

**AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY DELHI
SCHOOL OF HUMAN STUDIES**

**THIRD BOARD OF STUDIES MEETING
15TH MAY 2017**

Members present: Prof. Krishna Menon, Prof. Ashok Nagpal, Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali, Prof. Anita Ghai, Prof. Rachana Johri, Prof. Anup Dhar, Dr. Rajan Krishnan, Prof. Nivedita Menon, Dr. Vivek Bhandari, Dr. Divya Jalan, Dr. Amrita Narayanan, Dr. Rachna Chaudhary, Dr. Yogesh Snehi, Dr. Diamond Oberoi Vahali, Ms. Lovitoli Jimo, Ms. Anshumita Pandey

Special Invitee: Dr. Sandeep R. Singh

- Prof. Krishna Menon opened the third meeting of the Board of Studies (BoS) of the School of Human Studies (SHS) by reinforcing some of the ideas behind the formulation of a BoS in a School: to oversee and advise regarding academic programmes and courses launched, revisions to programme structures and helping the school organize its evaluation and assessments. In an advisory capacity on these and more, the BoS is conceived of as a critical body and resource for a School.
- These inputs helped formally introduce the agenda for the third meeting of the Board of Studies of SHS:
 - (1) To approve course proposed by MA Gender Studies programme Optional course: *Gendered World: Politics and Memory in Northeast India*
 - (2) To approve course proposed by the Proposed programme on Disability Studies: *Disability and Gender*
 - (3) To approve course proposed by the Proposed programme on Disability Studies: *Understanding Disability I*
 - (4) To approve the Assessment and Evaluation Committee of the School of Human Studies
 - (5) To approve the grant of PG Diploma in Gender Studies to Aarti Kansal (Enrollment No. S153CGS01), Batch of 2015-17
- Prof Nivedita Menon offered felicitations to the School and to the University for completing ten years and for staying resolute in creative pursuits in an increasingly challenging and depleting surround.

- Prof Rachana Johri talked about the need to re-structure and revise initial ideas and imaginations of programmes in the School in order to keep adding relevant metaphors in the exploration of human experience. The programme on Disability Studies, a first of its kind, was thought to be a step in this direction.
- After a brief round of introductions of members around the table, the discussion moved to the first agenda item: approval of the optional course offered by the Gender Studies programme.

Summary of the deliberations on *Gendered World: Politics and Memory in Northeast India*

- Lovitoli Jimo, after thanking Prof. Krishna Menon for convening a Board of Studies meeting, took the members through the programme structure of the proposed course. The course aims at starting a conversation around the discourse of Northeast India by deploying a critical feminist lens even as it deconstructs one homogenous discourse of the same. Memory and History, Culture and Politics become crucial themes/entry points in this endeavor. The course as it looks at the making of the Northeast in Colonial and Post-colonial India, explores how memory becomes a cultural artifact while a gendered lens allows creating a dialogic space between entrenched borders and borderline existences at the center and the margin (Course Structure is attached).
- Prof. Nivedita Menon opened deliberations on the course by commending both its scholarship and relevance. Voicing her concern around the transaction of the course - packing the different units within one semester - she began by offering two substantive suggestions:
 - i) The use of the word ‘memory’ in the course title: would it be helpful to develop the idea of memory some more in the introduction to the course so one gets a sense of why and how it is being deployed? In the present reading of the course structure, it doesn’t emerge as a continuous thread linking different units. Also, would it add to the current structure to bring it in historically, theoretically linking history and memory?
 - ii) An alternative title: does the title “**Politics, Memory and Gendered Worlds in Northeast India**” capture better the many nuances of the course structure?
- She also wondered if Sections 4 and 5 could be clubbed together under the theme of ‘**Gender and Work**’ which would then explore gendered notions of work and the location/roles attributed to women in the everyday. Further, since a crucial emphasis in the course is to demystify the assumption of women being liberated in the Northeast, would it help to have an entire section on customary practices? Thus to break section 4

into two where one section looks at gender and work and the other looks at customary laws and practices. Such a re-structuring still makes the total number of units in the course six.

- The course summary refers to the Northeast as ‘the binary other’. It could serve us well to re-think this as multiple binary others populate the Indian landscape and thus changing ‘the’ to ‘a’ binary other may be useful. Line 2 in Section 2 could be re-phrased as either ‘the Impact of Hinduism and Christianity’ or ‘the Impact of Hinduization and Christianization’, both carrying distinct tones. Lastly, would it help to distinguish between compulsory and additional readings in the suggested reading list, particularly for the student?
- Ms. Lovitoli Jimo appreciated the interventions and specified how memory is not used as a conceptual category but a methodological and pedagogical tool. Shahid Amin’s work was noted as a reference.
- Prof. Krishna Menon invited more comments from Prof. Nivedita Menon and others to help think through the idea of memory and its linkage with history.
- Prof. Nivedita Menon found the inclusion of memory in the title very enthusing and something to be retained. While emphasizing how it becomes difficult to separate method, pedagogy and conceptual axes, she talked of several important questions that could be reflected on in the beginning (sections) of the course - what is the status of memory? Is it to be taken seriously? What does it mean to take it seriously? This could be done by taking up not more than a single reading as one commences class discussions. She considered how memory as constitutive of history is an important conceptual step one needs to take and how this carries a distinctive and complex take when exploring leitmotifs in history.
- Prof. Anup Dhar added to the discussion by reflecting on the idea behind his initial writings on marginality that linked history, memory and nostalgia. Is the history of partition as written, the only history of partition? What dimensions are opened up when one reads this history via stories of partition? What would it mean then to explore questions around the Northeast not through standard historical pedagogy but via asking a critical question around scholarship on ‘exiled’ communities: (Why) is the Northeast not managing to inscribe itself in our collective consciousness? The course then is poised differently even as it looks at difference in addressing these questions and more in foregrounding memory as an ontological-epistemological tool.
- Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali reflected on how such a (re)positioning of memory allows one to critique history as linear. What would be non-linear ways of looking at History? What

would be the (re)imagination of history as layered? The work of Roger Kennedy was emphasized in this regard which looks at psychoanalytic notions of history and memory.

- Dr. Divya Jalan commented on how the introduction to the course seemed to be built on twin tracks – marginalization of the Northeast and Gender. Does the course make for an opportunity to look at the second track in a more in-depth manner and look at gender away from the feminist point of view? This would necessitate developing the notion of gender and inclusion of alternative viewpoints. Further, commenting on the instructional design, she wondered about the possibility of reflective and experiential work in the course that would make for a more immersive experience for the student. Would the instructional design benefit from exercises like a study tour? Would it be possible to transact part of the course, say for 2 weeks, in the Northeast? She also wondered about interfaces with other courses being transacted parallelly in the semester.
- Prof. Krishna Menon appreciatively took note of the recommendation of a study tour and similar opportunities of reflective immersion. She also shared how internships in the programme presented such opportunities with work often taking students closer to the Northeast landscapes; students' work with Binalakshmi Nepram's Control Arms Foundation of India (CAFI) was remembered in particular. Dr. Jalan endorsed the idea of internships as a crucial learning platform.
- Prof. Vivek Bhandari spoke of the vast canvass that the course aims to transact. While appreciative of its ambitious mandate, he suggested if a keen focus on two or three conceptual hooks could be emphasized that could hold the structure together. A sharper engagement with politics, in particular the institutional apparatus of the postcolonial state and the role that this apparatus has played in creating the Northeast, the relationship between such a framing and the apparatus could serve as a crucial entry point. For instance, how the state has imagined the Northeast as a site for disciplining, the over-arching presence of military in the region and how is this woven into discussions on memory and gender. A specific entry point, an everyday actuality thus allows one to open up fractured discourses and experiences. One could take this further with readings that complicate the theoretical underpinnings of gender, memory and power.
- Dr. Yogesh Snehi shared how the course begins at a very interesting juncture: the making of the Northeast region. He asked why the frame uses only the trope of the modern national state? These societies existed before the coming of the state or the missionaries and what is precluded from one's view in looking at the region thus? What are the problems a pre-colonial state throws up for us? How do we conceive of memory in an oral culture? How do we see orality transformed with the advent of Vaishnavism or Christianity – and with this the transformations of the notion of gender? Could the exploration of gender also take up masculinities as a domain (what makes men resist

reservations for women in Nagaland?) and in turn open up the landscape?

- Prof. Rachana Johri talked about the idea of having a basket of elective courses, collaborative transactions between courses and voiced concerns about the number of readings a student is expected to do. She also highlighted if a way forward could be to create an introductory unit which more clearly ties up the thematics– with reference to theoretical underpinnings (history – memory etc.) or vis-à-vis the idea of the Northeast.
- Dr. Rajan Krishnan while joining with others’ appreciation of the course and its significance, further added to point raised above by highlighting how the format for the course does not specify how many pages a student is expected to read in a week. Could a lay out be thought out and added to the structure at the very outset? Additionally, a clear indication of the key texts in a module and how they play into the larger concerns of the course may facilitate absorption on the student’s part.
- Prof. Dhar demarcated themes under two sections putting together Dr. Snehi’s and Prof. Bhandari’s inputs: 1. ‘Birth of the Northeast and the arrival of the postcolonial state’; 2. ‘Creation of another’. He emphasized how with such an opening, the Northeast could gradually become a crucial site for scholarship in AUD.
- Opinions were voiced on both sides – to what extent does the debate have to take into account a periphery vs. a center? Can we not de-center ‘centers’ in our thinking? Can we not re-define the periphery as center? On the other hand, is it possible to place at par all centers and periphery? Does the birth of the Northeast not have a very specific history? What specificity does the concern about militarization, different forms of armed action introduce to this conception of periphery-center?
- Dr. Amrita Narayanan introduced to the discussion the idea of loss involved around invisibility and how students would need time to be able to experience and assimilate that. The number of readings needs to also be thought about in this light.
- Ms. Jimo responded to the concern by sharing that she mediates this process by allocating key texts to students for their perusal while the rest of the readings are brought out in class discussions.
- Prof. Dhar proposed that SHS course outlines could henceforth carry two demarcated sections in the recommended reading list: ‘compulsory readings’ and ‘additional readings’. Prof. Johri added how this would facilitate other faculty stepping in to transact the course. Dr. Krishnan also suggested that it was best to indicate a clear number of students to be admitted in the course.

