

Agenda for 10th meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) to be held on February 10th, 2021 at 2.30 pm through Google meet

Item 1 To confirm the minutes of the 9th AAC meeting held on 23rd Dec, 2020.

The following items were discussed over email and concluded as below:

i. To discuss the present lecture hour duration.

AAC discussed the matter over email (reference email dated 20th Jan 2021) and noted that there are instances (during offline classes) where students rush from one classroom to the other to attend lectures when the instructor does not finish the lecture on time, which unnecessarily creates a lot of anxiety among students.

AAC members are of the view that changing lecture hour duration will not solve the issue. And hence some other ideas may be explored in this regard. Also, it is the responsibility of the instructor to start and end the lecture on time.

ii. AAC approved the following courses recommended by CAI faculty for addition to the Regular AI Elective bucket of the M. Tech. CSAI program.

1. Semantic Web, offered by Raghava
 2. Trustworthy AI Systems, offered by C. Anantaram
 3. Theories of Deep Learning, offered by Vinayak Abrol
 4. Mining Large Networks (offered by Tanmoy).
- [Reference email dated 10th Jan 2021]

iii. AAC approved course descriptions of the following courses:

- i. Theories of Deep Learning [Reference email dated 10th Jan 2021].
- ii. Intro to HCI course [Reference email dated 10th Jan 2021].
- iii. Next Generation Optical Networks [Reference email dated 25th Dec 2020].

iv. AAC approved the cross listing of the Convex Optimization course with 5xx Number.

v. AAC approved adding MLN in the list of electives for the M.Tech. DE specialization.
[Reference email dated 2nd Feb 2021].

vi. To discuss the change in M.Tech. defense dates and dates in award guidelines.
AAC approved the guidelines as placed at Appendix I.

Item 2 To consider a fee waiver request of a sponsored Ph.D. student, Niti Gupta.

Niti Gupta joined the Ph.D. program w.e.f. August 2019. Her advisors are Dr. Anuj Grover and Dr. Sneha Sourabh. She has been currently working as an Assistant Professor (Senior Scale) in ABES Engineering College since 01.07.2015 and has requested for a fee waiver. Both the advisors have recommended her case for consideration.

AAC may discuss and give the decision.

Item 3 **To consider the following recommendations of the CSE Department.**

(I) The Department of CSE in a FM held on 21st October 2020 discussed the matter where the fellowship of a Ph.D. student is reduced due to academic warning, which makes it difficult for the student to sustain with less money.

The Department recommended that

- i. The stipend of Ph.D. students should not be reduced irrespective of the fellowship source.
- ii. To clarify the duration during which the follow up review should be completed. At present, the follow up review is to be completed within 6 months from the date of conduct of review.

(II) AAC in its 9th meeting discussed *the recommendation of the Department of CSE regarding the exit policy for Ph.D. students.*

Further, to the decision of AAC, the Department of CSE discussed the matter again in department FM and made the following comments:

- i. There may not be legal actions while implementing the suggested actions, especially, it was not clear what is the legal implication in implementing a three years locking in period to allow a Ph.D. student to get an M.Tech. degree.
- ii. Regarding AAC recommendation "All PhD students will be required to do 2 mandatory TAships during their 1 year of Ph.D.". The department is of the view that the students who are joining on project fellowship can be given exception from this criterion. This will provide a settling period to these new Ph.D. students.

Item 4 **To discuss the rules for doing TAship by M.Tech. students having low CGPA.**

The current PG regulations are not clear whether the student who is under academic warning should be allowed to do TA duty or not.

As per AICTE "The Scholarship will be granted to the student on a monthly basis subject to satisfactory academic performance and adherence to University/Institute norms/rules and regulations as applicable from time to time, certified by the Head of the Institute and obligatory work."

Item 5 **To consider the following observations related to the conduct of Ph.D. Thesis evaluation process.**

- i. Currently, the Ph.D. advisor of the student is assigned as one of the examiner (internal examiner) which as per HOD CB is a conflict of interest. How a Ph.D. guide can write an evaluation report for his/her student, this needs to be fixed. Normally a guide is considered as an internal examiner but a guide is not supposed to write an evaluation report.
- ii. HOD CB also mentioned that in many of reputed Institutes (including IIT, IISc, IISER etc), only one external examiner conducts Ph.D. defense. At IIIT Delhi all external

examiners (or at least two) are required to be present in the Ph.D. defense. It is challenging to get a date for viva voce suitable for all examiners (all are senior researchers and busy). Multiple examiners are not comfortable to conduct Ph.D. viva voce.

- iii. **To discuss the timeline in which the student is required to defend the Ph.D. Thesis after receiving evaluation reports from all the examiners.** [point raised by Chair PG]

As per present thesis evaluation guidelines, there is no defined timeline within which the advisor is required to schedule the thesis defense after receiving all evaluation reports.

In a recent case of Ph.D. Thesis evaluation, when all evaluation reports were shared with the advisor, the admin was informed by the advisor that THESIS DEFENSE WILL BE PUT ON HOLD SINCE THE STUDENT IS YET TO SUBMIT CORRECT/PUBLISHED RESULTS. Upon enquiry with the student, it has been noted that one of the publications results (which is mentioned in the thesis) got rejected recently and the student and the advisor have re-submitted the updated results, reviews are awaited (may take 1 to 1.5 months of time for the final results).

Item 6 To consider the proposal from the placement office for reverting to the old academic calendar.

Item 7 ECE Department has recommended to consider below courses towards 32 ECE credits requirements for B.Tech ECE program

Course Name	Course Code
Statistical Machine Learning	CSE342
Deep Learning	CSE641

Item 8 To discuss below points:

The following points need to be discussed with regard to B.Tech. , M.Tech. & Ph.D. students.

- i. Are students allowed to register IP/IS under visiting Faculty? **(Allowed)**
- ii. Are students allowed to register IP/IS under Guest Faculty? **(Allowed only when the faculty is taking a course in the same semester)**
- iii. Are students allowed to register IP/IS/ under Adjunct Faculty? **(No)**

The following points need to be discussed for Thesis/SP/CapP for M.Tech. Students

- iv. Is an internal guide necessary when registering with an Adjunct faculty? **(Yes, when registering afresh. However, if the said faculty left the institute after registration, an internal guide is not necessary.)**

- v. Can we register Thesis after the Capstone project or vice versa? **(Yes, with approval from AAC. However, earned credits will not be transferred.)**
- vi. Do the grades of both Thesis & Capstone calculated in CGPA, if we consider only Thesis as a part of the graduation requirement? (Proposed answer - No)
- vii. Are students allowed to opt for Thesis and Capstone in the same semester? (Proposed answer - No)
- viii. Are students allowed to register Thesis/SP under Visiting or Guest faculty? (Proposed answer - Not allowed under guest faculty, allowed under visiting faculty with a Ph.D.)
- ix. If a student has completed the credit requirement, however only thesis defense is pending; what should we register in a semester to continue his/her registration?

Current regulation states the following: "The M.Tech. thesis shall be done under the guidance of thesis supervisor(s), who shall be faculty member(s) of the Institute. A thesis may also have co-supervisors, who may be Adjunct Faculty of the Institute, or external co-supervisors approved by the PG Committee."

Item 9 To discuss Doctoral Dissertation Awards.

Item 10 Any other item with permission of AAC Chair.