

Subject: RE: Re: normalization

From: "Sunil Kr Sarangi" <arangiskr@nitrrkl.ac.in>

Date: Tue, April 16, 2013 6:22 am

To: rajeshsingh.edu@nic.in ([more](#))

Cc: amitasharmahrd@gmail.com

Dear Mr Singh,

My comments are enclosed in the attached file.

Summary:

Merit should not be compromised. But how to define merit?

ACCEPT Prof S K Joshi committee's recommendations. [Option 1]

Details in attached file.

Regards

Sunil Kr Sarangi

Comments on Renormalisation of Board performance.

1. Merit should not be compromised. More meritorious student should get a seat over the less meritorious.
2. But what is merit? How is it measured? What is the metric?
3. There are two thoughts on question 2.
 - a. JEE score is true indicator of merit.
 - b. JEE score is a partial indicator of merit. It is adequately considered in the 60%. Balance 40% should be on some thing NOT influence by JEE score.
4. If one subscribes to the first, one need not proceed further. In fact one should work towards undoing the 60/40 model. I subscribe to second thought, i.e. the 40% should be uninfluenced by JEE of any kind.
5. The present analysis relates board marks with JEE score. Dr Vineet Joshi is presenting more Board marks and more AIEEE scores. Let us trash both data. Let us go by plain common sense.
6. The reasons for my delinking the 40% from JEE are following:
 - a. Intrinsic merit is uniformly distributed by uniformly across India at a child's birth, but gets choked during K-12 due to lack of training. Suppressed merit can be rekindled. In fact that should be the motto of college education. Nothing to do with social equity. Only economic benefits to the nation in future.
 - b. IIT Madras study established [PI refer to report of Prof Idichandy IIT Madras; also report of Prof D Acharya committee] that graduating CGPA was unrelated to JEE performance. It was better correlated with Board marks.
7. Graduating marks [After 4 years of B Tech study may be taken as an indicator of merit. If it is so then let us take Board percentile as indicator of merit also. Prof Idichandy did not find any distinction between boards.
8. That means – let us accept what the Prof S K Joshi committee has thoughtfully recommended – Option 1.

Subject: RE: normalization
From: "Sunil Kr Sarangi" <sarangiskr@nitrkl.ac.in>
Date: Wed, April 17, 2013 3:11 pm
To: "RAJESH SINGH" <rajeshsingh.edu@nic.in>
Cc: ashokmisra47@gmail.com ([more](#))

This note of mine has nothing to do with normalization per se. I just want to share a private thought on what should be our approach to recommendations of committees.

A committee is created out of people who know something on the subject at hand and are expected to discharge their responsibility with honesty. They may come up with

- (a) a unanimous or near-unanimous ambiguity-free recommendation, or
- (b) an ambiguous, poorly drafted report.

In the former case we should accept the recommendation of the committee. In the latter case of course we should debate further.

In the instant case, we do not doubt the competence of the committee, nor the clarity of the recommendation.

Then why are we continuing with the debate?

No one has come up with a lacuna in the recommendation of the Prof S K Joshi committee. The only objection is that those who would have been considered winners on the basis of last year's formula may not be winners under the recommended approach. Isn't that what we want? Every thing was not right last year, hence we chose to change. Then why not accept change with grace?

Regards

Sunil Kr Sarangi