- Prof. Ashok Nagpal in the light of the discussion shared how one could re-define the idea of an expert by foregrounding personal experience – for instance, to say ‘in my experience, concern around gender can be lost in a focused discussion on the region’ – would help create an empathic communication with the course facilitator even as a firm assertion could help channel creative energy in the School.
- With appreciative thanks to the many suggestions that could be incorporated, the Dean on the recommendation of the Board of Studies passed the course.

Summary of the deliberations on the electives to be proffered in the proposed programme on Disability Studies

- Prof. Anita Ghai and Dr. Sandeep Singh lead the discussion on the two courses that the proposed programme on Disability Studies aims to introduce – *‘Disability and Gender’* and *‘Understanding Disability I’*.
- Prof. Ghai opened the discussion on the said courses by talking about their location in the School of Human Studies. She described SHS as an ecosystem created to nurture interdisciplinary studies that aim at exploring human predicament. In this surround, a programme on Disability Studies aims to re-define disability as an epistemology marking a departure from understanding it as a confessional category. The emphasis of the programme and the courses it shall offer would be to expand the lexicon of disability and in so doing offer corrective insights to enhance the bodies of knowledge that define being human. The programme foregrounds disability as an onto – epistemology in the service of knowledge creation. *‘Understanding Disability I’* and *‘Disability and Gender’* would be offered as Elective courses under the aegis of the programme on Disability Studies.

Deliberations on *Disability and Gender*

- As it explores the various facets of human predicament with a particular concern being the notion of ‘difference’, the course builds on the common concerns of Gender, Psychosocial and Disability studies – emphasis on lived reality, social construction of ‘the natural’ and body as a site of knowledge - with a view to bring a specific lens and knowledge from the perspective of disability to understand various issues around care, family etc. (Course Structure is attached).
- While highlighting and attempting to elaborate the heterogeneity inherent in the idea of Disability, modules would continue to emphasize how disability theories are inherently linked to human experience, de-construct what it means to be human and thus foreground

disability as epistemology offering new insights be it to the understanding of care, notions about family, marginalities in cultural discourses – now viewed through the lens of disability.

- Dr. Singh shared how the course was structured around the conceptual understanding of disability taking it beyond a category and placing it in the realm of societal structure and in the norms of normalcy where deviance does not fit.
- Prof. Johri commented on the reading list and how it is well managed.
- Prof. N Menon commented that module 7 (*'Intersections'*) should not be a separate module in the course but should run throughout the course. Module 8 on *'Performing Disability'* could be dropped from the course. She also commented that the course could in fact stop at module 5 (*'Desire and Sexuality'*).
- Dr. Jalan further added to the discussion by congratulating the course team on two path breaking courses, refreshing in their approach to viewing human experience and offering new ways positioning it in life. Her concern was whether all the diversity in disability, their nuances and difference has found full expression in the course structure. She highlighted how in addition to physical disability, there are obvious psychosocial, mental, cognitive aspects present in varying degrees in the disability spectrum. She emphasized that when talking of care and dependence, the idea of an autonomous self and its final achievement – to be responsible for itself and others - should never get lost. She expressed her appreciation for the course once again before concluding her remarks.
- Dr. Snehi joined in with the concern around diversity in disability and its representation. He stated that the course seemed heavily inclined towards physical disability. He highlighted the difficulty of an individual who cannot discuss disability, being mentally or emotionally unable to do so and asked how would the course cater to this life situation and asked if the same could be foregrounded in the structure. He concluded by expressing how reading the course structures had been an enlivening and a humbling experience.
- Prof. Bhandari found in the courses an expansive window that allowed a sense of what we're only beginning to grapple with it. He highlighted that a crucial theme would certainly be corporeal disabilities and embodied selves. Additionally, he wondered about incapacitating life situations in which a helpless self may experience itself as disabled – say a diagnosis of any terminal disease in one's family and intimate relationships? He shared a personal experience in this context and its deep resonance and thus impressed upon the members the necessary inclusion of such a theme, how such experiences can shake a self to the core, take time to surface from and that such encounters and shades of existence carry a desperate demand for a vocabulary. He also emphasized his concern about how would students engage with the course in a manner such that it goes beyond a

surface intellectual grasp. In this light what would make the best impact pedagogically? What could supplement readings? Would inclusion of visual narratives, conversations and field visits help? Does late modernity give us some frameworks to think disability?

- Prof. Ghai shared how narratives from popular cinema, stories and vignettes were very much a part of class experience. Additionally, the introduction to the course is not without a bit of self disclosure and shared her experiences of finding students deeply engaged with their life stories. Dr. Singh endorsed the idea. Prof. Ghai also shared that class experiences where not just disabled but non-disabled students with certain dominance over their bodies ‘encountered’ a narrative like ‘*Children of a Lesser God*’, the impact and questions it created. In that sense, she added that the pedagogy in the course could well be thought of as an enabling pedagogy.
- Prof. Johri in her comments problematized the ways in which we tend to think about intellectual disabilities and notions about depleted agency it often comes with. Narratives like ‘*Monika and Dev*’ de-stabilize such received notions. In this light, to what extent does the course cater only to physical disability?
- Prof. Ghai noted the various remarks with appreciation as well as the concern about representation of diversity in disability and stated that the course shall be re-looked with that in mind.
- Prof. H Oberoi Vahali stated how the course takes another step in completing the vision SHS began with. She wondered if the course could begin with some experiential work? She emphasized the need to work with bodies, one’s own and others’ (before readings and films) and how this is a critical part of working on one’s own self - almost always a destabilizing yet leveling experience. She also joined in with the concern about critical and long term illnesses in a family and the impact it creates. When a loved person who is able bodied undergoes slow depletions and owing to a diagnosis the body and mind can never be the same, what does such a scenario do to that self and what is its impact on the caregiver? Given how helpless one may feel, does one indeed experience one’s self as disabled as voiced earlier by Prof. Bhandari? Does care not involve one person’s body but carried in two (or more) minds? Would it help to chart how this relationship transforms over prolonged periods? Could body be thought as a site of memory?
- Dr. Jalan endorsed the idea of inclusion of the caregivers’ perspective.
- Prof. K Menon emphasized how module 4 on ‘*Care, Dependence and Interdependence*’ would address the same.
- Given the immense scope of the course, the Board discussed and recommended that

merging module 7 (*Intersections*), talking about heterogeneity in disability) with module 1 (*Introduction*) would enhance class experience. Likewise module 8 (*Performing Disability*) could be dropped as a separate section given how deconstruction of the received notions of the body is a recurrent and a linking thread through all modules and could be emphasized as such. This may facilitate course transaction in a short semester.

- Dr. Narayanan emphasized how in wanting a language for disability, (auto)biographical notes could be a great way to begin and how such narratives allow one to tap into a range of emotions – including distancing ones (the representation of which is critical) – when faced with disability.
 - Prof. Ghai shared how biographical narratives are critical to course transaction which is often mediated through a rich medley of authors - Ved Mehta, Malini Chheb, Cheryl Wade, Nancy Myers in addition to her own story which is never away from classroom experience. Questions of privacy vs. private, care and dependence, difficult emotions and difficult assertions (‘I am a hard core cripple – understood in a classic way’) are thus filtered through this lens and the class experience in problematizing received notions can allow a sense of generativity. Healing as a module highlights the concerns being shared in the group and could be a potential space for addressing them.
 - Acknowledging the many suggestions that could be incorporated, the Dean on the recommendation of the Board of Studies passed the course on *Disability and Gender*.
- Deliberations on *Understanding Disability I***
- The course examines core concepts of Disability Studies and marks the emergence of disability as an epistemology (Course Structure is attached).
 - The discussion on the course began with Dr. Snehi talking about the proposed programme on Disability Studies. He asked if the courses could be linked to each other rather than be approached as standing alone? There are overlapping themes across both courses and this could then be envisaged as a section on say disability theories, just like gender could be a section. He also highlighted that given the specific mandate of the other course, perhaps this course on *Understanding Disability* could be a platform to think proactively about caste as a social disability. Looking at society and within society, are certain sections disabled? How do we think of disabilities that are not embodied, that are ‘ex-body’? He spoke of his reading of *The Ballad of Bant Singh* by Nirupamma Dutt. The narrative offers a moving account of the life story of a Dalit leader whose hands and legs are chopped off – socially disabled further rendered physically disabled – and his biography is a story of survival and resistance in everyday living: how he brings in poetry, how he rears his daughters, how does patriarchy come into play into such

narratives? Dr. Snehi also wondered if in Module 6 (*Education as the practice of freedom*) more discussion on pedagogy could perhaps be developed? Talking of a chance encounter with a book on a special child *Simply Nanju* that facilitated thinking differently, he asked how would concerns and issues of classroom and learning (dis)ability be included?

- Prof. Nagpal commented on how the disorientation that we are thrown into when carving out a vocabulary for disability, be it individual or social, carries an element of infantile disorientation and as such writings on these primal states may offer a potential of recovery, preserving a rawness where it is difficult to know where to turn to. He also wondered if and how gender is present in these infantile states.
- Prof. Ghai stated how the unit on *'Disability narratives: Self and subjectivity'* (module 4) would address the concerns being highlighted so far and how life narratives like Bant Singh or Sumit Baudh who talks of being Dalit and being gay as suggested by Prof. N Menon allow for weaving of necessary intersections.
- Prof. N Menon wondered if the course could be titled differently and not *Understanding Disability I* – which while it communicates the idea that there may be a second course (or more) does not do justice to the specific set of concerns that the present course structure takes up. She endorsed Dr. Snehi's concern of such courses coming together in the proposed programme on Disability Studies and pre-requisites etc. could be mentioned to avoid repetition. Again, given the immensity of the course structure, she wondered if the course could stop at Module 4 (*Disability Narratives*), with elements of *Gendering Disability* (module 5) being blended with *Care in the Indian Family* (module 3) and that in itself creates a self-standing and substantial course. Education, Law and Emancipatory practices (themes from the last three units) could another course on *Transcending Disability*.
- Dr. Jalan asked if *Gendering Disability* (module 5) could explore hierarchies within hierarchies: intersections between disability and gender/poverty/ caste/age – a comprehensive motif covering a multiplicity of hierarchies within hierarchies that define everyday experience. She also stated her concern that if one is splitting the course, education needs to find mention in the first part/course with its emphasis on education as a practice of freedom.
- Prof. Johri stated if this is positioned as the first course in the Disability Studies programme and *Disability and Gender* as the second one, could a propitious start be *Disability Narratives: Self and Subjectivity* (module 4) as the first module of the course? The unit could, at the outset, highlight different issues and intersections through narratives which could then be built upon as one subsequently theorizes disability.

