Minutes of the 12ᵗʰ meeting of the PGC of IIIT-D held on 13ᵗʰ January, 2016 at 3.30 p.m.in the Board Room, 5ᵗʰ Floor, IIIT-D Campus, Okhla Industrial Estate, Phase-III, New Delhi

Following were present:

1. Dr. Vinayak Naik   - Chairman
2. Dr. Pushpendra Singh   - Member
3. Dr. MayankVatsa   - Member
4. Dr. Vikram Goyal   - Member
5. Dr. Sujay Deb   - Member
6. Dr. Ojaswa Sharma   - Member
7. Mr. K P Singh   - Academic In-Charge
8. Mr. Ashutosh Brahma   - JM(Academic)
9. Ms. Priti Patel   - JM (Academic)

At the out set Dr. Vinayak Naik, Chair PGC welcomed all to the meeting. Thereafter, the agenda items were taken up for discussions and the following decisions/ recommendations were made.

1. **To confirm the minutes of the 11ᵗʰ meeting of the PGC held on 28ᵗʰ October, 2015.**

The PGC confirmed its minutes of the 11ᵗʰ meeting held on 28ᵗʰ October, 2015.

Arising out of discussions the PGC with respect to its earlier recommendation (7ᵗʰ meeting held on 1.4.2015 vide item No.5) clarified that replacement up to two courses by PG student (M.Tech. and Ph.D.) will be allowed after publication of result provided it does not result in underload.

Before continuing further discussions, the Chair PGC informed that a number of items listed in the agenda have been carried forward from the previous meetings as the same could not be discussed due to some reason or the other. Hence these items are now being listed below as deferred items and will stand deferred till they are taken up for discussions in the subsequent meeting (s) of the PGC :

Deferred items:
   Ph.D.

i. To consider the maximum time limit for registration by Ph.D. students. At present a PhD student needs to register course work / research work credits every regular semester. For example, an X student has completed the required course work / research work credits by the end of his 10 semester i.e. in 5 years however he/ she will need more time towards submission of thesis.

Whether in such a scenario he/she is required to register every semester after 5 years. If so, for how long?

ii. To consider the status of PhD students after their 5 years are over and they are not receiving any fellowship. Could they leave for home and submit from there?

iii. To discuss the Pcoin model proposed by Dr. Pushpendra Singh.

iv. To consider the case of a PhD student who receives F grade in thesis. What would be the steps and rules to deal with such cases?

v. To discuss the criteria for nominations to IBM or similar fellowships.

vi. To clarify whether attendance is compulsory for all PhD students or only for students getting funding from Institute? At present attendance is marked for students getting Institute fellowship.

vii. To consider the issue related to payment of fellowship during internship.

viii. To inform the PGC about the number of PhD students supported by institute per faculty

MTech

ix. To consider a proposal for mid-Semester MTech thesis presentation.

x. To review the criteria for best MTech thesis etc.

xi. To consider whether scholarly papers should be put online? This issue was raised in a recent meeting when discussions regarding NBA happened.

2. **Checking of plagiarism in PhD thesis, MTech thesis, and BTP.**

Chair PGC apprised the members of the background related to checking of plagiarism. It was noted that currently there is no uniform threshold. During the course of discussions the members expressed views which were at variance. After protracted discussions it was decided to continue with the existing practice.

3. **Currently, we have "two submissions in Core A*/ IEEE Transaction level Journal" as an expectation at PhD thesis submission time. We can now upgrade it to: "two submissions in Core A*/ IEEE Transaction level Journal, with one of them being accepted/published". The change, if accepted, will not apply to students who, are more than 3 years in the program or have cleared their comprehensives. We will ensure that we check this in the PhD submission form - we can have a checkbox for this and add, "If not satisfied, please state the reasons." (We should have it already for the current condition).**

Chair PGC apprised the members of the background of the proposal. After detailed deliberations the PGC decided to ask the Ph.D. students to provide the following information at the time of annual review as well as at the time of submission of synopsis for evaluation of thesis:

Two paper submitted in Core A*/ IEEE Transaction level Journal   Yes [ ]   No. [ ]
----------Got accepted/published   Yes [ ]   No. [ ]

4. **In the last mid-year review, we didn't ask tentative advisers submit mid-year reviews of the PhD students. We can ask them to do so.**

   Chair PGC apprised the members of the background of the proposal and after a brief discussion the PGC agreed to the proposal. A communication to this effect will be sent by the Admn-Ph.D. for information of the faculty and the students.

