



Minutes of the 11th Senate Meeting of IIIT-D held on 20th May 2010, at 3.00 PM in Conference Room, Library Building, IIIT Delhi

Following members were present:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| • Prof. Pankaj Jalote | - | Chairman |
| • Dr. Veena Bansal | - | Faculty for student affairs |
| • Dr. Astrid Kiehn | - | Faculty for academic affairs |
| • Dr. K. K. Biswas | - | Member (from IITD) |
| • Dr. Mayank Vatsa | - | Member |
| • Dr. Ponnurangam Kumaraguru | - | Member |
| • Dr. Pushpendra Singh | - | Member |
| • Dr. Richa Singh | - | Member |
| • Dr. Somitra Sanadhya | - | Member |
| • Dr. Vikram Goyal | - | Member |
| • Dr. Ashish Sureka | - | Member |
| • Dr. Anirban Mondal | - | Member |
| • Mr. Saurav Maitra | - | Student Representative |

Special invitees:

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------|
| • Dr. Gaurav Gupta | - | Faculty, IIIT-D |
| • Dr. Shishir Nagaraja | - | Faculty, IIIT-D |
| • Dr. Saket Srivastava | - | Faculty, IIIT-D |

11.0 Opening remarks of Chairman

The Chairman extended a warm welcome to all those who were present in person. The members who could not attend the meeting were granted leave of absence.

11.1 Confirmation of minutes of the 10th Senate meeting.

Minutes of the 10th Senate meeting was circulated through email. Director requested the members to provide the comments/feedback on the changes made in the UG and PG manual (as discussed in last senate meeting).

11.2 Report on Ph.D Admission 2010

The Senate took note of the summary report on the admission procedure for Ph.D Program 2010 for the academic year 2010 – 2011. The list of recommended candidates was accepted.

The Director also appraised the Senate that the Institute is exploring the possibilities of full-time sponsored candidates from some companies (ex: Robert Bosch).

11.3 Report on M.Tech Admission 2010

The Senate took note of the summary report on the admission procedure of M. Tech Program with specialization in Information Technology for the academic year 2010 – 2011. The list of candidates was accepted.

11.4 Appeal of students

Appeal from Mr. Pranshu Raghuvansh:

Chairman briefed about the case to all the members of the Committee. Pranshu requested to allow him to withdraw his application. Dr. Jalote explained him that he is not a student and hence cannot withdraw. He will have to appeal to the Senate to take back its decision or expulsion order. In reply, Pranshu has sent his application for the same.

The case is deferred as Pranshu was not available, and as the Senate felt that more information should be obtained about handling such cases.

Appeal from first year students (2009 batch):

Astrid briefed the members that 5 students have less than 18 credits that is the required number of credits to stay in the institute and repeat the year.

All the students submitted the mercy plea. One student Aditya Kumar joined the institute late. He was also enrolled at DU and was thinking of going back

and forth between DU and IIIT-D. Hence, he was not able to concentrate on his studies. Now he wants to stay here at IIIT-D and focus on his studies.

Abhishek Meena cleared 6 credits, but he realizes his mistakes that he has not studied and promises to work hard.

The Senate was apprised of policies of other Institutes. NSIT, it seems, routinely allows such students to repeat the year. IIIT-Hyderabad takes the approach that of being strict on the requirements for moving to second year, but do not terminate the program, even though they counsel students to explore whether the program is fit for them. IIT Delhi seems to have taken an approach of not terminating after first year, but giving the students a chance, though the expected performance for continuing in the program for the repeat year is pegged higher.

It was felt that terminating the program of the students is very strict, as they may have no option left this year since most of the entrance exams are over.

It was decided: (1) these students be allowed to repeat the first year, but they must be required to pass at least three (out of four) of the CS courses in the first semester of the repeat year, failing which their program will be terminated but put high bars for the next semester. It was felt that setting the expected performance for the next semester is better than expected performance for the full year, as it will give a clear message to students by December, which will allow them to apply and appear in competitive exams. (2) The Director will meet with the parents of these students and encourage them to explore options as the IIIT-D program appears to be not suited to these students.

Six students have between 18-22 credits and, as per rules have to repeat the first year. All except one have appealed to be allowed to proceed without repeating. It was felt that allowing weak students to continue to second year will be detrimental to their studies, as having strong foundations is very important, and continuing with the backlogs will most likely result in accumulation of more backlogs. Hence, it was decided that all these students should repeat the first year, as per rule.

Appeal from Second year students (2008 batch):

Adesh was in second year and failed five courses. He has appealed that his program not be terminated and he be allowed to repeat the second year. The Senate was informed that the Director and faculty incharge of academic affairs have talked to the student and his parents, and have explained to them

the gravity of the situation and that it may be best for him to move to some other Institute. However, he still wants to repeat the second year, and has appealed for the same. The Senate decided to allow him to repeat the second year. Furthermore, since he has a backlog (in CO from first year), if the schedule permits, he may be allowed to do CO in the second semester of the repeat year in place of one of the CS courses that he has passed. He is required to clear at least three of the CS courses in both the third and fourth semesters for continuation in the program.

Attendance rule:

We have issued academic warning to the students. The students with attendance below 70% will be put under academic warning.

Proxy:

Some students are put under academic warning due to proxy. The matter is transferred to the Disciplinary Action Committee for decision.

11.5 Workshop on teaching and learning

The Director informed the Senate that there is a plan to hold a workshop on Teaching and Learning, perhaps as a celebration of the 2nd anniversary of IIT-Delhi.

11.6 Approach/guidelines for disciplinary action, in particular cheating

Director appraised the Senate about the broad process for disciplinary action agreed by the Board and which was sent along with the agenda.

It was clarified that the Director can accept / reject / return the recommendations of the disciplinary Committee, but not change them.

Regarding the two members from the student council in this committee, it was felt that they should be there to give student views but should not be voting members, as it can put an undue pressure on them.

It was also agreed that a summary of decisions of DAC should be communicated to all the faculty members in the faculty meeting. It was further agreed that every semester/year the list of students on Warning, new students in it, students whose warning period has ended, etc should be tabled to the Senate.

Guidelines for Disciplinary Committee:

The broad guidelines for Disciplinary Committee were agreed. After a long discussion, specific guidelines for copying in assignments and tests were also agreed.

It was agreed that proper messaging be done about these guidelines when the students come next semester, as the main purpose of these is to act as deterrent rather than for punishment.

It was clarified that, as per wishes of the BOG, these guidelines and the process will be referred to some lawyer for review and necessary changes.

11.7 Attendance Policy

The note circulated on attendance policy was discussed. It was agreed that we move to a policy of taking attendance but not necessarily assign any weight to it. The motive is not to force them to come but encourage them to come, and faculty members should take it as a challenge. It was, however, clarified that individual faculty members can assign limited weight to attendance, or use attendance in some manner, or require attendance, if they so wish. It was also agreed that individual faculty members might do some experimentation to understand the impact of attendance on learning, if they so wish.

11.8 Any other matter with the permission of Chair

There being no other item, the meeting ended with vote of thanks to the Chairman.