- Prof. K Menon suggested that modules 1 and 2 (*Introduction* and *Theorizing Disability* respectively) be collapsed into a single module in this rendition.
- Dr. Jalan wondered how the heavy emphasis on experience would impact the running of the course if non-disabled people were to transact it?
- Prof. N Menon highlighted the necessity of a lecture (or more) sensitizing students to the debates within disability studies and current understandings within disability, especially in the light of ('politically correct') naming being a crucial concern.
- Prof. K Menon asked if this too could be a part of the first module (which now would fuse introduction, debates within disability studies and disability theories).
- Prof. Johri asked if terminologies could be a second unit with theorizing disability being a third module, if the introductory module was on disability narratives.
- Prof. K Menon offered an alternative model of transaction with the first module introducing debates within disability studies and theorizations followed by narratives.
- Prof. Dhar suggested that the current rendition of the course could go up till module 4 with *Gendering Disability* being a separate course, elements of which were discussed earlier. A third course could be *Disability and Intersections* highlighting concerns around citizenship, what it means to be human being viewed from multiple lenses and that this could be a foundation course offered by SHS.
- Dr. Singh appreciated the suggestions coming in as they would help facilitate further deliberation.
- Dr. Krishnan again brought to the table the necessity of a realistic estimate for students particularly in terms of suggested reading list in addition to an engaging classroom experience.
- Prof. Ghai shared how 11-15 pages of reading per week is communicated to the students to ensure continuity without overwhelming them.
- Prof. Krishnan also emphasized that while taking up narrative configurations around disability, their divergences and convergences, it was critical to introduce them as *representations*. Transparency of medium should not interfere with a critical engagement with entrenched hierarchies.

- In the light of the discussion, the Board of Studies approved an introductory course on understanding disability with four modules (afore mentioned), an emphasis on education and critical legal implications.
- Further the Board of Studies approved the proposed names from different programmes as constituting the Assessment and Evaluation Committee of the School of Human Studies.

Sl. No.	Name of Committee	MA Psychosocial Clinical Studies	MPhil, Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy	PhD Psychology	MPhil/PhD WGS	MA Gender Studies	MPhil Development Practice
1.	Assessment and Evaluation Committee	Deepti Sachdev and Anshumita Pandey	Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali, Dr. Shifa Haq, and Ashis Roy	Prof. Rachana Johri, Dr. Mamatha Karollil and Dr. Pallavi Banerjee	Dr. Rachna Chaudhary and Prof. Krishna Menon	Ms. Lovitoli Jimo and Dr. Bindu K C	Prof Anup Dhar and Dr Imran Amin

- The Board of Studies also approved the grant of PG Diploma in Gender Studies to Aarti Kansal (Enrolment No. S153CGS01). While appreciative of a provision of exit from programme(s) for students who are not in position to finish their degree, the Board of Studies took note that the nomenclature ‘Diploma’ carries connotations of accomplishment and not concession in several institutions (Prof. Bhandari highlighted the award of diploma degrees at IRMA) and decided to revise the nomenclature in accordance with UGC guidelines.
- Prof. Ghai responded to Dr. Jalan’s concern about participation and representation of people from the disability sector in advisory capacities by sharing the plan of designing the Disability Studies programme. This involves a corpus mapping in the field with people from different disabilities coming in to share their experiences, culminating in a Disability Studies reader. There are plans to collate and create an annotated bibliography, good practices from various NGOs (including both theoretical approach and practices) as well as faculty development workshops with experiential components. Discussions are also ongoing for launching a 32 credit MPhil programme with internship in different NGOs, consultation for which begins in July.

- The meeting ended with a vote of thanks and acknowledgement by the Dean.

Kommentar [1]: Anshu,

Please could you add the point about the constitution of the SHS assessment and evaluation committee?

Kommentar [2]: Krishna I had included the point on the Evaluation Committee in a line right before Aarti Kansal's case. You want me to re-frame it? Or add proposed names?

AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY DELHI
SCHOOL OF HUMAN STUDIES

FIFTH BOARD OF STUDIES MEETING
4TH DECEMBER, 2018

Members Present: Prof. Krishna Menon, Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali, Prof. Rachana Johri, Prof. Anita Ghai, Dr. Lovitoli Jimo, Ms. Anshumita Pandey, Dr. Yogesh Snehi, Dr. Diamond Oberoi Vahali, Prof. Rajan Krishnan, Dr. Divya Jalan, Dr. Amrita Narayanan,

Members Absent: Dr. Rachna Chaudhary, Dr. Mamatha Karollil, Prof. Harsh Mander, Prof. Nivedita Menon, Dr. Vivek Bhandari, Prof. Salil Misra, Dr. Bindu K.C.

Special Invitee Present: Prof. Jatin Bhatt, Prof. Ashok Nagpal, Prof. Anup Dhar, Ms. Deepti Sachdev, Dr. Imran Amin, Dr. Shifa Haq, Mr. Rajinder Singh

- **Prof. Krishna Menon** opened the fifth meeting of the Board of Studies (BoS) of the School of Human Studies (SHS) by welcoming respective members and putting forth the agenda for the meeting:
 1. Reconstitution of the Assessment Committee for MA Gender Studies program
 2. Discussion on the foundation courses in the Masters programs at SHS
- 1. The Assessment Committee for MA Gender Studies was reconstituted with Dr. Rachna Chaudhary and Ms. Lovitoli Jimo as the new members.

Kommentar [1]: This section in particular will need your inputs Deepti. Please append as you see fit. I've only captured minimal broad-strokes.

Kommentar [2]: Office to please confirm these names

The meeting to have a qualitatively rich discussion on foundation courses in SHS, an engagement routed through the distinctive gains these courses have to offer as well as the challenges the School has had to grapple with. As an advisory body on matters of academic curriculum and programme structure, the inputs of respective members play a critical role.

- **Ms. Deepti Sachdev** led the discussion on the foundation courses, opening with an orienting note that put into context the creation and placement of the four foundation courses in SHS {*Ideas, Knowledge and Ethics (IKE)*, *Experiencing the Self (ETS)*, *Ways of Humans (WOH)*, *Politics, Resistance and Transformation (PRT)*} their *raison d'être*, both historically as well as philosophically. The orienting note also put forth views and concerns voiced by the faculty during their deliberations through the semester leading up to the BoS.
- The founding ethos of the School in 2009 was governed by special attention to the constitutive exclusions from the category of 'human' and how, had knowledge systems been constructed by excluding certain categories as 'less than human', invisibilizing them from theory, and relegating their life-experiences to the margins. The mad person, the woman, the dalit, the disabled were all identities that had been kept at the fringes of mainstream theory, and we wondered in what ways these subject positions could decenter how 'humanness' had been thought of, and offer radically new possibilities for reimagining knowledge itself. This was to be the mandate of School of Human Studies and the programs housed in it.
- To retain the polysemy of the word 'human', the role of foundation courses was thought to be of utmost import in providing an inter-disciplinary introduction to the idea of human and allowing the word 'human' to be unpacked from a variety of epistemic positions/ perspectives with no one discourse being the master.
- At the outset there were 4 foundation courses of 4 courses each compulsory for all Masters students of SHS (enlisted above).
- In the current program structure of the two MA programs in SHS, students of MA Psychology are doing all four foundation courses, while students of MA Gender Studies can choose between 'Experiencing the Self' and 'Politics Resistance Transformation

- The experience of transacting said courses threw up significant challenges that were tabled. This vital and stimulating introduction could also prove to be cacophonous for students even as facilitators struggled to manage nuances of epistemic intersections, relation to core and discipline courses within the same semester and in subsequent semesters. A lack of academic community to turn to was keenly felt.
- Lack of participation by Gender Studies faculty in conceptualizing foundation courses given the historically later launch of the Gender Studies programme, consequent struggle to partake of vision, not without a sense of alienation, concern about the relevance and modality of engagement of students in Gender Studies with these courses was shared. The possibility of offering '*Introduction to Gender*' as a foundation courses was tabled, thereby expanding the basket.
- In a similar vein, the necessary integration of Development Practice and Disability as perspectives and epistemic locations, adding layers to the conceptualization of the idea of the human was talked about, taking note of discontent with the current situation which is more of an additive approach.
- Faculty's disagreement with the nomenclature of these courses as 'foundation' was made note of with the term carrying connotations of privileging an underlying unity. That this could inadvertently fix the understanding of the word human in entrenched locations was discussed.
- Significant pragmatic concerns were highlighted at the end of the orienting presentation: Does the School want to add new courses to the foundation courses basket? How would the autonomy of different programmes, both in terms of content as well as credits on offer be attended to? Should foundation courses go up to the third semesters as they currently do?
- With the conclusion of the orienting note, discussion proceeded with respective members sharing their thoughts about foundation courses and concerns that had been put forth.

