

Agenda for 19th meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) to be held on 13th July 2022 from 2.00-4.00 PM.

Item 1.	To confirm the minutes of the 18th AAC meeting held on 13 th April 2022.
Item 2.	<p>Reporting Items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><p>1. Currently, IIITD and Great Learning have a joint PG Diploma offering in CS & AI, and we have two batches running. Both batches have about 85 students each. The third batch is expected to start in the last week of August 2022. The plan is to have four batches every year in steady state. Currently, to get enrolled, the candidate must satisfy eligibility criteria and an eligible candidate must qualify a screening test. The screening test consists of MCQs covering quant (permutations and combinations, ratios, profit and loss) and programming loops and outputs expected. Great Learning has been trying to increase the batch sizes to 150 students. This is inline with our agreement with them. They connected with Dr. Sanjit (Program coordinator) a little while ago and mentioned that they see a lot of interest in getting enrolled in the program by eligible candidates. However, the fraction that actually takes the screening test is smaller. While they look at ways of better advertising the value of the IIITD brand outside Delhi/NCR and also advertising why a PG Diploma is more valuable than a certification (which is now offered by good universities in India and there are options like Coursera), they wanted to try changing the screening test by a screening call with the interested eligible candidates. After discussions with them, and some feedback from Prof. Pushpendra and Prof. Ranjan, the proposal to the AAC is to consider relaxing the screening test requirement, and replace it with a screening call, for those eligible candidates that have a BTech/BE/MTech/ME in any discipline. The relaxation, post approvals, will apply to batches 3, 4, 5, and 6. That is 4 batches. It will be revisited, and changed if necessary, post 4 batches.</p><p>This proposal was discussed over email and has been approved by AAC after a thorough deliberation.</p><p>2. The Department of ECE is planning to launch the B.Tech. program in Electronics Engineering - VLSI Design and Technology (EE-VDT) in the academic year 2022-23 and is seeking an in-principle approval from AAC before putting it in the forthcoming Board meeting for in-principle approval.</p><p><i>The AAC discussed this proposal briefly and provided an in-principle approval for supporting the B.Tech in EE (VDT) program in order to get in-principle approval from BoG. However, the document (or an updated version of it) will come back to AAC for a thorough discussion and as a part of the formal process later on.</i></p><p>3. New course approval, CSE513 - Parallel Runtimes for Modern Processors (PRMP) - 4 cr" from Dr. Vivek Kumar.</p><p>This course was shared with AAC over email. Since no comments are received, it is considered as approved by AAC.</p>

	<p>4. Elective course approval DESS23: 3D Animation Filmmaking (3DAF) to be offered by Dr. Anoop Ratn</p> <p>This course was shared with AAC over email. Since no comments are received, it is considered as approved by AAC.</p>
<p>Item 3.</p>	<p>To deliberate on Course Outcomes of Self Growth & Community Work.</p> <p><i>Our UG students do SG (Self-growth) and CW (Community Work) for two credits each. These are mandatory requirements for graduation, however, they were primarily treated as projects, so no outcomes were defined for them formally. Informally, SG is about learning a non-technical or non-academic related skill, e.g.learning a foreign language/guitar/swimming/... while CW is about engaging with the community, e.g., developing software for an NGO or teaching for an NGO, etc.</i></p> <p><i>Working for NBA, we have realized that some of the Program Objectives of NBA are only satisfied by SG/CW, however, for that we need COs defined for SG and CW and approved at the institute level.</i></p>
<p>Item 4.</p>	<p>Some PhD students are reported to be absent from the institute without taking any leave. There are many instances when either they do not turn up for invigilation duties assigned to them or they ask the academic section to find their replacement. It creates a lot of inconvenience to the academic section while conducting the mid-sem and end-sem exams. On the other hand, some faculty members unofficially request their PhD TAs to do invigilation in the exams. This duty is in addition to the other invigilation duties assigned to them by the Academic section. Many PhD TAs complain about this additional load.</p> <p>The AAC is requested to deliberate on these two points.</p>
<p>Item 5.</p>	<p>(i) Clarification regarding status of Supervisor (Primary/Co-supervisor) of a Ph.D. student when Supervisor (Regular faculty) leaves IIITD and becomes adjunct faculty.</p> <p>a. before comprehensive b. After comprehensive</p> <p>(ii) Clarification regarding status of Supervisor when Supervisor (Regular faculty) goes on long leave.</p>
<p>Item 6.</p>	<p>To consider a request by a Ph.D. student (joined in 2017) in the Department of SSH for considering two 300-level courses towards his Ph.D. coursework requirement.</p>
<p>Item 7.</p>	<p>To discuss revised PhD eligibility criteria for Computational Biology</p>
<p>Item 8.</p>	<p>To formalize the process of Research Assistantship for B.Tech. & M.Tech. students.</p>
<p>Item 9.</p>	<p>To revise the semester start timelines of Winter 2023 & Monsoon 2023 semester.</p> <p><i>The Placement Team proposed this agenda as there are clashes with companies who are visiting the campus for internship and placement purposes with existing semester timelines.</i></p>

