



## Appeal

### SRINIVASA INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES ,Visakhapatnam ,Andhra Pradesh

<b>Date of submission</b>	26/05/2025
<b>AISHE ID</b>	C-23898
<b>Institution Track ID</b>	APCOGN113498

<b>Name and Address of the Institution</b>	
Name of the Institution	SRINIVASA INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
Address	Srinivasa Institute of Management Studies Opp YSR International Cricket Stadium P M Plalem Madhurawada Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, 530041
Telephone	0891-2781366
Email	directorsimscollege@gmail.com
Location	Urban
Current Cycle	Cycle 1
<b>Details of Head of the Institution</b>	
<b>Present</b>	
Name of the Principal	V Sai Prasanth
Email	directorsimscollege@gmail.com
Mobile	8374714324
<b>At the time of PT visit</b>	
Name of the Principal	V Sai Prasanth
Email	directorsimscollege@gmail.com
Mobile	8374714324
<b>Details of the Coordinators</b>	
<b>IQAC coordinator</b>	
Name of the Coordinator	Dr Kona Yasoda
Email	yasodakona1@gmail.com
Mobile	9703108612
<b>SC coordinator At the time of PT visit</b>	
Name of the Coordinator	Dr Kona Yasoda

Email	yasodakona1@gmail.com		
Mobile	9703108612		
<b>Details of the Director CDC/BCUD</b>			
Name Of CDC College Development Council Or BCUD	Prof T V Krishna		
Email	cdc@andhrauniversity.edu.in		
Telephone	9849199052		
<b>UGC Center attached to in case of Recognition Under 2f and 12b</b>	NA		
<b>Date of declaration of grade</b>	26/09/2025		
<b>University Affiliated to</b>			
<b>Name of the University</b>	<b>Name of the Vice Chancellor</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone</b>
Andhra University	G P Raja Sekhar	vicechanecllor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	08912755516
Andhra University	G Sasibhusana Rao	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	91-891-2844222
Andhra University	Prof G Nageswar Rao	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	8912844222
Andhra University	Prof G P Raja Sekhar	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	08912844222
Andhra University	Prof. G.sAsibhusana Rao	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	0891-2844222
Andhra University	Prof G Sasibhusana Rao	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	08912844222
Andhra University	Prof. P.v.g.d. Prasad Reddy	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	+918912844222
Andhra University	Prof P V G D Prasad Reddy	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	9393112979
Andhra University	Prof. P V G Prasad Reddy	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	9393112979
Andhra University	Pvgd Prasad Reddy	vicechancellor@andhrauniversity.edu.in	9393112979
<b>Preference for Personal Presentation</b>			
i. If the institution would like to present their case personally	NA		

<b>Payment Details</b>	
Payment Mode	Online
Paid Date	26-05-2025
Paid Amount (Including GST)	118000.00
Receipt Number	152080
Bank Name	
<b>Nature of Grievance</b>	
<b>On Grading</b>	<p>SRINIVASA INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES (SIMS), Visakhapatnam, is formally appealing the CGPA of 2.94 awarded by NAAC. While we respect the assessment process, we are deeply disappointed with the assigned score, as it does not accurately reflect the quality and achievements of our institution. SIMS consistently strives for excellence, and we firmly believe that a CGPA exceeding 3.22 is justified based on our performance and submitted evidence.</p> <p>Grounds for Appeal:</p> <p>Discrepancies in Quantitative Key Indicators:</p> <p>A detailed examination of the assessment reveals significant discrepancies in the grading of the following quantitative key indicators:</p> <p>1.4.1 – Institution obtains feedback from stakeholders and publishes the action taken report on its website.</p> <p>3.3.1 – Number of research papers published per teacher in UGC CARE-listed journals in the last five years.</p> <p>3.5.1 – Number of functional MoUs/linkages for internships, training, and collaborative research.</p> <p>5.1.2 – Capacity development and skill enhancement activities for students.</p> <p>5.1.4 – Mechanisms for redressal of student grievances, including sexual harassment and ragging.</p> <p>6.2.2 – Implementation of e-governance in institutional operations.</p> <p>6.5.2 – Quality assurance initiatives by the institution.</p> <p>7.1.2 – Facilities for energy conservation, waste management, water conservation, green campus, and accessibility.</p> <p>7.1.3 – Quality audits on environment and energy.</p> <p>Despite submitting comprehensive evidence as per NAAC guidelines, the assigned grades do not align with the data provided. This suggests a potential oversight in the evaluation process.</p> <p>Incomplete Consideration of Evidence:</p> <p>It is evident that the DVV did not consider the full scope of documents submitted in support of our Self Study Report. Numerous valid pieces of evidence, meticulously compiled and uploaded as per SOP, appear to have been overlooked without justification. This selective consideration has unfairly impacted our overall score.</p> <p>Lack of Transparency in Grading:</p> <p>The assessment lacks transparency regarding the specific reasons for</p>