Summary of the deliberations on Foundation Courses in SHS:

- **Dr. Divya Jalan** made a clarificatory inquiry as to how foundation courses were different from other compulsory courses offered in a programme.
- **Prof. Rachana Johri** explained that the foundation courses bridge different Masters programmes across the School in looking at a common concern, for instance the question of the human or of lived narratives, which is then reflected throughout the different MA programmes. Foundation courses aim to thus forge a link across the different programmes even as they shed light on their location in the School of Human Studies.
- **Prof. Rajan Krishnan** shared thoughts about the experience of offering foundation courses in the School of Culture and Creative Expressions (SCCE), their content and structuring. Critical theory and culture studies formed the composite on offer across programmes. The need for an easy segregation and differentiation between what students needed to do in foundation courses and discipline based courses was emphasized. Prof R Krishnan shared how the students in the beginning had to be explained to at length how these courses fit into their disciplines and how they could provide an ideational scaffold for their respective programmes. For instance, each practice is grounded in the dynamics of its context. Understanding this contextual matrix then becomes important. One entry point for revision in foundation courses in SCCE came with the need to render them relevant to the contemporary context. The course basket then came to have courses on critical theory, culture studies, the margin and the minor. In each, students are introduced to a few significant texts (say, the Critique of Judgement) and orienting questions (what is beauty?) to familiarize the student with the corpus. He shared how flexibility in terms of number of texts and lectures had given students necessary latitude. That students are also asked to suggest texts of relevance to their areas of interest and need was found to be a helpful intervention catering to student agency as well as interest. He also shared how it is during the dissertation component in the final semester that the impact of these courses is fully appreciated by students given how they help stimulate and structure

thoughts, contextualize questions and locate them within a body of thought. On the question of foundation courses in SHS, Prof. Krishnan suggested that keeping a few texts that were sufficiently abstracted might allow a range of reflections. For instance a philosophical reflection on what is human would be answered differently from discipline to discipline and a few critical texts on the nature of enlightenment or modernity would prove helpful entry points. He emphasized the need to keep the number of texts minimal and create opportunity for sufficient and deep engagement. Another pertinent intervention was thinking about the question of human through the lens of post humanist thought (a text like Agamben's *Man and the animal* or questions around AI) which would allow the student a sense of constitutive lines of inclusion and exclusions in the category. Placing the human through rigorous questioning may open ways of thinking about subject formation.

- **Prof. Krishna Menon** took appreciative note of both the reflection on setting up foundation courses in SCCE and pragmatic interventions made in terms of thinking through the deployment of texts in the course. She also shared how the foundation courses in SHS are already being transacted in this modality: IKE with its deep philosophical inclination places the human within discourses of enlightenment and modernity and through similar such engagement problematizes the idea of the human. Another instance of the same was tracing Greek political thought followed by an attempt to decolonize received ideas through a critical engagement with Ambedkar. She further remarked on the specific challenge of huge class sizes (43 and 42 respectively in the current batch) that faculty have to contend with as well as heterogeneous disciplinary locations. This is at once a creative demand and a source of potential conflict. Splitting the group into sections is a route forward but to do so in a manner that does not prevent engagement among students still needs to be given thought.
- **Prof. Rajan Krishnan** acknowledged the struggle of having a huge class size. He re-iterated how minimal intake and some latitude in terms of learning outcomes such that student involvement is maximized has been of help.

- **Prof. Jatin Bhatt** emphasized the need to have a sharp understanding of learning outcomes. What do they mean, what is the process of arriving at these outcomes is critical. This could well foster clarity on rationale of courses and their location.
- **Dr. Amrita Narayanan** reflecting on the discussion thus far pithily captured the spirit of foundation courses - how it is these courses that make a school, a school and not separate programmes. She further added that the challenge lay in how diverse emphases/ mandates of self- awareness, political engagement, heterogeneity would be brought together, while not overwhelming the student. A closer look at key texts would help the same.
- **Prof. Krishna Menon** shared that course outlines could be circulated at appropriate occasions.
- **Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali** reflecting back on her journey of setting up foundation courses shared how learning outcomes were actively thought about while setting up the courses/programmes and keeping alive the imagination of the student graduating from both Gender Studies and Psychology. Having had an engagement with both experiential work and critical thought – two cornerstones in SHS – the student was imagined in different guises – that of a researcher, or a practitioner amid others. The main stake was the capacity to bring together theory and experience, to be able to work through questions of subjectivity and complexity of lived experiences rather than bypassing it, with subjectivity itself being placed within a critical framework -knowledge always already situated in the realities of a socio-political, psycho-political context. How would a student from Gender Studies and Psych work in sites that are human fields? How would s/he cultivate an ethos of involvement with others? How would s/he know one's own self as one engaged with other selves and engage with other selves having worked with his/her own self? Such questions, she opined, has meant a continuous churning as regards curriculum creation. Every curriculum making being an exercise of inclusion but also exclusion, it was critical to take stock of the status of these two disciplines that did not

necessarily share neighborhoods. Psychology as it is generally taught had become ahistorical, acultural, oblivious to its own historical production. Gender Studies programmes were generally away from the intrapsychic. A bi-valent critical engagement then became important - to think questions carrying political charge in Psychology and to think questions imbued with psychological import in Gender Studies in order to be able to give to the student an appreciation of the human field s/he was going to engage with. Occupying the space in-between was not easy and has not been easy, she stated, but this in-between terrain was where the four foundation courses had to be placed. She further added how just as enlightenment impacts the question of the human and that of subject formation, an equally important emphasis is critique of the discourse of enlightenment. The notion of the unconscious brings this in and with it the question of conceiving of as knowledge systems the non-knowable and the emergent and not just the knowable and the rational.

- **Prof. Ashok Nagpal** drew the focus back to the question of learning outcomes given that it had introduced both unrest and a creative demand of locating both gender and psychology in flux. He urged the group to own its muddled and complex history, to not shy away from its fractures and omissions. He voiced regret around an urgent question of whether we could come together as colleagues. **Prof. Anup Dhar** re-connecting with Prof. Vahali's remarks reflected on the how SHS is peculiarly placed in that it is built on a dual critique of enlightenment: the experiential and the historical. The dominant critique of enlightenment, he shared, gets located within a framework of reason. But to only use this to define foundation would be to miss the Freudian critique of enlightenment grounded in an engagement with the unknown which the School tries to keep intact. Carrying the creative tension between these apexes, it becomes important to consider what comes before the dogma of the discipline? What is prior? What is human? What is consciousness? What is experience? What is unmediated experience? Is there any? What is before history? A pre-history? Seen in this light, he proffered *Experiencing the Self* emerges as **the** foundation course that the School has to offer. Drawing a parallel between SCCE and SHS, he opined that just as questions of aesthetics/art/ beauty become

central to SCCE or a historiography of ideas (IKE) can become central to philosophy programmes in SLS, ETS offered a critical entry to the way the School is approaching questions of poverty, margins, caste, development or gender – from a human relational context. It becomes the distinctive flavor, that essential nuance that SHS brings to these themes. How does one experience oneself in this contradictory conflicting setting, this double critique and dual location? How does one foreground that life itself is foundational, that the act of living in its complexity, in its knowing and all its unknowing is what is foundational? How does one cater to the limit points which keep eluding a self? This brings alive how one is delving in not the unknown of the text (deconstruction) but in the unknown of one's own self, a story that needs construction. Thus ETS. Together with an IKE or a WOH so that psychoanalysis does not miss a critical reflection on its own historical coordinates.

- **Prof. Jatin Bhatt** shared how it was critical from the University's perspective that one not forget these ideas that went into the making of programmes and courses. With every transition as the life of an institution prolongs, there can be an erasure of memory, of routes taken and guiding motivations. Foregrounding the importance of institutional memory as a project, he discussed how it was important to develop a format that kept such ideas intact even as it smoothed the way for subsequent transitions and taking over of institutional functions by different cohorts.
- **Prof. Krishna Menon** spoke about an initiative in the Monsoon semester 2018 where recordings of different lectures in IKE had been made and that these could readily be made available for the archiving project. She also invited reflections on how ETS had been made into an optional course in the MA Gender Studies programme.
- **Ms. Lovitoli Jimo** shared how the primary impetus behind this decision was an overwhelming consensus that having 4 foundation courses will be too much. Given that PRT was similar in approach to other Gender Studies courses, an interplay between PRT and ETS was thought about.

- **Prof. Rachana Johri** discussed how the primary crisis the School and the programmes have faced is that of credit load. Given the minority location of both Gender Studies and Psychology, there is much one wants to offer including electives. The question has been where to draw the line. She also briefly reflected on the initial dynamics in the faculty group given larger numbers from Psychology and how these may have shaped trajectories. Re-connecting with Prof. Vahali's concerns she re-iterated the importance of inculcating in the student a certain sensibility, a sensitivity towards diverse locations that comes after a complacency about one's own position and knowledge is punctured. Do we need to go inwards with ourselves to know? Would it be important to have this inward sensibility to tackle questions around violence for instance in addition to addressing the same from the perspective of Law? She further spoke of resistance from students who also respond from dominant discourses within disciplinary location. The question then becomes if one has a sufficiently shared vision to take to the student, in consonance with the University's vision and mission. It was important in this context to take note that there are only three schools that are currently offering foundation courses.
- **Dr. Divya Jalan** shared she was of a similar bent of mind as Prof. Dhar in thinking of ETS as **the** foundation course from/of the School. She recognized the tremendous effort transacting it could take on both the teachers and students requiring as it would significant investment of both time and energy. She expressed the hope that the support required for the same will structurally be made available.
- **Prof. Anita Ghai** shared her own unique journey with ETS in Disability Studies including the re-naming of the course as '*Narrativizing the Self*' amid concerns of the limited reach of the psychoanalytic framework in the context of Disability.

- **Prof. Jatin Bhatt** emphasized the need to re-imagine the nature of course transaction along more creative lines and how these pedagogic innovations may faculty to attend to the challenges that come their way.
- **Prof. Krishna Menon** taking group deliberations into account, invited the Gender Studies programme coordinator to make re-visiting the decision to make ETS optional in MA Gender Studies an agenda item for programme level meetings. She was mindful of doing this without compromising on the concern of not increasing the total number credits for foundation courses as well as the need to open up credits for elective courses.
- **Ms. Lovitoli Jimo** shared how the initial conversations around foundation courses in Gender Studies were around which courses were non-negotiable. IKE and WOH with their heavy philosophical and anthropological gleanings respectively were thought to be critical. Since the total number of foundation courses was decided as three to manage credit load, PRT and ETS came to be optional. She shared that this would again be deliberated upon in the programme level meeting in the light of the discussion. She also shared how response to the courses differs across batches and ushers in a diverse range with different courses being popular with different batches.
- **Prof. Krishna Menon** welcomed the openness to re-visit decisions about course structuring as evident in Ms. Jimo's response as well as how this ongoing process of reflection was critical given diversity in student responses. She also highlighted that availability of faculty becomes a critical area of concern in a qualitatively rich transaction of these courses, especially given huge class sizes.
- **Dr. Yogesh Snehi** taking a look at the overall programme structure put forth the concern of accommodating diverse learner needs given that in the current arrangement, first semester Psychology students and third semester Gender studies students would find themselves together in an ETS course. This was a concern that had also been voiced by facilitators in the course. Dr. Snehi also drew the group's attention to the overall ratio of compulsory

taught courses and electives which was leaning heavily on the former side leaving the student with little opportunity to exercise choice in taking on elective courses. In Psychology against 16 credits of foundation and 26 credits of core, only 8 credits of electives were on offer. In Gender Studies, against 42 credits of core courses, 22 credits were offered as electives. He reflected on how this structural fixing of choice takes away from the plasticity of the category human as well as student agency over the course. That this needed to be remedied was voiced as a matter of some urgency. He also shared his experience of making available large numbers of electives in School of Liberal Studies (these were closer to faculty's research interest and expertise) in addition to core disciplinary courses. He also talked about the possibility of composite courses (courses that can be taught together) in order to attend to the problem of credit load. Could there be ways in which some courses can be brought together in Psychology and Gender Studies programmes?

