Date: July 2026

To,

The Chairman,

University Grants Commission (UGC),

Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg,

New Delhi – 110002.

Subject: Formal Complaint Against GITAM (Deemed to be University) Regarding Systemic Failures in Examination Evaluation, Revaluation, and Academic Administration — Request for Urgent Inquiry and Intervention

Respected Sir/Madam,

We, a collective of students currently enrolled across the Hyderabad , Visakhapatnam and Bangalore campuses of GITAM (Deemed to be University), write to the University Grants Commission with urgency and desperation. We are not a fringe group with a minor grievance , we are a large and growing collective — our internal survey has already documented testimony from a number of students, and we believe the total number of affected students runs into the hundreds.

We have exhausted every internal mechanism available to us. Our written complaints to departments, to Deans, to the Associate Dean of Academics, and to the Office of the Vice Chancellor have been met with silence, automated responses, or redirection from one authority to another with no outcome. We approach the UGC as our last and only recourse.

We are not approaching the UGC as a first step. We are approaching the UGC because we have completely and irreversibly lost faith in the ability — and the willingness — of GITAM's own management to address these issues honestly or fairly without transparency. Every authority within the university that was meant to protect students has either failed us or ignored us. The UGC is not our preference , but the only option left.

We respectfully and urgently request that our identities be kept strictly confidential and not disclosed to the university management at any stage. Multiple students have reported being afraid of academic reprisal. One respondent from Visakhapatnam described professors collectively targeting students who complained — arranging failures in examinations and practicals — with HODs reportedly supporting this conduct. Given this, anonymity is not a preference. It is a necessity.

Since our admission, GITAM has overhauled its assessment framework three times, without meaningful student consultation, without adequate notice, and without regard for the disruption caused to students who enrolled under a specific understanding of how they would be evaluated.

> Until the Academic Year 2024, Semester 1: Students were assessed under a system of 70 marks internal assessment and 30 marks external examination. This was the framework under which we enrolled and made our academic plans.
>
> Academic Year 2025 onwards: An entirely new Evaluation Policy 2025–26 (Document No: ODA/P/001, effective 01.07.2025) replaced the previous system

entirely, introducing Sessional I worth 30 marks, Sessional II worth 45 marks, and Learning Engagement worth 25 marks — along with paid revaluation fees for each sessional.

Students who enrolled under one framework have been subjected to a fundamentally different one at every stage of their degree. We are not objecting to improvement. We are objecting to the fact that the ground beneath our feet has shifted three times, without warning, without consent, and without acknowledgement of the disruption this causes.

We conducted a structured voluntary survey among affected students. Every student who responded did so anonymously, and we present their testimony here in generalised, anonymised form to protect their identities. The numbers speak for themselves.

Finding	Data
Total student testimonies	**20 students (survey ongoing; number growing)**
Campuses represented	**Hyderabad (13 students), Visakhapatnam (7 students)**
Programmes represented	**B.Tech, B.Sc, BA, BBA, BA Psychology, BCom ACCA**
Students rating the evaluation system 1 or 2 out of 5	**17 out of 20 (85%)**
Students who rated the system 4 or 5 out of 5	**Zero**
Total revaluation and verification fees paid by respondents	**₹65,800 (16 students; average ₹4,112 per student)**
Students who raised internal complaints (directly or via peers)	**12 out of 20**
Students who received a satisfactory or helpful response	**Zero out of 20**

Grievance 1: Results Delayed by Months, Students Left in the Dark

The single most universally reported grievance is an inordinate and unexplained delay in the declaration of results and revaluation outcomes. This is not an administrative lag. It is a structural failure whose consequences have cascaded through students' academic and professional lives.

The documented timeline: Sessional examinations for the Odd Semester were conducted in November 2025. Results were declared in January 2026 — over two months later. Revaluation fees were collected from students almost immediately upon the declaration of these results. Revaluation outcomes were not declared until April 2026 — nearly five months after the original examination. As of the date of this complaint, results from supplementary examinations conducted in the first week of June remain undeclared, being withheld because even semester supplementary processes are still ongoing.

No communication, explanation, or apology was issued by the university to students at any point during this period. Students were simply expected to wait, indefinitely, with no information.

> *"The exam was conducted in December 2025. I applied for revaluation in March 2026. The management took more than four months to give our results — and those results were also incorrect. The problem is not just the duration. It is the consistency and correctness of the results."*
>
> *— B.Tech student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"Results of supplementary exams held in the first week of June, pertaining to the previous odd semester, are still being withheld because other supplementary exams pertaining to the even semester are ongoing."*
>
> *— B.Tech student, Hyderabad Campus*

These delays have directly caused students to miss internship application windows, scholarship renewal deadlines, semester registration timelines, and higher education application processes. The harm is not abstract. It is concrete and irreversible.