5. **There are good online courses to improve technical writing. We can ask PhD students to take these courses.**

   Chair PGC apprised the members of the background of the proposal. After detailed discussions it was felt that the online courses will improve the technical writing of the students. It was therefore, decided that Chair PGC will a send a list of online courses to Ph.D. students (with cc to Faculty) and they will be impressed upon to do the courses in consultation with their Advisors/tentative advisors. Also, in the annual review form the students will be asked to confirm and list, if she/he has done the online course(s).

6. **All PhD students, regardless of when they joined, to have two reviews (first one with adviser and second one with the review committee) every year.**

   Chair PGC apprised the members of the background of the proposal and after a brief discussion the PGC agreed to the proposal to have two reviews (first one with adviser and second one with the review committee) every year. A communication to this effect will be sent by the Admn-Ph.D. for information of the faculty and the students.

7. **To discuss the issue regarding fee payment by Sponsored PhD Students.**

   Chair PGC apprised the members of the background related to payment of fee by the Sponsored candidates and the fee waivers granted to some of the students in the past. After detailed discussions it was decided to charge fee from all the sponsored candidates and henceforth the request for fee waiver will be considered and decided by the PGC on the merit of the case.

   During the course of discussions some members strongly felt that since there is no upper time limit for Ph.D. registration, even the regular Ph.D. students should be charged some nominal fee during the period they continue to be student of the institute. The PGC therefore, recommended the same for further consideration by the Administration. It was noted that other institutes like IIT-D and IIIT-Hyderabad also charge fees from their regular Ph.D. students.

8. **To discuss the case where an adviser of a PhD student stops being the adviser.**

   Chair PGC apprised the members of the background related to the cases where the Adviser of a Ph.D. student stops being the adviser on one pretext or the other. After detailed discussions it was decided to request the concerned Adviser to hold an early review and make appropriate recommendation to the PGC. If the committee recommends for academic warning due to poor performance, the student may be given six months time for improvement.

9. **To discuss the possible round of Direct PhD admission in a year.**

Chair PGC apprised the members of the existing practice of holding direct Ph.D. admissions. After detailed discussions it was decided that henceforth direct Ph.D. admission may be made three times in a year i.e. (i) March/April (ii) July and (iii) November/December. Also, the PGC emphasized that for smooth conduct of tests and interviews the participation of IIIT-D faculty is necessary unless he/she has taken prior approval for leave.

Further, in the application form the candidate should be asked to state whether she/he applied and appeared in the test/interview in the last one year ? (Yes [ ] No [ ]).

MTech

10. **To consider a proposal to add course titled "'GPU Computing" be in Systems or Software bucket.**

Dr. Ojaswa Sharma presented the salient features of the course 'GPU Computing" to be added in Systems or Software bucket. After detailed deliberations the PGC approved this course to be added for Data Engineering specialization.

11. **To consider a proposal to float a new DE specialization course.**

Dr. Vikram Goyal was requested to give a list of courses for DE specialization for further consideration of the Chair PGC/PGC.

Reporting Items

12. **The guidelines regarding conduct of Comprehensive Exam.**

The PGC noted the guidelines for conduct of Comprehensive examination placed at **Appendix.** It was also decided to put these guidelines in the Ph.D. student handbook.

13. **To inform format of leave application.**

The PGC noted the format of leave application and desired that the same may be put on the website for online application.

14. **To inform that the name of Ericsson has been added in list of A+ companies.**

The PGC noted the same.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

Guidelines regarding Comprehensive Exam for PhD Students

1. **Eligibility criteria to take the comprehensive exam**
   i.   The student needs to complete his/her coursework
   ii. The student should not be under any warning

2. **Deadline to take the comprehensive exam**

   The student is expected to complete his/her comprehensive examination as per the following timeline:

S.No.	Category of the student	Time limit
1.	PhD students admitted directly from a BTech	5 semesters
2.	PhD students after completing MTech	3 semesters
3.	PhD students migrating from MTech	3 semesters from the date of joining PhD

3. **Process for applying to take the comprehensive exam**

   i.   The advisor needs to send a request via email to admin-phd, with cc to student, co-advisors, and PGC-Chair, with the following details
   - Title of the talk
   - Abstract of the talk
   - Proposed evaluation committee
   - Date & time of the comprehensive exam
   - A research proposal containing literature survey and research plan in the prescribed format

   ii. The email should be sent at least a week in advance of the proposed date for the exam

4. **Constitution of the evaluation committee**
   i.   The comprehensive exam evaluation committee should consist of two internal faculty members and one external member. These members are in addition to advisor and co-advisor. The student should not be a co-author with any of these members.

   ii. An adjunct faculty can be an internal member.