Kommentar [3]: Could the office please re-check these numbers?

- **Prof. Krishna Menon** acknowledged the intervention while also highlighting the struggle of minority disciplines. Psychology programme, itself a departure from the mainstream discipline, was trying to imagine a different praxis. Ten years back, Gender Studies was the only programme looking at this theme. In both cases, there is a large ground to cover in order to provide the student with a comprehensive enough vocabulary. She also shared how the faculty is aware of the challenge of offering more electives with Gender Studies already opening credits in the upcoming semester to give more choice to students.
- **Prof. Jatin Bhatt** noted Dr. Snehi's input with appreciation. On the question of electives, he added that even as Schools manage to imagine Programme Electives, there was need to think about University Electives. His primary concern was how students manage to move out of programmes. He also shared a framework worked on by the Design academy that could offer an alternative imagination: Semester 1 – 'Me' with the emphasis being self, Semester 2 – 'They', the emphasis being the other, Semester 3 – 'We', emphasizing the relational and Semester 4 – 'Us' with its emphasis on the transactional.

- **Prof. Anita Ghai** linking back with the creation of SHS attending to constitutive exclusions from the category of the human, noted with curiosity not unmarked by some dejection, the gap between vision and its translation when it comes to framing curriculum. She questioned offering electives without adequate synthesis with other courses in a programme in which case the course merely becomes an additive. She highlighted pragmatic concerns about lack of slots in the time tables for situating disability as well as class size. While a smaller classroom made for deep engagement, one needed to attend to structural constraints that may be contributing to scant numbers. How has Disability as perspective, as location been attended to in Psychology and Gender? What would be the fate of an MPhil Disability Studies? Where then does the facilitator locate her own self?
- **Prof. Krishna Menon** urged the MA coordinators of both Psychology and Gender, Dr. Shifa Haq and Ms. Lovitoli Jimo to think about these questions in their respective programmes. She noted that MA Psychology has already opened up a slot for Disability but also that these questions asked for more engagement.
- **Prof. Rachana Johri** agreed that freeing up slots for electives was critical and suggested that one way of proceeding was to think about the minimum number of core courses that would earn the student a discipline specific MA degree in Psychology or Gender Studies beyond which slots/credits could be made available for elective courses.
- **Prof. Krishna Menon** suggested that two Board of Studies meetings could be held in the coming semester which would allow further deliberation and concretization of these suggestions.
- **Prof. Rajan Krishnan and Dr. Yogesh Snehi** shared total percentages of credits offered as electives in their respective schools - 25% in SCCE and 50% in SLS.

Kommentar [4]: Again, I hope I got the numbers right!?

- **Prof. Krishna Menon** acknowledged the same while also asking the group to bear in mind the different disciplinary locations and trajectories. While a discipline like History comes from a secure location, disciplines like Psychology and Gender Studies have had to struggle with being legitimate knowledge systems and have to offer continual demonstration of their relevance.
- **Ms. Lovitoli Jimo** shared that combining internal and external electives, 25% of credits had been freed for electives in the Gender Studies.
- **Dr. Shifa Haq** responded to Prof. Ghai's concerns from having taught courses like WOH and suggested that integration of disability as a perspective in courses like IKE and WOH may be a rewarding exercise. In which case it would help to revive the tradition of course teams that would think about the course together rather than courses creating 'guest lectures' on disability.
- **Dr. Imran Amin** re-iterated the challenge of having a large class size as well as that of dividing the cohort into sections given a cap on the total number of students. Given that there are two disciplines, how one thought about creating different sections emerged as a significant concern.
- **Prof. Krishna Menon** shared student responses that ask about such 'partitions' from their own disciplinary cohorts with a passionate playful urgency. She also shared how the journey within a foundation course and the nature of peer learning marks their trajectories in ways that by the end of semester, they want to remain in these groups. She endorsed the need to think about these sections some more.
- **Prof. Diamond Oberoi Vahali** shared that as regards the larger question of having foundation courses in the School or not, the School will have to reflect back on whether this experiment has worked. She remarked appreciatively how the four foundation courses themselves seem pertinent and offer useful perspectives to the student. She acknowledged logistical concerns, especially having large class sizes and creating sections while not

segregating disciplines which would betray the very idea of foundation courses. She endorsed ETS has having a singular contribution to make and expressed surprised at it having been made optional in Gender Studies.

- **Prof. Krishna Menon** stated that this had already been made note of and shall be taken up for further deliberation at programme level meetings.
- **Dr. Amrita Narayanan** suggested that lectures on ‘gender as a way of experiencing the self’ may make for bridge linking disciplinary cohorts.
- **Dr. Divya Jalan** endorsed the same and suggested the need to creatively think about similar bridges and convergences so that foundational courses do not stand alone.
- **Mr. Rajinder Singh**, based on his facilitation of ETS in past years, endorsed large class size as a significant challenge. Building on recommendations from the group, he suggested that having multiple facilitators that introduce perspectives to students – disability as a perspective, gender as a perspective – may be an immensely beneficial exercise that would meet the student at his/her own location with such encounters creating apertures for reflection and engagement. Such a form of course transaction would also foster inter-disciplinary spirit and conversations.
- **Dr. Amrita Narayanan** welcomed this suggestion and reflected on how this could provide a scaffold to the course. These lectures could serve as book ends holding together a process that can all too often evoke inchoate amorphous intensities in students. This intervention would give students something to hold onto and trace their journeys.
- **Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali** shared her experience of drafting ETS for multiple programmes – Psychology, Development Practice and Disability. All of these required the course to be re-invented closer to the specific need and primary emphasis with a programme. In the context of Development Practice for instance the course catered to relating self with others,

connecting with diverse locations of lived narratives - in particular a rural setting. The idea was to take these questions and reflectively turn inward towards one's own life and location which ran as a continuous thread in all ETS courses. Similarly she suggested how feminist methodology itself is a experiential methodology and could help in creating a middle path between gender and psychology. Thus conceived, foundation courses could serve as the environment within which the rest of the courses would sit. She asked the group to be mindful of potential disconnect between vision and translation in transaction which can interrupt synergy and advocated the need for complementarity and a not cutting through approach.

- **Prof. Krishna Menon** appreciated a fruitful meeting that gave the group much to think about. She stated how this was the beginning of a long process and requested the programme coordinators to take back relevant inputs for further deliberation at programme level meetings.
- **Dr. Shifa Haq** thanked the Dean, Ms. Deepti Sachdev and Dr. Bindu KC for taking the discussion on these courses thus far.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks and acknowledgement by the Dean.

AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY DELHI
School of Human Studies

Fourth Meeting of the Board of Studies

14-3-2018 (Wednesday), Faculty Lounge, Kashmere Gate campus

Members Present: Prof. Krishna Menon, Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali, Prof. Anita Ghai, Prof. Rachana Johri, Ms. Lovitoli Jimo, Dr. Rachna Chaudhary, Dr. Mamatha Karollil, Dr. Yogesh Snehi, Dr. Diamond Oberoi Vahali, Prof. Nivedita Menon, Dr. Vivek Bhandari, Dr. Divya Jalan, Dr. Amrita Narayanan

Members absent: Ms. Anshumita Pandey, Dr. Rajan Krishnan, Prof. Harsh Mander had sent his regrets since he is abroad currently.

Special Invitee Present: Prof. Ashok Nagpal, Dr. Shifa Haq, Dr. Bindu K.C.

Introduction and welcome by the Dean Prof. Krishna Menon.

Minutes of the 3rd Board of Studies meeting, passed.

After a note of condolence at the demise of Stephen Hawking, the meeting began with an introduction and welcome by the Dean Prof. Krishna Menon.

Minutes of the 3rd Board of Studies meeting, passed.

Item 1

Dr. Shifa Haq, programme co-ordinator introduced “Introducing Dissertation as an Elective in M.A. Psychology Programme.” It was proposed that :

1. An elective component rather than a core component towards fulfillment of the degree in MA Psychology;
2. The dissertation will include diverse forms such as written thesis, ensemble of photographs, film-making, theatre production or creative writing but may not be limited to these. This diversification is in line with the original imagination of the Master’s programme in Psychosocial Clinical Studies.

3. A student may be allowed to choose from other elective courses, offered in the 4th semester, in place of dissertation work. This is applicable both for MA Psychology and Gender Studies. This will be applicable from the 2018 admissions onwards for both courses.

Resolution: Passed by the BOS.

The BOS advised that the school to review the decision after two cycles of running the dissertation as an elective with feedback from students and faculty. The BOS suggested that while all students should be encouraged to work on a dissertation if they so wish, however those who do not wish to opt for it may choose from the electives offered in the programme. It was also suggested that there would be no criterion that might debar students from opting for the dissertation.

Item 2

Opening up the Option to Earn a Diploma after One Year of Programme after one year of MA Psychology Programme.

Resolution: Passed by the BOS.

Item 3

New Electives. The open elective “Situating Disability Studies” offered by Prof. Anita Ghai, School of Human Studies.