Grievance 2: Initial Evaluation Is Fundamentally Broken

Across campuses and programmes, students have reported a consistent and alarming pattern in the quality of initial evaluation. These are not complaints about borderline marking. These are errors so large and so consistent that they point to a systemic breakdown.

The following patterns have been reported by multiple, independent students across both campuses:

- Answered questions being recorded as 'not attempted' in the portal, resulting in zero marks for work that was clearly completed.
- 8-mark answers receiving 0 or 1 mark despite containing the required content, structured responses, and relevant diagrams.
- Entire questions left unchecked — not evaluated at all — and the student awarded zero as a result.
- Correct numerical answers receiving only 1 mark with no justification provided.
- Marks incorrectly totalled — individual question marks recorded correctly but final total computed wrongly.

- A student receiving an official passing certificate for a subject while simultaneously being shown as F (Fail) in the academic portal.

> *"Before revaluation, I received 17 marks out of 45. I had checked the evaluation scheme and answered every question with diagrams. Long answers were given 1 or 2 marks. After revaluation, I received 36 marks. My paper was neat and detailed — yet somehow the original evaluator decided not to give marks fairly."*
> *— B.Tech student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"In the second semester, they did not correct the whole question and recorded it as if I did not attempt it. The question was worth 8 marks and was entirely correctly answered."*
> *— B.Tech student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"I received an F for my environmental science examination even though I had passed it and had the official passing certificate. I had to mail and speak with numerous people before it was eventually corrected."*
> *— BA student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"I got 9 out of 45. I checked the answer key and had written almost the exact same answers. I needed just one more mark. I approached the HOD. He told me to send an email. I waited two months. There was no update — not even a rejection."*
> *— B.Tech student, Hyderabad Campus*

A student receiving 17 out of 45 in initial evaluation and 36 out of 45 after revaluation is not a minor discrepancy. It represents a near-complete failure of first-pass evaluation. When this pattern repeats independently across students, campuses, and programmes, it is no longer an isolated incident. It is a systemic failure.

Grievance 3: Revaluation Is Financially Exploitative and Yields No Meaningful Justice

The university presents revaluation as the remedy for evaluation errors. In practice, it is financially burdensome, administratively dysfunctional, and in most cases, completely ineffective.

- Students are charged ₹800 per course for Sessional I revaluation and ₹1,600 per course for Sessional II revaluation.
- Just 16 of our 20 survey respondents collectively paid ₹65,800 in revaluation and verification fees, averaging ₹4,112 per student. These are not wealthy students. These are young people in undergraduate programmes paying out of pocket to have their own papers checked correctly.
- In numerous documented cases, marks were not updated in the portal even after revaluation was completed and fees were paid. Students who then had to appear for supplementary examinations as a result lost additional fees — for failures that were the university's own fault.
- In several cases, revaluation produced no increase in marks whatsoever, despite the student having identified clear evaluation errors during script verification.
- Students who could not afford the revaluation fee had no alternative pathway to contest errors. This means economically disadvantaged students have no recourse at all.

- Revaluation fees were collected almost immediately after results were declared, before students had adequate time to review and decide whether revaluation was genuinely warranted.

> *"I have only applied for revaluation because after checking my script I saw they gave only 1 mark for a correct numerical answer. After revaluation, not a single mark was increased. I would have passed if they had evaluated my paper properly."*
>
> *— BBA student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"After paying supplementary fees, I went to follow up and found they had not updated the marks in the portal at all. I lost ₹1,600 for supplementary — it was their mistake that they did not update in time."*
>
> *— BA student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"It seems like GITAM is just trying to take money. They are not even trying to be discreet about it anymore. Not evaluating papers properly, and asking students to pay to make teachers do their job. Failing students by one mark. Reducing students' CGPA and SGPA so they lose their scholarships."*
>
> *— BA student, Hyderabad Campus*

We submit that a revaluation system that charges students to correct the university's own errors, takes five months to deliver results, fails to update marks in the portal, and in most cases produces no meaningful change — is not a grievance redressal mechanism. It is an additional financial burden layered on top of an already broken evaluation system.

Grievance 4: Voiding Passed Assessments in Supplementary Examinations — A Policy That Contradicts Itself

The university's supplementary examination policy contains a fundamental internal contradiction that directly punishes students for work they legitimately completed and passed.

Under the current policy, if a student does not meet the minimum threshold in either Sessional I or Sessional II, both assessments are voided in their entirety — regardless of performance in the other. A student who performed well and passed Sessional I has that result completely discarded simply because of their performance in Sessional II, and vice versa.

