

Minutes of the 11th meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) held on March 24th, 2021 at 2.30 PM through Google meet

Following members were present:

1. Dr. Anuradha Sharma - Chairperson
2. Dr. Pushpendra Singh - DoAA
3. Dr. M S Hashmi - Chair-PG Affairs
4. Dr. Sumit Darak - Chair-UG Affairs
5. Dr. Saket Anand
6. Dr. Ganesh Bagler
7. Dr. Sriram K.
8. Dr. Debajyoti Bera
9. Dr. Rahul Purandare
10. Dr. Sujay Deb
11. Dr. Kiriti Kanjilal
12. Dr. Shobha Sundar Ram - Special Invitee
13. Dr. Rajitha Prasad - Special Invitee
14. Dr. Gourab Ghatak - Special Invitee
15. Dr. Sanjit Kaul - Special Invitee
16. Tanmoy Chakraborty - Special Invitee
17. Mr. K P Singh –Academic In-Charge
18. Ms. Sheetu Ahuja – Manager (Academics)
19. Ms. Priti Patel – Assistant Manager (Academics)
20. Mr. Yash Gupta – President (Student Senate)
21. Mr. Ashutosh Brahma - Assistant Manager (Academics)

Item 1.

To confirm the minutes of the 10th AAC meeting held on 10th February, 2021.

Minutes of 10th AAC meeting were approved with the following clarification and recommendation on Item no. 7:

During the discussion of item 7, it was pointed out that “Deep Learning” is already in the list of approved courses for counting towards 32 credits for B.Tech. (ECE) students. So it was requested to check when it was approved. After checking all the previous minutes of UGC, it was found approved in the 36th UGC meeting.

Further, the Department of ECE recommended assigning ECE course codes to Deep Learning and Statistical Machine Learning courses, and both the courses will also count towards ECE credits.

The Department of ECE also recommended not considering these courses as VLSI and CSP specialisation courses.

Action: Academic Section

Item 2.

Reporting Item : The following items were discussed over email and other platforms, and concluded as below:

- (i) It was reported to discontinue the Mid-Year review of Ph.D. students.
- (ii) Approval of the courses to be offered by the Department of SSH:

1. Technology and the Future of Work (SOC 314/512)
2. Intersectionality Studies (SOC 315/511)

3. Markov Decision Processes (ECO341/ECO541)

The course templates of the above courses were shared with AAC members over email, and no comments were received. During the AAC meeting, a clarification was sought on the difference between existing Reinforcement Learning and Markov Decision Processes courses. Dr. Sanjit Kaul (a special invitee) explained the differences between these two courses.

For Markov Decision Processes, AAC suggested adding Probability and Statistics as a prerequisite and also appending the list of prerequisites with “or equivalent”.

After a detailed deliberation, AAC approved the above listed courses.

(iii) AAC also approved the request from the Department of SSH to change the course code of Microeconomics ECO101 to ECO301.

Action for the Department of SSH: To update the list of prerequisites in the course template of Markov Decision Processes and share the final course description with the Academic Office.

(iv) As approved in the recent meeting of BoG (minutes was circulated on 12th March 2021), wherein the honorarium rate for foreign examiners has been revised as \$400 (net) and the tax component owing to this amount will be paid by the Institute.

In view of this decision, the following is proposed :

1. For all examiners wherein the thesis is sent for evaluation after 12th March 2021, the examiner will receive honorarium @\$400 (as approved by the Board).
2. For examiners where the thesis is sent for evaluation before 12th March 2021, the examiner will receive honorarium @ \$250.
3. For examiners wherein the honorarium is due for payment because of non-submission of FORM 10 F and TRC, honorarium will be now released @ \$250 without seeking tax documents.

Action: Academic Section

Item 3.

Proposal from ECE department to dissolve CSP specialisation and to introduce new specialisations.

Dr. Gourab and Dr. Ranjitha presented a proposal to replace the CSP specialization of MTech (ECE) with the following two new specialisations: 1. Cyber-Physical System (CPS) and 2. Machine Learning (ML).

They had also mentioned that 2 workshops for the ML specialisation and 1 workshop for the CPS specialization were conducted by inviting experts from both industry and academia.

