Agenda for 13th meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) to be held on 9th June 2021 at 2.30 PM through Google meet

Item 1. To confirm the minutes of the 12th AAC meeting held on 17th April, 2021.

Clarification on item 7 (i) <u>To allow M.Tech. students to register 8 credits of Thesis/Capstone</u> /SP/Course work in summer.

The above point was discussed in the light of PG regulation which includes M.Tech. as well as Ph.D. Later on, this was clarified with the Chair, PG Affairs that it should be applicable to both. Hence it is proposed to amend the minutes for item 7 (i) and include Ph.D as well.

Item 2. Reporting Item: The following items were discussed over email and concluded as below:

- (i) New Course approval: The course description of following courses are shared over email and approved.
- 1. CSE5xx/ECE5xx Speech and Audio Processing
- 2. DES302 Introduction to Animation and Graphics
- 3. DES509 Design Futures
- 4. DES514 Digital Audio & Video Production Workflow
- 5. ECE5xx Optical and Wireless Convergence for Beyond 5G Networks and IoT
- 6. BIO524 Biomedical Image Processing
- (ii) Cross listing of Game Theory (ECO311/511) was approved over email. The course outline is shared here.
- (iii) List of companies_Industry Doctoral Program

With regard to Senate item 49.5.2.2 departments were requested to submit a list of companies which may be considered by the AAC for allowing admissions under Industry Doctoral Program.

CSE and ECE department has suggested 4 and 37 company names respectively, which was shared over email to all AAC members and following names were suggested for adding to the CSE list;

- 1. Google
- 2. Microsoft
- 3. IBM
- 4. CISCO
- 5. Facebook
- 6. Apple
- 7. Siemens
- 8. Persistent Systems
- 9. Adobe Research
- 10. Verisk Analytics
- 11. ABB Robotics

Updated list is placed here for reference.

Item 3. Discussion items from 50th Senate:

(i) Taking Lenient view for TAship of the PhD students on Academic warning.

While ratifying the decision of Chairman Senate, to forgoing the financial penalty imposed on Ph.D. students due to Academic Warning during tough time due to Covid19, one of the Senate members pointed out taking a lenient view for TAship will have further repercussions, and we may get such requests in future as well. Some faculty members also raised a few other concerns, hence the Senate suggested to discuss the issue of allowing/disallowing such students to do TAship with the AAC for further deliberations.

(ii) More Effective Plagiarism Policy

The Senate in 50th Senate meeting, while looking at the records for plagiarism cases reported, noted that the number of plagiarism cases reported every semester are not reducing and hence desired the AAC to revisit the plagiarism policy keeping in view the policies of other Institutes, and to see if the policy can be made more effective.

Few suggestions from Dr. Debajyoti are placed here.

(iii) The timeline within which the students are required to defend the Ph.D. thesis after receiving evaluation reports from all the examiners.

In the 10th AAC meeting, it was recommended to the Senate that "the student is required to address the comments of all the examiners (external & internal) within 8 weeks from the date of receipt of all evaluation reports and should be ready for the oral defense". However, the Senate was of the view that since the students would like to have the degree at the earliest possible, no such timeline is required. The delay on the part of the student could happen only in genuine cases like medical sickness, compelling personal reasons etc. which could be considered on a case-by-case basis. For any major revision, the extensions may be allowed depending on the nature of major revisions suggested by the examiners. For any delay due to strained relations between the student and the supervisor, the concerned faculty could be counseled suitably to expedite the timely completion of the degree requirement. The Senate therefore requested AAC to discuss the matter again.

(iv) Convocation medals and awards for UG and PG students

AAC in its 12th meeting held on April 17,2021 proposed some new Convocation awards from which the below were not agreed by the Senate

(a) Chancellor's Gold Medal awardee should also get Institute Silver medal - In the Senate meeting there was no unanimity on the matter and hence the Senate decided that the Director should consult the Chairman, BoG and take the final decision. The Chairman's uggested to have only one medal for the student who is eligible for both Chancellor's Gold medal and Silver medal i.e. the Chancellor's Gold Medal. Here is the quote from the Chairman, BOG:

"I feel that giving two medals to a person for the same achievement is not desirable. It is unnecessarily redundant, and devalues, in my view, the value of one or both medals."