One would expect that the supplementary examination — the replacement for both voided assessments — would be a single unified paper. It is not. In the supplementary, students are still required to write both Sessional I and Sessional II as two separate papers on the same day, totalling 75 marks in the same structure as the original assessment. The 75 marks are then multiplied by a factor of 1.33 to arrive at a score described as being 'out of 100,' and absolute grading thresholds from the official Evaluation Policy are applied to this scaled result.

This creates two simultaneous contradictions. First: if the purpose of voiding both sessionals is to give the student a completely fresh start, why are they still required to write the exact same two separate papers? If the university's own position is that the components are separable enough to be written separately in the supplementary, then voiding the one that was passed serves no academic purpose and only punishes the student. Second: the absolute grading thresholds in the Evaluation Policy were designed for raw, unscaled marks. Applying them to scores that have been

arithmetically inflated by a factor of 1.33 distorts grade boundaries and may misclassify students who fall near a threshold. A student scoring 56 out of 75 receives a scaled score of approximately 74.5 — and is then graded against a system that treats 70–79 as 'A (Very Good).' This is not a system the university's own policy anticipated or designed.

The result is that students are penalised twice: once by having legitimately earned marks discarded, and again by being assessed under a mathematically inconsistent scaling mechanism.

Grievance 5: Laboratory Marks Zeroed When Theory Is Failed — An Undocumented Rule Causing Serious Harm

A rule is being enforced on students enrolled in combined Theory-Practical (TP) courses that does not appear anywhere in the university's official Evaluation Policy 2025–26. This rule was communicated to students in writing by a university representative when students sought clarification. The communication stated, verbatim:

> ***"If you failed the theory part of a TP course, your lab marks also become zero. You have to retake the laboratory part also."***
>
> *— Written communication from a university representative to students*

Section 2.3 of the official Evaluation Policy 2025–26 states that for combined TP courses, 70% weightage is assigned to the theory component and 30% to the practical component, and that the student must secure a passing grade in both components. The policy treats theory and practical as two separate, independently assessed components. There is no provision, no clause, and no footnote in the official policy that states failing the theory component will result in the practical marks being reduced to zero.

This rule has been created and communicated outside the official policy document. Students only discovered it when they asked directly. This is a serious breach of transparency and due process. Students cannot be held to rules that are not written in the official governing document of their assessment.

The academic injustice is equally serious. Laboratory assessment in TP courses involves continuous, skill-based practical work carried out over the entire duration of a semester — data collection, experiments, observations, analysis, results presentation, and record work. A student who has diligently completed and passed all of this practical work over an entire semester cannot have their laboratory record reduced to zero on account of a written theory paper. Theory tests conceptual knowledge. The laboratory tests practical skill. Failure in one does not negate demonstrated competence in the other.

> *"The policy of failing students in the lab if they fail the corresponding theory subject is questionable. Also, the website stops completely when there is high traffic — they simply do not have the right structure for any of this."*
>
> *— B.Tech student, Visakhapatnam Campus*

Grievance 6: Every Internal Complaint Has Been Ignored

Students have not been passive in the face of these failures. Twelve of our twenty survey respondents, either personally or through peers, raised formal or informal complaints with the university. Every single one was either ignored, misdirected, or

met with a response so inadequate as to be meaningless. Not one student reported receiving a satisfactory or helpful response.

The patterns of institutional non-response documented by our students are as follows:

- Automated email acknowledgements with no follow-up, no timeline, and no outcome.
- Students being redirected from department to department indefinitely, with each office pointing to another.
- HODs advising students verbally to 'send an email and wait,' resulting in waits of two months or more with zero resolution or even acknowledgement.
- Written complaints to the Dean, Associate Dean, and Vice Chancellor's office going entirely without substantive response.
- Rude and dismissive replies from faculty members when students sought clarification on examination matters.
- A faculty member summoning students to campus for supplementary examination clarification — with students travelling up to 94 kilometres — only to inform them upon arrival that he was not the correct faculty and did not know what to do.

> *"They are making us go to different departments and everyone is asking us to go to some other department."*
> *— BA student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"We begged for exam dates and portions for months. We received rude replies from faculty. A faculty member called us to campus — 94 kilometres from our homes. We arrived in the morning only to be told he was not the right faculty and did not know what to do."*
> *— BA Psychology student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"There was a reply but it was more like complaining about other departments and passing the time. Zero communication skills. Zero management towards students' examination or revaluation."*
> *— B.Tech student, Hyderabad Campus*

> *"Even if you complain, they will not revert the issue."*
> *— B.Tech student, Hyderabad Campus*

This is not occasional administrative inefficiency. This is the complete and documented failure of the university's internal grievance infrastructure. It is precisely this failure that has compelled us to bring this matter to the UGC.