During the presentation, the following points were mentioned:

- It will be better to offer the CPS specialization as cross domain specialization. DOAA appreciated the thought, however as it can't be explored with the current setup, he suggested discussing this later on.
- DOAA sought clarification on whether students admitted in these two specializations would be appreciated by Industry or Academia. Dr. Gaurab replied that the skill sets which are proposed through the courses target both Industry and Academia. These were prepared taking suggestions from both.
- DOAA again reiterated the point of placement opportunity with new specialization in place. He also raised the point that irrespective of having multiple specializations, the placement is within some similar area. Dr. Gourab replied that the program is in line with the offering of top most institutes like IISc, however placement needs a collective effort.

- Chair PG Affairs asked for clarification on seat sharing. Dr. Gourab mentioned that if the total seat is “X”, then it will be X/2 for VLSI and the remaining 50% will be distributed evenly among both new specializations.
- Chair PG Affairs pointed out that the number of seats should be looked into carefully, as placement is getting difficult day by day. Dr. Gaurab agreed to the point, however suggested to revisit it after one or two years.

After a detailed deliberation, AAC suggested the following points ;

- As the department suggested removing OOPD and offered a regular 4 credit course, which will be counted towards graduation requirement; the committee pointed out that, as it will affect the overall program structure of all other M.Tech programs, this need to be looked into. It was also proposed that if the OOPD point is not resolved, then it will be continued for the upcoming batch. It will only be changed after due approval.
- For CPS structure, AAC raised the concern over the structure of the program as it was different from the existing structure and advised the department to propose the structure similar to the other two specializations, i.e., VLSI and ML.
- Members from the Student Senate raised the concern over the dual degree student regulation.

Eligibility criteria was also discussed and it was agreed to continue with the existing admission criteria.

Further, the Academic Section was suggested to share the updated regulation with the ECE department highlighting the points of concerns. Further the department should address the above concerns and put up the updated regulations to AAC for approval and further recommendation to the Senate.

Due to time constraints for admission this year, Manager (Acad) suggested DOAA to have a special Senate to get this approved. DOAA agreed for the same.

Action: ECE Department

Item 4.

To discuss the academic proposal for collaboration with Great Learning to launch a PG Diploma program in Computer Science and AI.

The proposal was presented by Dr. Sanjit to AAC. AAC recommended the proposal with satisfaction and pointed out a few points as below;

- To review the target audience specifically the eligibility of B.Tech./B.E. in all disciplines. It was suggested to add minimal Math in addition to one programming.
- To check the copyright of the lectures video and other study materials during agreement and after agreement.

Dr. Sanjit assured the committee to put up these points with the partner, Great Learning, in the upcoming workshop and also invited all the AAC members to the upcoming workshop. He also requested DOAA to consider taking this item for Senate approval in the special senate to be held for ECE new specialization approval.

Action: Dr. Sanjit will inform AAC regarding the final points for both.

Item 15.	<p>To consider the following recommendations of the CSE Department.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. The Department of CSE in an 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 the stipend of Ph.D. students should not be reduced irrespective of the fellowship source. II. AAC in its 9th meeting discussed the recommendation of the Department of CSE regarding the exit policy for Ph.D. students, and recommended that the Department may propose some better options to handle the concerns as highlighted by the Department. The same may be discussed in future AAC meetings. Further, to the decision of AAC, the Department of CSE discussed the matter again in department FM and made the following comments: 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. III. AAC in its 9th meeting also recommended that “All PhD students will be required to do 2 mandatory TAs during their first year of Ph.D.”. With regard to this recommendation 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. IV. Presently the follow up review for a PhD student who received an Unsatisfactory grade in yearly review is to be completed within 6 months / before the start of next semester from the date of conduct of review. There is no minimum duration defined after which the follow up review needs to be conducted. <p>Dr. Tanmoy represented the department of CSE for these queries. It was pointed out that this time due to Covid-19, financial penalties had been put off and the academic section is anyway trying to come with regulations to delink the two. For item two, it was further explained that the institute cannot have lock-in period, etc. The existing policy allows a poorly performing student to leave early, which has its own benefits. Further the point was discussed in length and previous decisions were explained to Dr. Tanmoy. On the sideline, the Academic section has decided to gather information on exit policy of 5 older IITs (Delhi, Bombay, Kharagpur, Madras, and Kanpur) and IISc.</p> <p>For point 4, it was made clear that the current regulations ask the review to be completed within 6 months. An advisor can propose the next review date ideally between 3-6 months.</p> <p>Action: Academic Section.</p>
	Items 5 - 14 stand deferred
	The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to and by the Chair.