	<p>discounting certain evidence and assigning lower grades in the quantitative metrics. This lack of clarity hinders our ability to understand the assessment rationale and address any perceived shortcomings.</p> <p><b>Request for Action:</b>                  We respectfully request the Appeals Committee to conduct a thorough and impartial review of our case, taking into account the following:</p> <p><b>Re-evaluation of Quantitative Key Indicators:</b> We urge a re-examination of the above-mentioned disputed quantitative criteria, with due consideration given to all supporting evidence provided.</p> <p><b>Comprehensive Review of All Submitted Evidence:</b> We request a comprehensive review of all documents uploaded as part of the Self Study Report and DVV clarifications, ensuring that no valid evidence is disregarded without justification.</p> <p><b>Detailed Explanation of Assessment Rationale:</b> We kindly request a detailed explanation outlining the specific reasons for grading decisions and any evidence deemed insufficient, promoting transparency and facilitating our understanding of the evaluation process.</p> <p>SIMS is committed to continuous improvement and meeting the highest standards of academic excellence. We are confident that a fair and comprehensive review will result in a CGPA that accurately reflects our dedication and achievements.</p>
<b>On other Issues</b>	-

<b>Criterion-Wise Grievance</b>			
<b>Sl.No</b>	1		
<b>Criterion</b>	Curricular Aspects		
<b>Grievance</b>	No issues on qualitative metrics in this criterion.		
<b>Obtained GPA</b>	3.5	<b>Expected GPA</b>	3.9
<b>Sl.No</b>	2		
<b>Criterion</b>	Research, Innovations and Extension		
<b>Grievance</b>	No issues on qualitative metrics in this criterion.		
<b>Obtained GPA</b>	2.09	<b>Expected GPA</b>	2.36
<b>Sl.No</b>	3		
<b>Criterion</b>	Student Support and Progression		
<b>Grievance</b>	No issues on qualitative metrics in this criterion.		
<b>Obtained GPA</b>	2.21	<b>Expected GPA</b>	2.5
<b>Sl.No</b>	4		
<b>Criterion</b>	Governance, Leadership and Management		
<b>Grievance</b>	No issues on qualitative metrics in this criterion.		
<b>Obtained GPA</b>	3.29	<b>Expected GPA</b>	3.56
<b>Sl.No</b>	5		
<b>Criterion</b>	Institutional Values and Best Practices		
<b>Grievance</b>	No issues on qualitative metrics in this criterion.		
<b>Obtained GPA</b>	2.6	<b>Expected GPA</b>	3.3
<b>Extended Profile Data Recommendations</b>			

<b>Metric Level Data Recommendations</b>	
<b>Sl.No</b>	1
<b>Ref.No</b>	1.4.1
<b>Description</b>	<i>Institution obtains feedback on the academic performance and ambience of the institution from various stakeholders, such as Students, Teachers, Employers, Alumni etc. and action taken report on the feedback is made available on institutional website</i>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With reference to Metric 1.4.1, we wish to bring to your kind attention that our institution had opted for Option A: “Feedback collected, analysed, action taken, communicated to the relevant bodies, and feedback hosted on the institutional website.” However, it has been reclassified as Option C on the grounds that "weblinks not working." We respectfully submit that the institution has already provided comprehensive supporting evidence, including sample-filled feedback forms, stakeholder-wise feedback analysis reports (students, teachers, alumni, employers), action taken reports (ATRs), minutes of meetings indicating feedback communication to relevant bodies, and proof of hosting feedback and ATRs on our institutional website. These documents were submitted as per the DVV clarification requirements, and we addressed all points raised—including uploading functional links and complete documents in the final clarification phase (Supporting Document: FINAL2). Therefore, we sincerely request the Appeal Committee to reconsider and reinstate Option A for Metric 1.4.1, as it more accurately reflects our institution’s transparent and structured stakeholder feedback mechanism and continuous quality improvement practices.</p>
<b>Sl.No</b>	2
<b>Ref.No</b>	3.3.1
<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of research papers published per teacher in the Journals notified on UGC care list during the last five years</b>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With reference to Metric 3.3.1.1, we respectfully submit that our institution had reported publications in UGC CARE-listed journals for each of the last five years (2018–19 to 2022–23), with 2 publications per year, as reflected in our original submission. However, the DVV has recommended a revised input of zero for all years. This appears to be based on the observation that the journal validation process through the UGC CARE list was not evident. In response to the DVV clarification, we submitted the authenticated list of research papers, duly signed by the competent authority, along with the supporting data in the prescribed format. Furthermore, we ensured that all listed journals were verified against the official UGC CARE portal and included a valid functional link to the UGC CARE search portal for cross-</p>