Grievance 7: Alleged Academic Victimisation of Students Who Complained — Visakhapatnam Campus

The most grave allegation in this complaint comes from respondents at the Visakhapatnam campus. When surveyed specifically about whether students who raised complaints faced any form of retaliation, one respondent stated the following:

> *"Don't know about suspension, but professors group up against these students — either making sure they fail exams or making sure they fail practicals. And the worst part is even HODs are supporting this."*
> *— B.Sc student, Visakhapatnam Campus*

A separate respondent from the same campus confirmed having heard of students being threatened with suspension for raising complaints with management. A third respondent noted that students who gave honest course feedback were specifically targeted when their course enrollment was small — because in a small class, individual feedback could be traced back to the respondent.

We submit these allegations to the UGC for formal investigation. We are not in a position to prove them independently — that is precisely why we are bringing them to a regulatory authority with investigative powers. If substantiated, they constitute academic victimisation of the most serious kind, and they explain in full why anonymity is not optional for the students submitting this complaint. Even now , we are in a situation that , if the management gets to know about this complaint , we will incur their wrath unnecessarily. As mentioned above , we cannot go to the management with the same grievances , as we know for a fact that they will not pay heed to us.

Relevance to the UGC's Mandate

Each grievance in this complaint directly engages the UGC's core statutory mandate and applicable regulatory framework:

- UGC (Redressal of Grievances of Students) Regulations, 2023: GITAM is obligated to maintain a functional, time-bound grievance redressal mechanism. Our documented evidence demonstrates that this mechanism does not exist in any meaningful form.
- UGC guidelines on transparency and fairness in examination systems: The university is enforcing a rule regarding laboratory marks in TP courses that is not stated in its official policy document. This is a fundamental breach of transparency.
- UGC Act, 1956 — Standards for Deemed to be Universities: The university's repeated mid-programme changes to assessment structures, its failure to maintain evaluation integrity, and its non-responsiveness to student grievances constitute a failure to meet the academic standards expected of a Deemed University.
- Principle against mid-programme policy changes: Students enrolled under one assessment framework cannot be subjected to fundamentally different frameworks mid-degree without consent, adequate notice, and regulatory oversight.

Our Requests to the UGC

We respectfully request the UGC to take the following actions:

Initiate a formal inquiry into the evaluation, revaluation, and script verification practices at GITAM (Deemed to be University) across its campuses, covering the academic year 2025–26.

Direct the university to immediately and accurately update all pending revaluation outcomes in the academic portal, and to take responsibility for losses suffered by students where delays or non-updation of marks led to unnecessary supplementary examination fees.

Direct the university to review and discontinue the practice of voiding legitimately passed sessional assessments in supplementary examinations, and

to examine the mathematical validity and fairness of the ×1.33 scaling mechanism applied to supplementary results against absolute grading thresholds.

Direct the university to either formally incorporate the rule regarding laboratory marks in TP courses into its official Evaluation Policy with proper student notice, or to immediately withdraw it — as a rule that exists only in informal communications cannot be validly enforced against students.

Investigate the allegations of academic victimisation, collective targeting of complainants by faculty, and threats of suspension against students at the Visakhapatnam campus, and take appropriate action if substantiated.

Direct the university to establish and operationalise a genuinely functional, time-bound, and accountable grievance redressal mechanism in full compliance with the UGC (Redressal of Grievances of Students) Regulations, 2023, with named responsibility at each stage of the process.

Ensure that GITAM is not permitted to make further fundamental changes to the assessment and evaluation framework for currently enrolled students without adequate prior notice, justification, student consultation, and regulatory oversight.

Maintain strict confidentiality of all complainants' identities throughout any inquiry, investigation, or correspondence with the university, given the credible risk of academic reprisal that has been documented in this complaint.

We are students. We are not agitators or litigants. We enrolled in this university in good faith, we are paying fees, we are attending classes, and we are sitting examinations. We ask only that our work be evaluated fairly, that our results be declared in a reasonable time, that the rules governing our assessment be transparently written and consistently applied, and that when things go wrong, there is someone accountable for making them right.

GITAM has not provided this. We trust that the UGC will.

We are willing to provide any further information, testimony, or clarification upon the UGC's request. We only ask that we are protected in doing so.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

A Collective of Students

GITAM (Deemed to be University)

Hyderabad and Visakhapatnam Campuses

[Names withheld — anonymity requested for protection against academic reprisal]

Confidentiality Request

This complaint is submitted anonymously. The complainants formally request that the UGC treat the identities of all students involved as strictly confidential and refrain from disclosing any identifying information to GITAM University or its management at any stage of inquiry,

investigation, or correspondence. The risk of academic reprisal is real, documented, and the basis for this request.

This complaint may be submitted and tracked via the UGC Student Grievance Portal: grievance.ugc.gov.in