Resolution: Approved by BOS

Item 4

Reconstitution of Evaluation and Assessment Committee. MA Psychology Evaluation and Assessment Committee was reconstituted to include:

1. Ms. Deepti Sachdev (2017-2019)
2. Ms. Thokchom Bibinaz (2018-2020)

Resolution: Approved by BOS.

Item 5

UGC Experts Committee on Model Courses in Psychology 2016 introduced by Prof. Honey Oberoi. A few observations about the Model Courses were shared:

1. On reviewing the UGC Model courses in Psychology, Psychology programme found resonance in the vision and the emphasis on creating bridges between psychology, culture and historical context.
2. The Model Courses list many core courses as well as specialization courses. There are a few interesting overlaps in the courses offered in the MA psychology programme AUD and the model courses, such as, the emphasis on History of Psychology, Research Method, Counseling and psychotherapeutics, Self Psychology and fieldwork/ research.
3. At the moment, the UGC document is being studied by various departments and programmes in different universities. The psychology programme may also attempt to engage with responses from other universities to appreciate the diverse responses.

Resolution: BOS advised in the communication with UGC to point out the how valuable the UGC intervention was and how AUD courses have many of the suggestions already at work in our course.

Item 6

Proposal for course Rearrangement within the MA Gender Studies Programme March, 2018.

Resolution: Approved by BOS.

The detailed plan is given below:

Proposal for course Re-Arrangement[1] within the MA Gender Studies Programme March, 2018

General Rationale for the Gender Studies MA Programme Structure

The M.A. programme is imagined to give the students training in looking at the world through the lens of gender. The rich theoretical debates in the field

of Gender Studies and the symbiotic relationship that Gender Studies has with Women's Studies as well as the Feminist movement is sought to be reflected in the programme structure.

The course is a training in looking at gender as a theoretical category as well as has a practicum component through its Internship and Dissertation courses.

The course is run and managed in a collegiate manner and draws a great deal of support and strength from peer feedback, periodic reviews such as this and of course most centrally the feedback from our students. Every semester, students give their feedback on specific courses, as well as on the entire course structure and the program. Based on some consistent points raised by our students, we have felt the need to re arrange and re allocate credits for some of the courses.

The Gender Studies faculty met on several occasions over the last two years to discuss the need to re arrange the placement of certain courses within the program of MA Gender Studies. The changes have taken into consideration student feedback, student profile and their interests.

The changes are proposed from the cohort enrolling in the Gender Studies Programme, 2018-20 onwards.

The kind of courses that are part of the MA GS programme are broadly divided into

1. Foundation courses (taught and studied in common with the Psychology programme)
2. Programme specific core course (Conceptual, movements based as well as research methods courses)
3. Practicum/Fieldwork
4. Electives – a) Internal Electives b) Open Electives

(Internal electives are courses that are to be taken from within the options given by the programme. Open electives can be from within or outside the program and school).

Electives

We wish to change the nature of some of our existing core courses into electives, both internal electives as well as open electives.

Based on student feedback and the interdisciplinary nature of Gender Studies, the programme would like to make available to students greater opportunities to explore diverse range of electives offered by the various programmes and schools of AUD. The proposed structure opens up the course in a graded fashion towards the fourth semester. First semester consists of foundation courses (compulsory, studied along with Psychology students) and core courses with specific relevance for Gender Studies. The second semester has foundation, core and internal electives. The third has foundation, core and open elective. The fourth semester would also have electives in addition to the compulsory dissertation.

(Existing Open Electives Offered from Gender Studies Open to students from all Schools and Programmes of AUD).

Gendered World: Politics and Memory in North East India (SHS202842) is the open elective offered by Gender Studies right now.

Opening One More Open Elective Slot within the course structure

Given the interdisciplinary nature of the Gender Studies programme and based on consistent student feedback and faculty experience, the programme team would like to add more elective slots to enable students to pursue courses and areas of their interest. It is in this context that it has been decided to move the course titled Health (SHS202805 course code) which is a 4 credit course from being a core course to an open elective. This decision was taken after a great deal of deliberation within the programme group. This is not because Health is not an important category of analysis. Neither can one ignore the richness of the feminist work in the area. However, the conceptual courses like State, Nation, Citizenship and the Law (SHS202808) or Gender Work and Labour (SHS202803) appear to be stronger contenders for the core slots within a Gender Studies Master's Degree Program. Opening up this elective slot would address the student interest in courses offered by the

School of Education Studies, School of Culture and Creative Expressions, School of Design and School of Letters to name a few.

Internal Electives (Electives within the Gender Studies Program)

For a course on Gender Studies that also draws from Women's Studies discipline studying movements is a very important component. However, instead of having two core course slots taken up by the study of movements by the courses titled "Feminist Movements in South Asia" (SHS202831) and "Global Feminisms" (SHS202832) we propose that students choose either of the two courses. We also propose to offer them as internal electives where the student is expected to do either of the two.

We have many courses that introduce a particular conceptual category close to the analysis of Gender. In a similar vein we propose that students be allowed to choose either the course titled "Bodies" (SHS202809) or the course titled "Violence: Feminist Critique and Resistance" (SHS202841). Please do note that the latter course was already an elective course within the programme structure.

Increasing of credits for internship from 2 to 4

We would like to propose an increase in the credits from 2 to 4 for the internship component.

The overwhelming feedback from the students who have successfully completed the programme has been in favour of internships. Many find the out of classroom experience of learning very effective and memorable because it helps bring alive to them the various theoretical debates, conceptual frameworks and information and history learnt in the classroom and through a wide body of literature. The internship is a valuable component of the program because it not only gives them a flavour of 'work' situations, but also helps them build bridges with organizations and groups where they could potentially work. Internships become an occasion for them to test and challenge their understanding of Gender Studies. This rich experience is a very valuable aspect of their Master's degree. Many of our students get placed

in the organizations that they intern with and this is another reason for the worth attached to this course by our students.

This has led us to ask for an increase in the credits for internship. Students are expected maintain a daily diary to be submitted as well as an analytical report apart from the supervisor's grading. The daily diary trains them and helps them while undertaking ethnographic research. The internship is supervised and evaluated by a designated supervisor in the field and the Gender Studies programme team at AUD. The students have also attached the work that they actually produced for the institution they interned with (sometimes reports, sometimes XL sheets, sometimes fieldwork captured through visual documentation like photographs or voice interviews and often transcripts). Given the considerable degree of work involved in the internship, student feedback has consistently expressed disappointment at the fact that it counts only for 2 credits, and hence we request that it be increased to 4 credits.

Increasing of credits for Dissertation from 4 to 8

The next proposal is to increase the credits for the course titled Dissertations from 4 to 8. The logic for proposing this is stated below:

Research is an integral part of social science education and is a skill that our program tries to instil in our students. The program attaches a great deal of significance to teaching the students 'how to conduct research'. Research methodology courses precede the dissertation course and students are taught the skills needed to write a proposal and make a defence. In addition, is of course the final dissertation that often becomes the most important testament of their suitability for higher research in specific areas and also for position with NGOs/teaching etc. Hence this is a very important course that both students and teachers invest fruitfully a great deal of their time and energy. Students have repeatedly requested that it be reflected in the credits allotted to this course.

The students experience the final semester dissertation as a “grand finale” to their two year Masters. We have got some “disappointed” feedbacks on the consideration of it as “just another 4 credit course” because the thinking

towards the dissertation and research often begins from the second semester onwards. Considering the credits given for dissertation in other schools (SCCE for instance within AUD and outside AUD- TISS Women’s Studies Centre give 8 credits for M.A. dissertation) and other programmes with dissertation component we also feel that the credit for dissertation should be increased to 8. This is crucial to give a research focus to the programme and it helps our students prepare for research degrees more easily. The increasing of credits gives the students space to develop the research problem more rigorously in the 4th semester. The present structure is experienced as cramming them with classroom teaching in the 4th semester with very less time to write the dissertation.

The difficulty that is experienced by students to write a dissertation also has to be considered. Due to this, we have decided to allow students who do not wish to go through this particular form of assessment to take two 4 credit courses instead. Also, the form of final submission need not be insisted to be analytic writing, but creative expressions, visual documentation and other “experiments” can also be accepted. (AUD’s interdisciplinary vision already allows for this).

Present Course Structure. Total credits = 64

	Semester 1	Semester 2	Summer Holidays	Semester 3	Semester 4
Foundational courses	1. Ideas, Knowledge and Ethics (4)	5. Ways of Humans (4)	10. Internship (2)	11. Experiencing the Self or Politics, Resistance, Transformation (4)	
Programme specific core course	2. Introduction to Gender (4)	6. Gender Work and Labour (4)		12. Health (4)	17. Bodies (2)
	3. Family (4)	7. Sexualities (2)		13. Masculinities (2)	18. State Nation Citizenship Law (2)
	4. Feminist	8. Global			

	Movements in South Asia (4)	Feminisms (4)			
Elective				14. Violence (2)	19. Gendered World: Politics and Memory in North East India (4)
Research Coursework		9. Introduction to Research Methods (2)		15. Feminist Research Methods (2)	20. Reading Feminist Texts (2)
Seminars / Workshop				16. Dissertation Workshop (2)	
Practicum Or Fieldwork					21. Dissertation (4)

Proposed Course Structure: Total credits = 64

	Semester 1	Semester 2	Summer Holidays	Semester 3	Semester 4	
Total Credits in the semester	16 credits	16 credits	4 credits	14 credits	14 credits	
Foundational courses	1. Ideas, Knowledge and Ethics (4)	5. Ways of Humans (4)	9. Internship (4)	10. Experiencing the Self or Politics, Resistance, Transformation (4)		
Programme specific core course	2. Introduction to Gender (4)	6. Gender Work and Labour (4)		9. Internship (4)	11. Masculinities (2)	
	3. Family (4)	7. State Nation Citizenship Law (2)				
	4. Sexualities (2)					
Internal Elective		8. Feminist Movements in South Asia			13. Bodies Or	

		Or Global Feminisms (4)			Violence: Feminist Critique and Resistance (2)
Open Elective				12. Health Or Any other Open Elective course (4)	14. Gendered World: Politics and Memory in North East India Or Any other open elective (4)
Research Coursework	5. Reading Feminist Texts (2)	11. Introduction to Research Methods (2)		16. Feminist Research Methods (2) 17. Dissertation workshop (2)	
Practicum/Fieldwork					15. Dissertation (8)

[1] Re-arrangement refers to opening up of compulsory course slots into two types of elective slots- electives from within the programme and electives from outside the programme and the school.

