

Minutes of the 13th AAC meeting held through Google meet at 2.30 p.m. on 9th June 2021

Following members were present:

Dr. Anuradha Sharma - Chairperson
Dr. Pushendra Singh - DoAA
Dr. M S Hashmi - Chair-PG Affairs
Dr. Sumit Darak - Chair-UG Affairs
Dr. Debajyoti Bera
Dr. Rahul Purandare
Dr. Sriram K.
Dr. Sujay Deb
Dr. Ganesh Bagler
Dr. Mrinmoy Chakrabarty (In place of Dr. Kiriti Kanjilal)
Mr. K P Singh - Academic In-Charge
Ms. Sheetu Ahuja - Senior Manager (Academics)
Ms. Priti Patel - Assistant Manager (Academics)
Mr. Yash Gupta - President (Student Senate)
Mr. Ashutosh Brahma - Assistant Manager (Academics)

Item 1. The [minutes of the 12th AAC meeting](#) held on 17th April, 2021 were confirmed with the clarification on item 7 that the point was discussed in the light of PG regulations which includes both M.Tech. and Ph.D. Hence the minutes were amended for item 7 (i) and included Ph.D as well. The amended minutes will now read as under:

The AAC discussed this point and recommended allowing M.Tech. and Ph.D. students to register upto 8 credits in the Summer semester. The 8 credits could be of any nature.

Action: To Senate

Item 2. The following items were discussed over email and concluded as below:
(i) New Course approval: The course descriptions of the 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](#)
7. [CSE530 - Distributed Systems: Concepts & Design](#)

Action: Academic Section

(ii) Cross listing of Game Theory (ECO311/511) was approved over email. The course outline is shared [here](#).

Action: Academic Section

(iii) List of companies Industry Doctoral Program

With regard to Senate item 49.5.2.2, all departments were requested to submit a list of companies, which may be considered by the AAC for allowing admissions under Industry Doctoral Program. The Departments of CSE and ECE suggested the names of 4 and 37 companies respectively, which were shared over email with all the AAC members. AAC suggested adding following names to the list of CSE companies:

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

After a brief discussion, the AAC suggested sharing the names of companies with the CSE department for any further comments. If no comment is received from the department within a week, then this list will be considered as approved.

[Updated list is placed here for reference.](#)

Action: Academic Section will send the names of 11 companies to the CSE department.

Item 3. Discussion items from 50th Senate:

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

The point was discussed, and it was noted that the matter is linked to a point which was discussed in [11th AAC \(item 15\)](#). Hence, it was suggested by AAC to discuss the point when the data of exit policy and academic warning has been collected from 5 older IITs (Delhi, Bombay, Kharagpur, Madras, and Kanpur) and IISc.

Action: Academic Section

(ii) More Effective Plagiarism Policy

The point was discussed at length. Most of the AAC members were of the view that the current IIITD plagiarism policy is robust. Considering the increased student strength, the number of cases appears to be reasonable. During the course of discussions, the DOAA informed the members that soon a workshop on plagiarism will be conducted, where the current policy will also be looked into during the workshop. It was also suggested to collect information about the plagiarism policy of other institutes. It was also suggested to fetch statistics for the number of plagiarism cases reported in IIITD in the last 3-4 years. The [suggestions from Dr. Debajyoti](#) will also be discussed and

taken into consideration during the workshop.

Action: Plagiarism policies of some of the institutes from 5 old IITs and IISc.

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

The point was discussed in light of the comments received from the Senate (50th meeting) and most of the members were of the view that it is desirable to have a timeline to defend the Ph.D. thesis after receiving the reports. It was felt that it gives a soft handle to remind and manage the process. Further the external examiners cannot be made to wait for a long period for participation in the defense; it was also noted that IIIT-Delhi releases the honorarium of PhD examiners after the defense. After detailed deliberations, the AAC recommended the following:

The student shall be required to address the comments of all the examiners (external & internal) within 12 weeks from the date of receipt of all the evaluation reports and should be ready for the oral defense. The student may seek any extension for genuine reasons like medical, compelling personal reasons, etc. If the extension is not granted and the student misses the deadline, then it will be taken as a new submission and the entire process of thesis evaluation will be repeated. Since the Institute pays honorarium to the external examiners, for any second evaluation, the cost of paying the honorarium to the previous examiners will be recovered from the student.