(b) In place of "Institute Silver Medal for M.Tech all programs (CSE, ECE, CB)", Senate suggested AAC to deliberate on "high-quality research-based awards". Below are the points which were noted from the discussion;

Some of the Senate members were of the view that the number of courses being done by M.Tech. students is very small as compared to the UG students. It was suggested that they could be considered for a few high-quality research-based awards which they do as M.Tech. students and the number of such awards could be increased.

(c) "Doctoral Dissertation Award" is proposed to be discussed further as few members had some reservations with earlier recommendations. Below is the earlier recommendation;

"The AAC proposed to create "Doctoral Dissertation Awards", which will be awarded to Ph.D. students who have received all reports in the Category "A" in the initial review of their PhD theses. Multiple Doctoral Dissertation awards may be given in an academic year."

Below are some of the points that were quoted by the members

- 1. Only the reports of external examiners should be considered
- 2. Why not do it similar to BTP and M.Tech. Thesis awards i.e. PhD examiners may approve a project to be in category-A but may still not think it is worthy to be an Outstanding dissertation.

Item 4. Suggestions from Student Senate regarding "B.Tech overall performance gold medal"

Here are the suggestions from student senate for deliberation in AAC:

(i) A suggestive rubric of points can be created to help the committee. For example, specified points for achievements like research paper/journal publication, student-club members/coordinators, technical contest awardees, social and innovation ventures, etc.

Student senate can help to create this rubric, under the guidance of Sheetu ma'am and past awardees if you suggest so. And also for every application to tentatively give out the points for the committee to check.

- (ii) In 2019, there were interviews for some selected candidates. In 2020, there was no interview round. This may be due to covid. Interviews may help to reduce the subjectivity based on Google Forms.
- (iii) The past recipients of the awards may be better student members of the committee rather than junior year students as they can help the committee with the credibility and importance of what's written in the form by the applicants.
- (iv) We discussed that as there is already a grade cutoff of 8 cgpa to apply to these awards, the committee is requested to not have a higher grade as a cutoff and give every eligible application an equal chance.

Item 5. Award of high number of "A+", "A" grades in Maths III course offered in Monsoon 2020 semester

During moderation of grades in the Monsoon 2020 semester, it has come to our notice that one faculty from a department has given 137 "A+" and 109 "A" grades. It came to the notice of the academic section while preparing the semester summary report for Monsoon 2020 semester and was also pointed out to the HoD. The HOD mentioned that the department noted the same during moderation and is convinced about the same. The semester summary report was reported in the 50th Senate, where Chairman Senate requested AAC to look into the matter.

Item 6. Concern of faculty members on certifying the M.Tech. Thesis/SP/CapP specialization domain.

One of the faculty members has raised the concern over certifying the Thesis/SP/CapP domain for individual students. As per his view the faculty domain is already known to the academic division, then why is it necessary for a faculty to certify that the project done under his supervision is within a specialization domain.

Background: If M.Tech. students wish to opt for a specialization, they have to do thesis/scholarly papers in that area. The advisor will certify this fact.

Here the student takes approval from the faculty in the graduation requirement form. Earlier it was in hard copy form. Due to COVID, as the students are submitting the online form, they take approval from the supervisor over email.

Item 7. List of B.Tech. students who are on extension of one year and are critical cases

The list will be placed on the table.

Item 8. Discussion about the promotion rules applicable for promotion of UG students from the first year to second year

As per the UG regulations para 7.1, page13, point 3, which are as follows:

- (2) If a student passes 3 or less technical courses in the entire first year provided he/she did not take semester leave in any of the two semesters, his/her program will be terminated. If a student passes 3 or less technical courses in the entire first year and was on leave in either of the two semesters, he will have to repeat the first year, i.e., he/she has to do the first semester in the next academic year and will not be allowed to continue with the third semester.
- (3) If a student passes 4 or 5 technical courses in the entire first year, he/she will have to repeat the year. Further, if a student passes 3 or less technical courses in the first semester, he/she will be allowed to take semester leave in the Semester 2 or can continue in Semester 2. However, in both the cases, he has to follow rule 2 mentioned above.