	<p>verification. Given that these clarifications and authenticated documents were provided in the file FINAL2 (1722071960.xlsx) as per the stated requirements, we kindly request the Appeal Committee to re-evaluate and restore the original input, which accurately reflects the scholarly contributions of our faculty in UGC CARE-listed journals.</p>
<b>Sl.No</b>	3
<b>Ref.No</b>	3.5.1
<b>Description</b>	<p><b><i>Number of functional MoUs/linkages with institutions/ industries in India and abroad for internship, on-the-job training, project work, student / faculty exchange and collaborative research during the last five years.</i></b></p>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With respect to Metric 3.5.1, our institution had reported a total of 19 functional MoUs during the last five years, covering diverse areas such as internships, on-the-job training, student/faculty exchange, project work, and collaborative research. However, after DVV clarification, the recommended count was revised to 11, possibly based on functional validation of MoUs. We would like to respectfully submit that all 19 MoUs were active and functional during the assessment period. In compliance with the DVV's request, we have already submitted copies of MoUs, a year-wise authenticated list of collaborative activities conducted under each MoU, and supporting documentation outlining the start and end dates, and the nature of collaborations. These documents were submitted as part of the clarification process. In light of the above, we kindly request the Appeal Committee to reconsider and restore the original input of 19 functional MoUs, as it more accurately reflects the institution's engagement with industry and academia for meaningful collaborations and skill development opportunities.</p>
<b>Sl.No</b>	4
<b>Ref.No</b>	5.1.2
<b>Description</b>	<p><b><i>Following capacity development and skills enhancement activities are organised for improving students' capability</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>1. Soft skills</i></b></li> <li><b><i>2. Language and communication skills</i></b></li> <li><b><i>3. Life skills (Yoga, physical fitness, health and hygiene)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>4. ICT/computing skills</i></b></li> </ol>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With reference to Metric 5.1.2, our institution selected Option A: All of the above, indicating that we have conducted capacity development and skill enhancement activities across all four areas — soft skills, language and communication skills, life skills (Yoga, physical fitness, health and hygiene), and ICT/computing skills. However, the DVV has considered it as Option C: 2 of the above, citing issues with document access. We respectfully submit that comprehensive evidence has been provided, including detailed reports</p>

	with photographs, activity-wise documentation, and institutional data in the prescribed format. These documents are available in attached file and include verifiable records of organized programs for soft skills, language and communication skills, and life skills, as outlined in the criteria. The submitted material meets the NAAC SOP requirements, and we kindly request the Appeal Committee to re-evaluate this metric and restore the original input, which more accurately represents our institutional efforts to enhance student capability through diverse and inclusive skill-building programs.
<b>Sl.No</b>	5
<b>Ref.No</b>	5.1.4
<b>Description</b>	<p><i>The institution adopts the following for redressal of student grievances including sexual harassment and ragging cases</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Implementation of guidelines of statutory/regulatory bodies</b></li> <li>2. <b>Organisation wide awareness and undertakings on policies with zero tolerance</b></li> <li>3. <b>Mechanisms for submission of online/offline students' grievances</b></li> <li>4. <b>Timely redressal of the grievances through appropriate committees</b></li> </ol>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With reference to Metric 5.1.2, our institution initially selected Option A: All of the above, reflecting that we have consistently organized capacity development and skill enhancement activities across all four specified areas—soft skills, language and communication skills, life skills (including Yoga, physical fitness, health, and hygiene), and ICT/computing skills. However, the DVV has revised this to Option C: 2 of the above, citing issues related to document accessibility. We respectfully submit that comprehensive supporting evidence was provided in the uploaded documents, which include detailed activity-wise reports with photographs, documentation of programs conducted under each skill category, and institutional data in the prescribed NAAC format. These documents are clear, verifiable, and aligned with the NAAC SOP requirements. Therefore, we kindly request the Appeal Committee to re-evaluate this metric and restore the original input of Option A, as it more accurately reflects the institution's committed and inclusive approach to enhancing student capabilities through a broad range of structured development programs.</p>
<b>Sl.No</b>	6
<b>Ref.No</b>	6.2.2
<b>Description</b>	<p><i>Institution implements e-governance in its operations</i></p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Administration</b></li> <li>2. <b>Finance and Accounts</b></li> <li>3. <b>Student Admission and Support</b></li> <li>4. <b>Examination</b></li> </ol>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With reference to Metric 6.2.2, our institution had initially selected “All of the above” as the HEI input, reflecting the comprehensive implementation of e-governance across all four functional areas: Administration, Finance and Accounts, Student Admission and Support, and Examination. However, this was revised during DVV clarification due to the absence of authenticated supporting documents. In response, we have now provided all necessary documentation, including the institution’s E-governance Policy, relevant invoices, module-wise screenshots reflecting the institution’s name, the ERP system document, and the Annual E-governance Report. These documents clearly demonstrate the institution’s commitment to adopting digital systems in all key operational areas. Therefore, we humbly request the Appeal Committee to kindly reconsider and restore the original input of “All of the above,” which accurately represents the institution’s e-governance practices.</p>
<b>Sl.No</b>	7
<b>Ref.No</b>	6.5.2
<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Quality assurance initiatives of the institution include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Regular meeting of Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC); quality improvement initiatives identified and implemented</b></li> <li>2. <b>Academic and Administrative Audit (AAA) and follow-up action taken</b></li> <li>3. <b>Collaborative quality initiatives with other institution(s)</b></li> <li>4. <b>Participation in NIRF and other recognized rankings</b></li> <li>5. <b>Any other quality audit/accreditation recognized by state, national or international agencies such as NAAC, NBA etc.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With reference to Metric 6.5.2, our institution initially selected “All of the above” as the HEI input, reflecting the comprehensive quality assurance initiatives implemented during the assessment period. However, this was revised during the DVV clarification process due to the need for authenticated supporting documentation. In response, we have now provided the required evidence, including the Minutes of IQAC meetings, Feedback Collected along with Analysis and Action Taken Reports, a list of collaborations with other institutions along with their e-copies, the Academic and Administrative Audit (AAA) report, ISO certification, and the NAAC accreditation certificate. These documents substantiate our active engagement in multiple quality assurance processes and align with the expectations of this metric. Therefore, we respectfully request the Appeal Committee to re-evaluate the inputs and consider restoring the original HEI input of “All of the above,” which accurately reflects the institution’s ongoing commitment to quality enhancement and accountability.</p>

