



अखिल भारतीय तकनीकी शिक्षा परिषद्  
ALL INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION  
(भारत सरकार का एक सांविधिक निकाय) (A STATUTORY BODY OF THE GOVT. OF INDIA)

**Prof. Rajnish Shrivastava**

Adviser (Academic)

Ph : 011-23392589

Fax : 011-23392630

F. No. Equi./AB/Gen. Corr.(4)/2006-07

Date : 30.05.2007

**Dr. C. S. Venkata Ratnam**

Director

International Management Institute

B-10, Qutab Institutional Area

Tara Crescent

New Delhi - 110016.


**Sub : Equivalence of PGDM with MBA – reg.**

Sir,

This is with reference to your request / application / proposal on the subject cited above. The same has been examined by the Standing Committee for Equivalence of AICTE as per its guidelines / norms and the Committee is of the opinion that ***PGDM programme offered by International Management Institute, New Delhi is equivalent to MBA***, provided the course has been approved by the AICTE during the period for which the equivalence is sought.

This is for your kind information.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,  
  
( Rajnish Shrivastava )



प्रो. प्रसाद कृष्णा  
सलाहकार-I  
Prof. Prasad Krishna  
ADVISER-I (Quality Assurance)

# अखिल भारतीय तकनीकी शिक्षा परिषद् ALL INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(भारत सरकार का एक सांविधिक निकाए) (A STATUTORY BODY OF THE GOVT. OF INDIA)

राष्ट्रीय प्रत्यायन मंडल (रा.प्र.म.)  
NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION (NBA)

(Constituted Under Clause 10(u) of AICTE act. 1987)

*Handwritten signature and date: 18/5*

F.No. NBA/ACCR-749/2005  
May 7, 2007

To  
The Principal/Director  
International Management Institute,  
B-10, 30 & 31 Qutab Institutional area,  
Tara Crescent,  
New Delhi – 110 016

Sub: NBA Decision on Accreditation Status of Programmes offered by your Institution.

Dear Prof.

With reference to your application for accreditation of the following programme (s) and the Expert Committee visit to your institution, the report of the visit team was considered by the various Sectoral Committees and subsequently by the National Board of Accreditation in its meeting held on 04.05.07. Based on the recommendations of the Board, I am pleased to communicate the Accreditation Status of the following programme (s) from your Institution.

Sl.No.	Name of Programme(s)	Accreditati on Status	Period of validity w.e.f. 04.05.07
1.	PGDBM (F/T – P/T)	Accredited	3 Years

(Total number of programmes **Accredited** vide this letter – **One** and **Not Accredited** – **Nil**).

The Accreditation status awarded to the above programmes of your institution does not imply accreditation to the College / Institution as a whole. Complete name of the Programme(s) Accredited and its period of validity, as well as the date from which the award is effective, should be quoted unambiguously whenever it is used. The accreditation status of the above programmes is subject to periodic review by the NBA Secretariat and will be changed if major deficiencies are identified on surveillance. You are also requested to comply with the mandatory disclosure of pertinent information as per the proforma placed in the AICTE website with respect to accredited programmes of your institution. The same information should also appear in the website and information bulletin of your institution clearly indicating the date of publication of the same.

The status awarded to the above programmes of your college / Institution is on the presumption that the programmes would maintain the current standards in future. If there are any changes that would effectively

Cont ..... 2

after the status (such as, major changes in faculty strength or changes in the organizational structure, etc.), the same shall be communicated to the undersigned, with an appropriate explanatory note. A comprehensive report submitted by the Chairman of the expert committee who visited your institution and the distribution of marks/points awarded for each programme against the accreditation parameters are enclosed for further necessary action at your end to overcome the shortcomings observed in each programme. If you are not satisfied with the decision of the Board, you may forward your appeal application with requisite fee within thirty days of receipt of this communication.

Let me also take this opportunity to congratulate all those who have contributed to the quality enhancement of programmes that secured accreditation by NBA.


With best wishes,

**Yours Sincerely**



(Prasad Krishna)

1. The Director, Directorate of Technical Education, Muni Maya Ram Marg, Prem Bari Pul, Pitam Pura (Near TV Tower), Delhi – 110 034.
2. The North – West Regional Office, H.No. – 1310, Sector – 42 – B, Chandigarh – 160 036.
3. Accreditation file.
4. Guard file.



(Prasad Krishna)



## International Management Institute, New Delhi: Chairman's Report

NBA team had multiple interactions on 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> April 2007 with several stakeholders of International Management Institute, New Delhi to capture comprehensive information so that the accreditation is done objectively, professionally and fairly. Based on this, the following are identified as the Strengths and Weaknesses of the programme, PGDBM of IMI, New Delhi:

### Strengths:

- Guidance from well experienced and illustrious members of the Governing Board
- Stable Financial Position (due to internal revenue generation)
- Very Research Driven and Experienced (Academic and Corporate) Faculty as well as Committed Staff (high degree of Ownership)
- Impressive emphasis on Faculty and Staff Development
- Very commendable Institute and Industry Interaction

### Weaknesses:

- Alumni Resource is strong but not fully tapped
- Physical space constraints, despite optimal utilization of resources
- Yet to get into the orbit of "league" Institutions
- International only in name and yet reflect in its activities



R. Ravi Kumar, Ph.D.  
Professor, IIMB  
Chairman, NBA Team

**International Management Institute, New Delhi**  
**Summary Assessment**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>PGDBM (P/T-F/T)</b>
<b>Mission, Goals, Organization and Governance (80)</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Financial Resources, Allocation &amp; their utilization(100)</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Academic Performance Indices Faculty &amp; Staff(150)</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>Students(100)</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Technical-Learning Processes (200)</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>Supplementary Processes(50)</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Industry-Institution Interaction(100)</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Research(120)</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Innovation(50)</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Contribution Community (50)</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Total = 1000</b>	<b>698</b>

The programmes were not qualifying on the basis of minimum eligibility criteria to get > 65% marks in Ind-Instt Interaction, Research and Innovation, therefore one mark was increased in Research to make the programmes eligible for accreditation for 3 years. The total marks thus became 698.