Resolution: Passed by BOS

Discussion:

The proposal to increase MA Gender Studies dissertation credits from 4 to 8 credits was discussed and approved by BOS. The BOS suggested that while all students should be encouraged to work on a dissertation if they so wish, however those who do not wish to opt for it may opt for the various electives suggested by the program. It was also suggested that there would be no criterion that might debar students from opting for the dissertation.

Workload issues was also discussed where dissertation components are not given due recognition and there is a disparity of both workload credits as well

as number of students. In Gender Studies, the credits given to the faculty for MA Dissertation guidance is 2 credits while in History it is 4 credits. The faculty students ratio was brought out where the current ratio for Gender Studies is 1:6 and for the 2017-18 batch it is 1:10. In this context how to account for dissertation supervision and workload was also brought out.

BOS advised the school to embark upon a process of re-visioning the foundation courses and bring the new imagination of FC to the BOS for a discussion.

AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY DELHI (AUD)

Sixth Meeting of the School of Human Studies Board of Studies: Minutes

Friday, 26th April 2019, Faculty Lounge, Kashmere Gate campus

Members Present: Prof. Krishna Menon, Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali, Prof. Rachana Johri, Prof. Anita Ghai, Prof. Nivedita Menon, Dr. Divya Jalan, Dr. Amrita Narayanan, Dr. Lovitoli Jimo, Dr. Mamatha Karollil, Dr. Yogesh Snehi and Dr. Diamond Oberoi Vahali.

Members Absent: Dr. Rachna Chaudhary, Dr. Rajan Krishnan and Prof. Harsh Mander

Special Invitee Present: Prof. Jatin Bhatt, Prof. Anup Dhar, Dr. Bindu K.C, Dr. Priyanka Jha and Ms. Deepti Sachdev.

Introduction and welcome by the Dean SHS, Prof. Krishna Menon.

Item 1

- Minutes of the 5th Board of Studies meeting was passed.
- Prof. Menon also inform the house that Experiencing the Self (ETS), SHS foundation course will be taught by the Gender Studies faculty Dr. Bindu KC in the Monsoon Semester 2019 to MA Gender Studies, Semester-3 students. Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali inform the house that Gender Studies faculty has proposed to teach ETS course with some modification and perspective of gender in teaching the said course.
- Prof. Anita Ghai, suggested that she would first audit the course before making changes to the existing course. At the same time when we are talking about the need to incorporate some changes to the course, to also integrate the disability perspective as in experiencing the self, one is also experiencing the disabling parts as well.

The BoS members in principle approve for some modification in the transaction of ETS course in order to cater to the needs and politics of Gender Studies.

ITEM 2

MA Gender Studies open elective course on *The 'Herstory' of Ideas: Women's Intellectual History in South Asia* was presented by Dr. Priyanka Jha and Bindu KC

The need for such course was felt by the members and the members congratulate Dr. Priyanka Jha and Dr. Bindu KC for coming up with an excellent course which was one of its kind in India. The members also suggested some changes and modification to the course.

Prof. Nivedita Menon: Suggested an alternative title- **Intellectual History in South Asia: Women Thinking the World**. She also pointed out that in Module 4 under Tribe, the need to include the thought from the Northeast India which was missing in the course and some work on Naga Mothers Association and Irom Sharmila was suggested to be explored.

Bodies, Labour and Knowledge in Module 5, one of the readings from Sharmila Rage's book can be looked at

In Module -2, where are women in the political, to look at Uma Chakravarti's essay Beyond the Altekarian paradigm in Kumkum and Sudeshi's edited book. The essay answers the question.

In Module -3, Not sure on why there is African American work. A suggestion was made to look at Tanika Srakar's work on Rassundari Devi. The absence of writing from Pakistan was pointed out and it was suggested to look at abducted women during partition which counter pose the idea of Nation. Khan and Kamla Basin, Veena Das, Afiya Zia in EPW- critical perspective on Islamic rights from critical feminist view. Devika's essay in EPW, Contrasting Naleni Jamila and Kamla Das as autobiography which raises a very important theoretical points on women's writing.

Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali: The course can become a foundation course for School of Human Studies. She also adds that women and psyche may be represented since this course is coming from SHS. On the significance of life writing from women standpoint, she suggested module or reading to look at 'knowledge from and on women's genealogy'. The works of Irigary and Kristiva was suggested. Life writing is not just an issue in itself but it will have implications for several other things, how discipline has been conceived or have been imagine so far. Some reflections of that into the course on methods or analysis on what becomes text, what is the relationship between subjectivity and theory etc was suggested.

Prof. Anita Ghai: Opines that very often we talk about body and knowledge, somewhere it always looked at normative body. The body which is not considered as perfect body is never looked at/left out. Suggestion was made to look at South Asia and works such as Renu Addlakha and Anita Ghai to look at disabled bodies. How the absence came out. In the knowledge construction, the absence of disabled body is never looked at even in Gender Studies in SHS.

Dr. Bindu KC: Exclusion as part of the course is very evident and the course team will look/take the suggestions.

Dr. Amrita Narayanan: Happy to see psycho anaysis and women studies coming close. To look at the book Being a Character: Psychoanalysis and Self Experience by Christopher Bollas

She infact appreciated the inclusion of Afro-American literature as a part of methodology. She suggested the following text. In Module 5: Sangeeta Ray's reading on Sultana's Dream in the book Engendering India. A reading on **Swarna.....** ..Body in Devdasi Tradition and Knowledge was suggested.

Prof Rachana Johri: Some readings are repeated in different courses so it can be reworked by keeping them in supplementary readings and introduce newer readings/texts.

Prof. Jatin Bhatt: Module -5 Body Labour and Knowledge- Asked the question of how do you differentiate between labour and work? The second question is on expansion of the source of Text as text, is work a source of text/knowledge? What is the contribution of labour in knowledge production? To look at the book Unfashionable Human Body by Bernard Rudofsky.

Prof. Krishna Menon suggested Kamla Devi Chattopadhyaya.

Dr. Priyanka Jha responded that the question of labour has been looked at but Kamla Devi's writing on craft becomes important but it has not been referred to or invoked as others thinkers would be.

Dr Divya Jalan: Shared some thoughts on

1. Disability: Where there are lots of writing and infact more by women than men. Many of us are familiar with literature in English and Hindi but there must be some literature on experience by women all over the country and need to look at those literatures.
2. On the question of informal, thoughts, thinkers and women: The areas of craft and folklore etc are areas where women think all the times through the experience of motherhood, family etc and brings a lot of thinking on day to day basis but these are not documented, non academic and not formal. How can we bring the thinking aspects of these performers, women the thinking aspects of the thinkers on living everyday life and how they are developing and expanding on philosophies, on life etc.
3. If we are going to move away from Text, then how are we going to include the written Text. It is an important idea to go into the realm of imagination and idea but how will it get included.

Prof. Krishna Menon points out that this is the first time the course will be introduced and therefore the need to tap on the resources available in this aspects especially from school of Culture and Creative Expressions, School of Letters, School of Design and look at different themes such as Democracy and design, cinema etc and work closely together by bringing in different realm.

Dr. Bindu K C acknowledges that these are very important question about body and idea. Body is usually constructed as though it not connected but with a clear cut division between body and ideas where body is the non transcended, which pulls us back into the everydayness of field and the lower realm of existence where thought is considered higher which transcend body. This is the problem of both the human and the women. This itself is how women were never included in writing.

Prof. Anita Ghai suggested to contact **Sumashwar**, JNU and Sanju Thomas from School of Letters (SoL) to look at their essay on disability and body.

Ms. Anshumita Pande suggested a book on poetry Therigatha- Poems of the first Buddhist might be an important addition both chronologically and look at performance, language, body and knowledge.

Ms. Deepti Sachdev - Echoes the larger questions. When you are asking the question, What is the political question? Does one also have to think on what does the political include? To foreground the notion of care work or do we want to continue to see care work as anti intellectual work? Debates in psychology opens up the notion of care by approaching justice differently, through care vs Justice, care work and notion of affected labour by looking at Kant or other recent works.

Prof. Krishna Menon cautions the course team on the danger of trying to include everything/ suggestion/comments but to pick and choose in order to keep the initial imagination of the course intact. We can run it for one two session and come back to BoS members with the experience and think of another course or reimagine it later based on experience of running the course.

Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali puts forward the idea that since both MA Psychology and Gender Studies are going for course revision soon, if there is a possibility of the course like this running across four semesters invariably building on the idea of the previous ones, but looking at the history of intellectual idea from the women's position to rewrite the companion course to the entire programme.

Resolution- The BoS approve the course with a new title and to incorporate some suggestions to make it SHS course.

ITEM 3

MA Psychology Assessment Committee: Deepti Sachdev reported to the members of BoS, the reconstitution of new assessment committee for MA psychology programs. The members consist of Kamei, wrick Mitra, Deepti Sachdev (programme Coordinator) and Dean SHS.

ITEM 4

To Review the Existing Attendance Policy of SHS MA Programme (MA Gender Studies and Psychology)

Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali spoke on SHS attendance Policy and gave a brief background on why stringent attendance policy was adopted by SHS at the initial years. She also highlighted that BA program followed strict attendance policy in the 1st and 2nd year but in the 3rd year, students are not bound by compulsory attendance.

The university does not have attendance policy for MA programmes. School of Education, School of Business, School of Design and School of Human studies adopt their own policy based on the specific needs of the programme.

SHS- In 2014, there was a discussion and deliberation on attendance for graduate of SHS atten. In 2014 attendance policy was approved by BoS, SCAP and AC with 65% attendance requirements for students to pass the course. It later evolve with cutting one grades and it was tried out for 5 years.

The idea was to facilitate students but in experience it was felt that the policy is becoming more punitive. In the process both SHS MA programmes came together and formulate a grade. Till 59%, the students, got Cplus in attendance components and the higher grades gives incentives to the students to get good grades in attendance upto A plus. Attendance is a minor components of 10-15% percentage and other components of class participation. At this juncture the school wants to align itself with larger attendance policy of the university of no compulsory attendance.