<b>Sl.No</b>	8
<b>Ref.No</b>	7.1.2
<b>Description</b>	<p><b>The Institution has facilities and initiatives for</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Alternate sources of energy and energy conservation measures</b></li> <li>2. <b>Management of the various types of degradable and nondegradable waste</b></li> <li>3. <b>Water conservation</b></li> <li>4. <b>Green campus initiatives</b></li> <li>5. <b>Disabled-friendly, barrier free environment</b></li> </ol>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With reference to Metric 7.1.2, our institution had initially submitted “All of the above” as the HEI input, accurately representing the range of environmental and inclusive initiatives implemented on campus. However, the DVV revised the input to “None of the above” due to a lack of authenticated documentation at the time of review. In response, we have now submitted comprehensive supporting documents that substantiate our claims, including geo-tagged photographs and videos, invoices, MoUs for solid and e-waste management, circulars regarding the ban on the use of plastic and the restriction of automobile entry, scribe acceptance letters, and relevant policy documents. These materials clearly demonstrate our institutional commitment to sustainability and inclusivity through initiatives such as energy conservation, waste management, green campus development, water conservation, and a disabled-friendly, barrier-free environment. We kindly request the Appeal Committee to re-evaluate this metric and restore the original input of “All of the above,” which best reflects our sustained and verifiable efforts.</p>
<b>Sl.No</b>	9
<b>Ref.No</b>	7.1.3
<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Quality audits on environment and energy regularly undertaken by the Institution. The institutional environment and energy initiatives are confirmed through the following</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Green audit / Environment audit</b></li> <li>2. <b>Energy audit</b></li> <li>3. <b>Clean and green campus initiatives</b></li> <li>4. <b>Beyond the campus environmental promotion activities</b></li> </ol>
<b>Comments by HEI</b>	<p>With reference to Metric 7.1.3, we respectfully submit an appeal for reconsideration of the DVV-suggested input. Initially, the HEI had entered "All of the above," as our institution has undertaken activities across all four areas specified in the metric—namely, Green Audit/Environment Audit, Energy Audit, Clean and Green Campus Initiatives, and Environmental</p>

Promotion Activities beyond the campus. The DVV later updated the input to "None of the above" citing lack of authenticated documentation. In response, we have now uploaded comprehensive and verifiable supporting documents, including the Policy for Energy Utilization and Environment, Green Audit Report, Environment Audit Report, Energy Audit Report, documents and a report related to Clean and Green Campus Initiatives, and a detailed report on Environmental Promotional Activities conducted beyond the campus, complete with geo-tagged photographs, captions, and dates. These documents clearly establish the institution's compliance with all four components of the metric. We therefore request that the input be revised back to "All of the above" in accordance with the evidence now submitted.