<p>Item 10.</p>	<p>Points related to formative assessments of the course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Making Mid Sem & End Sem Exams mandatory ● Mandatory %age for proctored exams (Mid-sem and End-sem) ● Mechanisms to ensure that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show the sum total of marks before the end-sem exam ○ Instructors show the exam copies to students before moderation meeting ○ Grades are submitted by the moderation meeting. ○ %age of A+ grades and criteria
<p>Item 11.</p>	<p>To enhance the ORF amount. <i>(it was shared by Dr. Vivek Bohara)</i></p>
<p>Item 12.</p>	<p>To review IIITD Course Description format. <i>The current course description document has information that keeps on changing and not being a part of the approval.</i></p> <p><i>Also, it is proposed that the current taxonomy be updated with the revised "<u>Bloom's taxonomy</u>" (Given below) from "<u>Computing Curricula 2020</u>" which has more actions/verbs which will allow more flexibility to design the Cos. Annexure II</i></p>
<p>Item 13.</p>	<p>To reconsider guidelines for various Awards.</p> <p>a. Teaching Excellence Awards</p> <p>The following changes are proposed to AAC for making the process more rigorous. The interested faculty needs to submit an application towards his/her participation for the above awards through a Google form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The form will capture details like course feedback score, course rigor, type of assignments and quizzes, course completion, teaching methodology, type of exam, etc. · Student feedback will be taken as per present practice. · A committee will look into all the applications and based on some predefined rubrics, the awardee(s) will be finalized. <p>Few queries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Questions to be asked in the Google form 2. Who will form the committee? 3. Rubrics? <p>b. Outstanding Educator Awards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · To rename the award as Best Mentor Award/ Outstanding Mentor Award. · Since this award does not depend on a particular course and hence the award will be given only if the voting % from the entire graduating batch would be 50% or above. In case, if the voting percentage is low, then the award will not be announced for that particular year. · Some minimum percentage criteria will be finalized and the faculty will be considered for the award only if he/ she receives more votes than the defined criteria.

Queries:

1. What should be the percentage criteria?
2. How many maximum such awards can be given?
3. Are there any fixed number of awards per department/per year?
4. Eligibility of Visiting/Guest faculty for this award
5. Will these awards continue having monetary benefits as earlier?

c. TA Awards

- To ask students specifically about TA performances. Would you like to nominate any TA for the Best TA award and write the name. Each student can nominate at most 3 TAs for this purpose.
- Faculty will recommend the TAs while awarding TA grades.
- Student feedback may or may not be used along with the course instructor's recommendation. This will be decided by the committee who is accessing the nominations.
- There will be no cap on the number of TA awardees for at least one cycle.
- Per 50 students, 1 TA award can be given in a course.

Query:

1. What if in a course with 200 students, a faculty nominates 6 TAs. How will be decide the top 4
2. If the course has 99 students, will it be eligible for 2 TAs or 1 TA?

d. DOAA Award

- Review of eligibility of graduating batch students for this award. As per the Senate decision, the graduating batch students are not eligible for this award.
- Can any student of the graduating batch who is on semester extension be given the Dean's Academic Excellence Award, if (s)he fulfills the criteria? If yes, will (s)he be considered based on his one-semester result?
- If a student is on semester leave, will (s)he be eligible for the awards in that particular year?
- The DoAA may have the right to update/modify the eligibility criteria for this award. At present, the DoAA cannot modify the eligibility criteria for these awards.
- Students who received a jump of 2 points in their CGPA (earlier having low CGPA and had improved their performance over time) had also received the DoAA awards in the past.

Dean's Award – Communication

1. The Dean awards-communication were given to three students promptly for the first time in 2018 by then Dean. The students awarded were those who were extremely helpful during the entire planning and execution of the 10-year anniversary function of the institute.
2. In 2019 and in 2020, the student heads of the communication team nominated students from their respective team to receive the awards. On the dean's approval, the award was given to those students.

3. In the year 2021, the award was not given due to the lockdown for most of the time.
4. We also thought that the nominations were taken from the communication teams only, few students who are doing really well and are not a part of the communication team were missing this opportunity.
5. Post the discussion with Dean Communications, we present the below process for the senate's suggestion and approval thereafter.
 - a. A form will be floated to the entire student community for them to submit entries.
 - b. They will have to mention their contributions toward the Institute outreach and promotion.
 - c. The entries will not be limited to the communication team students, but students who worked for student fests, magazines, and induction will also be able to apply.
 - d. Since the nature of the inputs will be qualitative, a team will be created to evaluate the same. The team will have representation from faculty, staff and students.
 - e. The shortlisted names will be shared with the Dean/Associate Dean Communication for his inputs and final approval
 - f. The final names will be awarded the Dean's List communication Awards.

Item 14. To reconsider guidelines for "All Round Performance Medal Award"

The previous Student Senate (SS) felt that our criteria for All Round Performance Medal Award is not appropriate and hence they suggested the below criteria for this award. The DOAA once had a meeting with the SS President to understand their suggestions and recommended discussing the suggestions as listed below in the AAC meeting.

1. A suggestive rubric of points can be created to help the committee. For example, specified points for achievements like Research paper/journal, student-club members/coordinators, technical contest awardees, social and innovation venture, etc. Student senate can help to create this rubric in consultation with the past awardees if you suggest so. And also for every application to tentatively give out the points for the committee to check.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

Any other items with the permission of the Chairperson.