Action: To Senate

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

The following points from the Senate (50th meeting) with regard to awards were discussed

- (a) The AAC was informed that there was no unanimity on “Chancellor’s Gold Medal awardee should also get Institute Silver medal” in the Senate meeting and hence the Senate decided that the Director should consult the Chairman, BoG and take the final decision. The Chairman BoG has suggested giving only one medal (*viz.* the Chancellor’s Gold Medal) to the student who is eligible for both the Chancellor’s Gold medal and the Institute Silver medal. Here is the observation 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.”

In view of the above observation, the AAC noted the decision given by the Senate and the Chairman BOG.

Action: No Action

- (b) The AAC was informed that the Senate does not agree with the AAC’s proposal of awarding the Institute Silver medal award to the topper of each M.Tech. program. The Senate suggested the AAC create “high-quality research-based awards” for M.Tech. students. However, most of the members were of the view that it is very subjective. As we already have “Outstanding M.Tech. Thesis Award”, another research award is not desirable looking

at the constraints of judging the best out of various publications. The AAC also noted that many of those publications come after the student graduates from the Institute. It was noted that there is a provision of giving multiple Outstanding M.Tech. Thesis Awards in a given discipline. AAC suggested intimating the same to the departments.

Action: Academic Section to Sensitize the Department and the evaluation committee.

(c) The “Doctoral Dissertation Award” proposal was re-discussed and the following was recommended:

The purpose of creating the “Doctoral Dissertation Award” is to honour truly outstanding Dissertation researched and written by a graduating PhD student. To award the same, it is suggested to add the following question in the PhD evaluation form itself:

Would you like to nominate this thesis for the Doctoral Dissertation Award? (applicable only if you are rating this thesis in either A or B category).

The student will be awarded “Doctoral Thesis Award” only if the majority of the external examiners recommend it. It was also suggested to re-look this process after a year if the number of PhD students eligible for the award turns out to be on a higher side.

Action: To Senate

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

The AAC suggested the standing committee first discuss this item and come up with an initial proposal for discussion in the AAC meeting.

Action: Academic Section

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

The AAC discussed this point at length and noted that this is indeed a serious matter and reflects a failure of the Dept. and Head to maintain high academic standards. The AAC members discussed various possibilities to avoid such an occurrence in future while maintaining academic freedom. Dr. Debajyoti volunteered to talk with the concerned faculty members and let AAC know of the conversation for further action.

The DoAA also mentioned that many faculty members have expressed a need for clear guidelines while awarding grades, especially A+. The need is to maintain academic freedom while also maintaining high academic standards. It was suggested to discuss this issue in the academic workshop.

Action 1: Dr. Debajyoti

Action 2: (Para 2) To be discussed in the workshop

<p>Item 6.</p>	<p>Concern of faculty members on certifying the M.Tech. Thesis/SP/CapP specialization domain.</p> <p>The DOAA explained the issue to all the AAC members, as he had received this concern and a suggestion from a faculty member. The AAC discussed this point and the suggestion that “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?” During the course of discussions, the members were of the view that it will be difficult when there will be a cross domain Thesis and a faculty member from different departments may also offer a thesis.</p> <p>After detailed deliberation, and keeping the existing regulations in mind, it was suggested to reverse the current procedure of the process, i.e., students will ask and take approval of specialized domains before starting a thesis. This will also allow the thesis to be guided suitably to satisfy the needs of the specialization. The AAC also suggested informing this to the department Heads.</p> <p>Action: Academic Section.</p>
	<p>Other items listed in the agenda were deferred for the next meeting.</p>
	<p>The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to and by the Chair.</p>
