous declaration can be rectified and the applicable fee remitted. **Expected Outcome:** Prevent incorrect fee exemptions, revenue loss and avoidable administrative complications.

(b) Stabilize Assessment and Examination Modules

Action Required: Undertake an immediate technical review of the CCA mark-entry and processing modules and resolve all outstanding component-related issues. Establish a formal issue register with responsible personnel, target dates, testing and closure confirmation. Core examination and assessment functions should be validated before further expansion. **Expected Outcome:** Protect assessment integrity and improve reliability of academic records.

(c) Operationalize FYUGP Exit, Progression and Credit-Mapping Provisions

Action Required: Develop end-to-end digital workflows for three-year exit, applicable early-exit provisions, credit validation and mapping of recognized online or other permissible credits. The system should cover eligibility, credit verification, institutional recommendation, University approval, fee verification where applicable, certificate generation and preservation of the student's academic record. **Expected Outcome:** Enable the FYUGP regulatory provisions to operate digitally without dependence on manual procedures.

(d) Establish a Comprehensive Data Governance and Security Framework

Action Required: Define data ownership and custodianship, role-based access, authentication, encryption, audit trails, backup and disaster recovery, retention and archival, migration controls, data-integrity checks, vulnerability assessment and institutional data-protection responsibilities. Conduct an independent security assessment before integrating additional student batches. **Expected Outcome:** Protect academic records and establish clear accountability for data security and continuity.

Draft Report

(e) Define Institutional Roles and Approval Hierarchies

Action Required: Prepare a KReaP Administrative Workflow and Responsibility Matrix covering students, teachers, Tutors/mentors, Heads of Departments, Academic Coordinators, college administrators, Principals, University officials and technical administrators. For every major transaction, specify who may initiate, verify, recommend, approve, modify, reject and close it. **Expected Outcome:** Eliminate ambiguity, duplication of work and dependence on informal communication.

(f) Redesign Dashboards, Reports and Data Reconciliation

Action Required: Redesign institutional and University dashboards to provide accurate, real-time and reconcilable information on enrolment, course registration, attendance, CCA/ESE marks, credits, examination registration, fees, concessions, exit eligibility, internships, projects and other FYUGP requirements. Displayed counts should reconcile automatically with the underlying database. **Expected Outcome:** Reduce manual Excel-based reconciliation and make KReaP a dependable decision-support system.

(g) Align Digital Workflows with Ground-Level Academic Processes

Action Required: Conduct structured process mapping with affiliated colleges before introducing or modifying major modules. Compare actual academic procedures with system workflows and incorporate necessary verification, approval, correction and escalation stages. Include students and operational staff in user-experience testing to identify repetitive entry, unnecessary steps and process bottlenecks. **Expected Outcome:** Ensure that the software reflects real academic administration and reduces operational burden.

(h) Establish a Centralized Helpdesk and Grievance Management System

Action Required: Replace fragmented support through WhatsApp groups, personal messages and individual emails with a ticket-based helpdesk. Provide unique ticket numbers, categorization, severity/priority, assignment, service-level timelines, status tracking, escalation, closure confirmation and analysis of recurring issues. Maintain a searchable knowledge base for common problems. **Expected Outcome:** Provide accountable, traceable and timely technical support.

(i) Mandate Independent Audit and Pre-Deployment Validation

Action Required: Commission an independent multi-disciplinary audit covering FYUGP compliance, functional completeness, academic workflows, examination and assessment, credit and exit provisions, data security, database integrity, backup/disaster recovery, performance, accessibility, reporting, error handling and

Draft Report

technical support. No major module should enter live operation without Pilot–Test–Validate–Review–Deploy procedures, including functional, integration, security, load and user-acceptance testing using synthetic or anonymized data wherever possible. **Expected Outcome:** Prevent live academic operations from becoming a de facto testing environment and independently establish system readiness.

(j) Establish KReaP Governance, Change Management and Version Control

Action Required: Create a standing KReaP Governance and Review Committee with representation from KSHEC, Universities, affiliated colleges, academic and examination experts, IT/cybersecurity specialists and other relevant stakeholders. Require documented change requests, release notes, testing status, known issues, implementation dates and academic validation for changes affecting regulations or examinations. **Expected Outcome:** Provide continuous oversight, traceability and controlled system evolution.

(k) Implement a Time-Bound KReaP Improvement and Stabilization Roadmap

Action Required: Require the concerned Universities and technical team to maintain a single prioritized improvement register. Classify issues as Critical, High or Medium priority and assign each issue an identifier, responsible authority, proposed solution, target date, testing status and formal closure/acceptance status. Progress should be reviewed periodically and reported to KSHEC. **Expected Outcome:** Convert issue resolution into a measurable, accountable and time-bound programme.

(l) Introduce a Formal KReaP Readiness and Stakeholder-Validation Mechanism

Action Required: Before each major academic cycle, batch expansion or deployment of a new module, require confirmation that the relevant digital workflows are complete and compliant with approved FYUGP provisions. Use a structured stakeholder consultation mechanism for requirement analysis, testing, validation and prioritization of enhancements, with documented user acceptance before release. **Expected Outcome:** Ensure that regulatory provisions are digitally supported before implementation and that future development remains stakeholder-centered.

Priority Areas for Immediate Intervention

Priority	Area	Immediate Measure
Critical	Assessment, examination and academic records	Resolve CCA/assessment issues; validate core examination functions.
Critical	Fee management	Implement verification and correction mechanisms.

Draft Report

Critical	Data security and integrity	Independent security/data-governance assessment and backup controls.
Critical	FYUGP exit and credit provisions	Develop and test exit, credit validation and mapping workflows.
High	Institutional workflow and dashboards	Define roles; redesign reporting and reconciliation.
High	Technical support	Implement ticket-based helpdesk and escalation.
High	Testing and deployment	Mandate pilot validation before live deployment.

Overall Recommendation: KSHEC may direct the concerned Universities and the KReaP technical team to undertake a comprehensive functional, academic, technical and security review before substantial further expansion of live implementation. The immediate focus should be on assessment, examination, fee management, credit management, student progression and exit processing, data integrity and institutional accountability. KReaP should ultimately function as a fully integrated, regulation-compliant academic management platform supporting the complete FYUGP student lifecycle.

CONCLUSION

The actionable recommendations collectively provide a focused framework for strengthening the implementation of FYUGP across the universities and colleges of Keralam. They seek to improve curriculum flexibility, assessment quality, academic coordination, research opportunities, internships, digital systems, student mobility, financial support, faculty capacity and grievance redressal. The proposed institutional mechanisms, including Inter-University BoS Committee, SCAPEC and the FYUGP Facilitation and Resolution Committee, can promote greater consistency and timely resolution of implementation issues. Simultaneously, preparatory action on the fourth year, postgraduate programmes, OBE, infrastructure and ITEP will facilitate future reforms and ensure that FYUGP evolves into a coherent, student-centred and outcome-oriented higher education framework.

Draft Report