Dr. Lovitoli Jimo: The Gender Studies programme have been deliberating on attendance policy since last year. The faculty agreed to follow the larger university policy and wrote to students service asking for the university Attendance policy but Bindu Nair from student service responded that there is no attendance policy. The intention of compulsory attendance policy was to facilitate the students but students felt that it was a way to penalise them.

Ms. Deepti Sachdev: Attendance is a concern and it also important to talk about why we introduce attendance policy. The Attendance policy at MA level is peculiar as in BA 3rd year there is no attendance policy but in MA there is strict attendance policy. At master's level, there is a need to think of other activities rather than policy on attendance.

Prof. Rachana Johri: The concerns was that after masters most students will become professionals It prepares them for work and post MA many psychology graduates were employed as school councillors. Therefore it was felt that there should be more stringent evaluation process where their presence necessitates them to be in the class to complete the course requirements rather than having a compulsory attendance which also compromises the quality of the class.

Dr. Divya Jalan: To break up the components, where the teacher felt that students should be compulsorily present in the class like introduction etc should be made compulsory. She raises the question- if there is any time that the teachers feel that the students should be there in the class which is very crucial. She also poses the following questions. If students are not there, how do we evaluate their participation? How can we make attendance not mandatory but effective?

Students may not be present in the class but attention can be there without physical presence by finding out what is happening in the class, the deadline for assignments etc. The question of attention Vs presence is an important question to look at. To decide on which section is important/compulsory for students to attend and bring in accountability for the students.

Prof. Anita Ghai: Interjects with the experience of elective course where for all other elective courses, there is no compulsory attendance and students says that it is saying that they have to be there inorder to participate in the course. But she also feels that attendance becomes important at the end of the day. She also suggests to make readings more creative and engaging.

Dr. Mamatha Karollil: Supporting attendance policy. It is not only about choice for students for attendance or infantilising them but it is also the question of the ability of the teachers to invoke more interactive sessions. Very often students presence in classroom with attendance is a floating population where for teachers who is drawing a trait across which is dependent upon participation, finds it extremely difficult. The question is therefore on why is it only about student's choice and agency. It is also a part of the pedagogy. Should it not be a kind of pedagogy to follow for students to participate and engage? Why only attendance?

Prof. Krishna Menon: Points out to the reality where there are some students who cannot survive without some form of employability. She points out that in Gender Studies, there are many students who are under pressure to support themselves and without some form or employability they cannot manage.

Prof. Nivedita Menon responded to Dr. Mamatha Karollil on the question of pedagogy. As a serious teachers, we want to address attendance not to penalise or control but as a pedagogical methods, is attendance necessary? She pointed out that, body in class is not equal to attendance- it is fooling us to thinking that presence of body is just a classroom full of attendance and therefore it cannot be resolved by compulsory attendance. Some segments of course could be made compulsory which require practicum and sets of questions which requires both involvements as well as collective memory. Some of them might want to go through MA and just get degree. This is an unfortunate reality we should accept. The larger pedagogical question is that we cannot mandate attention and that is something we should take seriously.

Ms. Deepti Sachdev: Brings out the experience of subsidiary papers in college where attendance is not compulsory. It was not attendance that brings students to class.

Dr. Amrita Naryan: Can be looked at in 2 ways.

1. Imagination of what the future professionals going to be and therefore concerns for attendance is about accountability.
2. Sense of entitlement by the students can be damaging for the future professionals.

Some kinds of etiquette can be incorporated into our ways of thinking about attendance. She articulate that she feels much better if students come and talk face to face with the teachers of their concerns and reason of absence in class. If there can be oral participation instead of attendance, through body and not just through writing.

Ms. Anshumita Pandey: In agreement with no compulsory attendance as a policy. Struggle with the pragmatics of class rooms and peers groups, and classroom dynamics. In the case of Undergraduate, attendance is linked with scholarships and Student welfare fund.

Dr. Yogesh Snehi talks about how as programme coordinators she gets distressed calls from colleagues about the absence of students in class rooms at 9:00 am and therefore there is no answer to this question. However he said he is going to be provocative as members of the BoS of SHS and not as SLS teacher. The uniqueness of SHS is that, there seems to be nothing available for dissent except attendance/ absence in the class with no elective except compulsory. With Psychology programme where everything is compulsory, he raises this question of whether absence in class a form of dissent to say that you do not give any choice and I do not want to agree. Is this structural? In SLS there are elective choices but students still don't turn up for class. Attendance in the class is seen as phase declining consistently which is also because of assessment cycle? We cannot completely blame the students for their absence. What does this assessment cycle does is something to think about? What is the way we evaluate students? With the decline of class attendance over a period of time, the question is what should be our engagement and how can we formulate assessment which will engage with students more. Agree with no compulsory attendance.

Dr. Diamond Oberoi Vahali: In her programme, all the courses are elective without any compulsory course but the problem of attendance still persists. The need to find ways to address the concerns of the students presence and motivate them. For her, keeping a grade for class participation helps. SHS has to take its own decision but at the same time to keep the scope for individual teacher decide on attendance situation.

Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali: Welcomes the provocations of Dr. Yogesh Snehi which is significant but at the same time felt the need to contextualise the struggle within the programme, historicise the struggle within the discipline and situate it. When MA Psychology programme was imagined in 2008, there was no elective because it was the first time where psychoanalysis was being brought within the university programme not just in India but also in Asian context. There was no faculty or the disciplinary basis on which the programme could establish. The history and the context of the programme determines whether the programme could spread very widely or to keep with some foundational access at that time.

Now after ten years, she felt that there is a serious need and thought on restructuring the programme and to strike a balance between what could be the core and electives. On Compulsory attendance policy, she suggested that if we give up the compulsory attendance policy, the programme team and teachers should preserve the right to implement and demand for attendance in their course.

Prof. Nivedita Menon: There should be no mandatory attendance but to start structured conversations between teachers and students on attendance. Experience shows that students who do not attend class consistently do not do well. She also points out that students who are not attending class will be hungry so there are different mechanism and ways through which

learning takes place by keeping track of deadlines and turning in assignments etc. For professional look, as profession they change. May be mid semester exam for whole school is an alternative so that there are no class but that also did not help with attendance as is the experience with JNU.

Prof. Anup Dhar: For SHS Psychology, attendance was thought as important because it was a clinical psychology programme but on hindsight he felt that clinical work they might learn overtime as profession. Classroom and professional space is different. He put forward the idea of having a discussion with students on how a classroom is imagined/think of? How do we want to imagine the classroom in today's world? He also agreed to give up compulsory attendance policy, but at the same time to collectively look at student's problem and attendance and to re-look our assessment policy. May be university have to re-imagine themselves also. The classroom also have to re-thought.

Prof. Rachana Johri agreed on the need to discuss with the students not just collectively but also individually.

Dr. Divya Jalan: Decide on which components/section, you want the students to be. To bring in accountability not just for attendance but as a way of life will be useful.

Ms. Deepti Sachdev: To go with AUD policy at the same time while giving the teachers to decide, in the moment of anxiety, we sometime put stringent attendance or assessment policy and what is it doing to the other course and teachers? Is it really helpful? She also brings up the question as programme coordinator on the idea of attendance not just for students but to keep attendance policy for programme meetings for teachers.

Prof. Honey Oberoi Vahali: To do away with compulsory attendance policy and having a components with teachers having a requirements based on course requirements and keeping the larger context in mind, the need to understand the generational change.

Dr. Dimond Oberoi Vahali and Dr. Yogesh Snehi agreed to leave the attendance concern to individual teachers. Lovitoli Jimo, speaks about the deliberation of Gender Studies faculty to not have mandatory attendance policy. Anshumita Pandey agreed on no mandatory attendance policy at the same time to re-imagine assessments.

Prof. Jatin Bhatt: Faculty needs to ensure that students are interested. For school of design, the students have choices/options on what they want to do. The problem of attendance are three levels:

1. Whole generation of students who have high pitched life and if you are not engaged, you need to stop. The present generations are unable to handle the pressure.
2. Existential question-Alternatives for economic survival is a genuine concerns.
3. Pedagogy- Academic transactions where faculty are enthusiastic to teach and negotiation between which faculty to teach. More negotiation by the students between which faculty is more demanding and which class you can miss/bunk.

Ownership of learning is shared. Learn as much as you want but I won't be missed. Students may not be bodily present but hunger to learn. There is a need to have good coordination between faculty and students and how to manage to pressure and nature of assessment. Different cohorts have different dynamics, where there is an experience of huge success and huge failure. The need to continue to debate where students can have ownership and engagement but to leave the autonomy of attendance requirements to the individual faculty. Prof. Bhatt cautioned that whatever is decided/outcome not to make announcement to the students that there is no formal attendance policy but to document it.

Dr. Mamatha Karollil: Go with the group but stand by the need to have compulsory attendance policy and caution against reducing it as student's anxiety and also to look at our failure as teacher. There is a need to think of assessment which is engaging and continuous at the same time to talk and orient the students of every batch on the need to be present in the class room session and interactions. Assessment to be re-imagined and the importance of talking with students of every batch on the need to be present in the class.

Prof. Nivedita Menon: Felt the need to put thoughts into how the circular is issued on how attendance is to be handled.

Dr. Amrita Narayan: Felt that regarding compulsory attendance, the discretion should be given to individual instructors with structured conversations and accountability.

Prof. Anita Ghai: Said that in her 35 years of teaching undergraduate teaching, attendance has always been an important component. Timetable should be arranged in such a manner that electives are not clashing. Prof. Nivedita Menon interjects that elective course timetable can be adjusted between the teacher and students.

Assessment calendar should be prepared and provide to the students at the beginning of the semester which has been followed by both MA in Gender Studies and Psychology programmes.

Resolution- The BoS approve no compulsory attendance policy for MA programmes at SHS with different views and some apprehension but individual course instructors will have the discretion to devise the requirements for individual courses based on felt needs and requirements.

The Chair Prof. Krishna Menon ended the meeting with the vote of thanks and with a note to get back to the BoS members with the outcome of AC decision.