

Inaugural Session of ITW 2025

The inaugural session commenced with Saraswati Vandana. Prof. Shibani Jha, Faculty-in-Charge of the Teaching Learning Centre (TLC), delivered the welcome and orientation address. As TLC celebrates 10 successful years, she highlighted the Centre's sustained contributions toward enhancing teaching quality and its recognition through the ET Award. Prof. Jha emphasized the multi-domain nature of the gathering and underlined the relevance of the imminent session on designing course handouts aligned with Program Outcomes and Course Outcomes in the context of the ongoing curriculum review and accreditation processes. She also oriented the faculty to the workshop's structure, which included interactive discussions on challenges faced in teaching, a session on ethical practices in professional development, and another focusing on the effective integration of technology in classroom teaching.

Prof. V. Ramgopal Rao, the Vice-Chancellor, then addressed the participants, underscoring the institution's responsibility to nurture and empower newly appointed faculty to realize their full potential. He outlined the three aspects of an academic institution—transformative education, impactful research, and innovation—and reflected on the evolving role of teachers in an age shaped by social media and digital distractions. Highlighting the purpose of the workshop as a platform for mutual learning, he urged faculty members to leverage technology rather than compete with it for students' attention. He encouraged innovation in classrooms, open dialogue, and a culture where students are inspired to challenge and surpass their teachers. He also emphasized the importance of the attendance policy in enabling faculty to maintain meaningful engagement with students.

Prof. S. K. Barai, the Director, further addressed the gathering, emphasizing the four cornerstones of effective teaching—Commitment, Communication, Connection, and Collaboration—and shared the mantra of BITS - Best Innovator Teaching Students.

Prof. N. V. M. Rao, the Dean, Administration, conveyed his best wishes to the participants for a productive workshop.

The session concluded with the presentation of mementoes to the dignitaries as a token of appreciation.

CO-PO Mapping, Bloom's Taxonomy and Handout Development by Prof. Shibani Jha

The session began with an outline presented by Prof. Jha, the resource person, who announced that the workshop would focus on understanding and applying Bloom's Taxonomy in the context of Course Outcome (CO)–Program Outcome (PO) mapping. The emphasis was on aligning teaching plans and assessments with Bloom's hierarchical framework of learning. The following questions were asked to guide the participants' thinking.

- Are we following Bloom's Taxonomy in our assessment practices?
- How do we link our lesson plans to assessment plans for effective CO–PO mapping?

Linking Course Design to Learning Outcomes

Participants explored the process of designing a course learning framework, focusing on the following key principles:

- Course objectives must directly relate to Course Outcomes (COs).
- Each course should specify what learners are able to do upon completion.

- Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) represent the learners' perspective, while Course Objectives represent the teacher's perspective.
- A 14-week plan should be structured with clear modules, sub-units, and corresponding lessons (e.g., Module 1: Introduction).

The session also encouraged reflection on revised or re-tuned curricula, highlighting the need for coherence between modules, objectives, and the broader program goals.

Graduate Attributes and Program Alignment

Participants were guided to think about Graduate Attributes (GAs), that is, what a student should be able to do at the end of the program. These attributes form the foundation for mapping Program Educational Objectives (PEOs), Program Outcomes (POs), and Program Specific Outcomes (PSOs) to course-level outcomes.

Autonomy in Designing and Assessment

The facilitator stressed the autonomy of instructors in designing course objectives and assessments, even though the broader framework is often directed by the Head of the Institution (HoI). Participants learned how autonomy plays a role in contextualizing Bloom's taxonomy within their own courses.

Linking Bloom's Verbs to Outcomes

A major portion of the session was devoted to the choice of action verbs in outcomes and assessments, corresponding to Bloom's levels:

- LOTS (Lower Order Thinking Skills): Remembering, Understanding, Applying
- HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills): Analyzing, Evaluating, Creating

The facilitator demonstrated how the correct verb choice determines the level of learning and influences both POs and COs.

The PCC Framework

An important model discussed was the PCC framework, emphasizing that every measurable outcome should specify:

- Performance: What the learner is expected to do
- Condition: Under what circumstances the performance should occur
- Criteria: The acceptable standard or quality of performance

Example: Write an essay using MS Word without grammatical mistakes.