For CSSS students the number of technical courses in their first year is 9 and if they fail in 4 courses, will have to repeat the first year whereas for the rest of the students the number of technical courses are 8 and if they fail in 3 courses, will have to repeat the first year. Provided that the student has not

taken a semester leave in either of the semester. In both cases the student has to pass a minimum 5 technical courses in their first year.

Item 9. Policy for striking off students with unauthorised absence.

AAC is requested to deliberate and recommend a general practice that can be followed for all such cases.

Item 10. To consider the proposal from the placement office for reverting to the old academic calendar.

AAC in its 10th meeting discussed the matter and suggested getting the views of Departments and other concerned people who will be affected from the change. The views of the Departments are placed at Annexure _as under for further deliberations;

HoD Math: We discussed this matter in the Math department FM yesterday (Feb 25, 2021). The math faculty will follow whatever the institute decides regarding the academic calendar. However, all faculty members present in the meeting agreed that the new calendar has many advantages and they would personally prefer to continue with the new calendar. Also, it was noted that the new calendar was only introduced from the current academic year and that it might not be a good practice to change the calendar so frequently.

HoD SSH: We also have had a brief discussion in the SSH dept, and are fine if the institute reverts to the original time table. We will leave it to those better informed to take this further and shift accordingly.

HoD HCD: We did a survey at HCD regarding the proposal and found that majority of colleagues have a preference for the existing calendar, but have not objected to changing back to the old calendar. I personally prefer reverting to the older calendar while keeping intact the policy of joining the Midsem + Break.

HoD CB: We have discussed this agenda with CB dept. faculty members; majority of faculty members are in favour of the existing academic calendar i.e. starting Monsoon and WInter Semester around 20th August and 20th January respectively. Members also proposed that frequent changes in academic calendar are not encourage as previous change was six monty back only. Last time also given same reason that calendar need to change as it is not full filling requirement of placement team. It is difficult to understand why placement team is asking change in calendar so frequently. It give bad impression to change academic calendar every year. Existing calendar is fine if placement team can adjust.

HoD ECE: Dr. Shobha presented the point of view of Academics section on shifting the Academic calendar, the presentation by the Placement cell was also presented during the meeting. After a detailed discussion on the perspective of both the academics and placements, the faculty members were of the opinion that the latest Academic calendar should be followed. However minor changes like swapping Wednesday's and Friday's time table can be done to support the placement activities.

HoD CSE: Awaited

DOSA:

The discussion pertaining to the shift of the academic calendar was discussed with the SC. The view from the DoSA is provided as:

Monsoon Semester 11/12 Aug 2021 - 10/11 Dec 2021 Winter Semester 5/6th Jan 2022 - 5/6th May 2022

Comments from SC:

Instead of postponing the semester by 2 weeks/20 days, we feel that postponing the semester by 1 week/10 days would be better. The benefits of doing so are the following:

- 1. The students would get more time during the peak placement season to appear for tests and interviews, since it usually starts around 10th July and most of the companies visit during this period itself, rather than visiting during the semester. Thus, having a whole month for the placements before the semester starts would greatly help all students.
- 2. The current Winter semester which is ending on 14th May will end earlier on 6th May if the delay is reduced, allowing students to be a part of their company's internship onboarding processes without any academic stress.
- 3. Having an additional one week buffer also allows the Students Affairs office to plan a great induction programme for any incoming batch

Item 11. To discuss the policy of M.Tech. and Ph.D. theses submission in the Library and making theses public. And inclusion of TRs (Technical Report).

To define the "embargo"

Dr. Debajyoti will take up this matter

Item 12. Any other item with permission of AAC Chair.