Here, "writing an essay" reflects performance, "using MS Word" indicates condition, and "without mistakes" defines the criteria.

Workshop Activities

Participants engaged in:

- Drafting module-level and course-level objectives using verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy.
- Reviewing and refining their written objectives with feedback from the moderator.
- Discussing and resolving issues related to the clarity, measurability, and alignment of outcomes.

The session effectively linked theoretical aspects of Bloom's Taxonomy to practical course design and assessment planning. Participants left with a clearer understanding of how to:

- Align teaching, learning, and assessment activities with measurable learning outcomes.
- Select appropriate verbs and performance indicators for various cognitive levels.

- Strengthen CO–PO–PSO mapping to reflect both teacher and learner perspectives.

Overall, the workshop reinforced the importance of constructive alignment in outcome-based education and encouraged reflective curriculum design.

Assessment, Evaluation Matrix Development, and Grading by Prof. Shibani Jha

Interactive Grading Facility

- Faculty members were assigned the task of plotting the grades.
- Prof. Jha explained the “eye-ball the gap” approach and the concept of relative grading to interpret grade distributions.

Grading Policy Discussion

- The session covered the institutional grading policy in detail.
- It was highlighted that MGPA (Mean Grade Point Average) reflects the overall class performance.

Understanding Grading Scales

- Various grading scales were introduced and compared, including:
 - Two-category system
 - Five-category system
 - Thirteen-category system
- The advantages and applications of each were discussed in context.

Use of Rubrics in Evaluation

- The importance of rubric was emphasized for maintaining transparency, objectivity, and consistency in assessment.
- Rubrics help in aligning evaluation criteria with learning outcomes.

Question & Answer Session

- The session concluded with an interactive Q&A, where faculty members clarified doubts and discussed practical grading challenges.

Using AI/LLMs in Teaching & Learning by Prof. Ashutosh Bhatia

Prof. Ashutosh Bhatia gave a talk on the use of AI/LLMs in Teaching & Learning. In his talk, Prof. Bhatia demonstrated the use of different AI applications and online resources for creation of quizzes, literature review, diagrams etc. Prof. Bhatia demonstrated how to use ChatGPT and prompted it to create an effective quiz by summarizing a book. Other resources like Thesis AI, Scispace etc. were also demonstrated.

Use of BITS Learning Management System (NALANDA) by Prof. Virendra S. Shekhawat

- Nalanda is managed by BITS and pulls student data from ERP; mapping is based on ERP numbers.
- Instructors control visibility of course items; ERP number changes must be updated on Nalanda.

- Assessments support MCQ/TF and use safe exam browser; requests must go through IPC.
- Teachers can turn editing on, enroll students correctly, create grade items, and edit/import questions (including bulk import).
- Evaluation can be done on Nalanda or offline and re-uploaded.
- Announcements from Nalanda reach students and faculty; 30-minute edit window available.
- Backup and restore options exist.

Ethical Practices in Academia by Prof. Tapomoy Guha Sarkar

- Key academic roles of faculty remain teaching and research, though research involves dealing with uncertain knowledge and generating new ideas.
- Many students are not used to asking questions due to schooling; colleges must encourage enquiry-based learning, collaborative learning, and discovery rather than spoon-feeding.
- AI & LLMs will supplement—not replace—teachers.
- Human teachers bring empathy, emotional connection, and context that AI cannot replace.
- Ethics in research:
 - Purpose of research: generate knowledge, advance humanity, benefit society, and pursuit of truth and knowledge.
 - Researchers must reflect on actions; rules alone can't ensure ethical behavior.
 - Pursuit of truth must be complete—whole truth, not partial.
 - Ethical issues arise when researchers hide mistakes, misrepresent data, follow pressure to publish, or focus only on tenure.
- Supervisor responsibilities:
 - Maintain research quality, guide students, and uphold honesty.
 - Scholars should be trained to become autonomous researchers.
 - Supervisors must avoid inappropriate relationships with students.
- Things to remember as a teacher:
 - Emphasize transparency, fairness, and clarity in teaching.
 - Explain why a handout is important; learner-centric agreements.
 - Document and clearly state instructor expectations and discuss problems like plagiarism.
 - Know what not to do with students and avoid creating dependency.
 - Be mindful and careful about what is said in a class.