

Minutes of the 4th meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) held on September 09, 2020 at 3.00 pm through Google meet

Following were present:

1. Dr. Anuradha Sharma - Chairperson
2. Prof. Pushpendra Singh - DoAA
3. Dr. M S Hashmi - Chair-PG Affairs
4. Dr. Sumit Darak - Chair-UG Affairs
5. Dr. Debajyoti Bera
6. Dr Rahul Purandare
7. Dr. Debika Banerjee
8. Dr. Ganesh Bagler
9. Dr. Kiriti Kanjilal
10. Dr. Sriram K
11. Dr. Saket Anand
12. Dr. Sujay Deb
13. Dr. Rajiv Ratn Shah
14. Mr. K P Singh - Academic In-charge
15. Ms. Sheetu Ahuja - Manager (Academics)
16. Ms. Priti Patel - AM(Academics)
17. Mr. Ashutosh Brahma - AM (Academics)
18. Ms. Nisha Narwal - JM(Academics)
19. Mr Abhinav Srivastava - JM(Academics)

At the outset, Dr. Anuradha Sharma (AAC Chair) welcomed all members to the AAC meeting. Thereafter, the agenda items were taken up for discussion and the following decisions/recommendations were made:

General Items

Item No.1 To confirm the minutes of the 3rd meeting of the AAC held on 18th Aug, 2020

No comments were received on the minutes of the 3rd meeting of AAC held on 18th Aug, 2020. Hence, the minutes of the meeting were confirmed.

Item No.2 To discuss the timeline for allowing Ph.D. admissions through Rolling.

Admin-PhD briefed AAC regarding the present timeline and practices followed regarding the conduct of rolling admission process. It was also noted that:

- As per the present process, for every rolling admission, the matter is put up to the Director for approval as it arrives, and this leads to multiple approvals being sought.
- Faculty are conducting rolling admissions even when the regular admissions cycle is open.

AAC discussed the matter in detail and felt that the rolling admission process needs to be streamlined. After further discussion, the following was recommended:

- During regular admissions (i.e. from the time of announcement of Advt. and till the application date is over), the rolling admissions should not be scheduled. Faculty planning to conduct the Ph.D. interview for hiring during this time is requested to advise the candidate to apply through the regular admission process only.
- For rolling admissions, the approval of the rolling round will be sought thrice in a month: on every 10th, 20th, and 30th day of the month. The faculty will be informed as soon as approval is obtained.

AAC also felt that there is a need to review the current regular PhD admission process, and this is to be added as an agenda item for the upcoming AAC meeting.

Item No.3 To discuss Ph.D. applicants who are coming with DST fellowship provisional award letters. [These students seek admission to PhD programs on the basis of their provisional fellowship award letter. The grant of fellowship depends upon further evaluation of the research proposal submitted by them to DST. The grant of fellowship depends on the evaluation of the proposal. Should such students be counted on external funding at the time of their admission?]

AAC Chair presented the item to the committee. Since the fellowship grant is not guaranteed to such students at the time of their admissions to the Ph.D. program, these students should not be considered being hired on external fellowship.

Item No. 4 To discuss the changes in regulations of various B.Tech. programs that are arising because of the recent change in the core course of first year i.e. PIS to HCI.

AAC Chair presented the item and informed that the PIS course in the first semester has been replaced by the HCI course, which is listed as a core course in the program structures of BTech CSE, CSD and CSSS programs in the 4th semester. Further, Department of CSE recommended the HCI course to be replaced with either PIS or Practical Bioinformatics, i.e. replacing HCI/TOC with PIS/Practical Bioinformatics/TOC in the 4th semester. During the course of discussion, it emerged that Algorithms in Computational Biology is more suitable than the Practical Bioinformatics course for BTech CSE students. Dr. Rahul Purandare was requested to check if Department of CSE would like to consider replacing HCI with PIS/Practical Bioinformatics/Algorithms in Computation Biology and share the final recommendation of the department in the next meeting of AAC.

It was also noted that Department of SSH would like to keep the HCI slot open for students to choose from open electives. That is, SSH will replace HCI course with other open elective courses in the 4th semester and retaining Graph theory (as a suggestion in the bracket).

DoAA informed AAC that Department of HCD recommends replacing HCI course by any other elective course in Design. During the course of discussions, it emerged that a slot for core course cannot be replaced by an elective slot. It was decided to refer the matter to Department of HCD for re-consideration in the light of the discussions held at the meeting and for making appropriate recommendation for consideration of AAC.

Item No.5 To consider the proposed regulations regarding 300 or 400 level courses for M.Tech. CB program. Currently M.Tech. CB regulations do not have any clause that allows M.Tech

CB students to take 3xx/4xx level courses. The Members of CB FM recommended the following change in the existing MTech CB program guidelines:

“A MTech student should be allowed to take a maximum of one 300 or 400 level course (4 credits) from the CB Department approved course list (both Bio and Non-Bio courses included).”

AAC Chair presented the item. AAC discussed the matter and considering the fact that the proposal is in line with the existing rules that are applicable for M.Tech CSE and ECE programs, AAC agreed to the recommendation of CB Department and recommended for approval of the Senate.

Item No. 6 To discuss the following matters related to UG programs:

- i. The current regulation states that UG students can take two 2xx level courses in their 3rd and 4th years. However, the regulations are not clear about the below points:

If 2xx level CSE courses will count towards the 32-credits requirement of CSE/CSAM/CSD etc. programs.

- ii. CN is listed in semester 5 for CSE students. It has a 2xx number, will it count towards 2xx limit. What if a CSAM student for whom CN is not a core course, will it count towards 2xx limit. If yes, will it count towards the 32-credit requirement.
- iii. Many SSH courses on offer for senior students have 1x, 2x number, will these courses count towards 2xx limit

AAC Chair presented the item. After detailed discussions, AAC has recommended the following:

For i & ii - For a UG Student, the 32 credits should come from 3xx or above level courses. Further, the core courses should not be counted against 2xx level courses. CN is a core course for CSE & CSD and hence being a 2xx level course, it will not count towards 2xx limit for CSE & CSD. For CSAM students, since CN is not a core course, the CN course will be counted towards 2xx level requirement, but CN will not count towards the 32 credits requirement.

- AAC also recommended to get this updated in the UG Regulations as well.
- Students can take 2xx level courses, and the same will be counted towards their degree requirement. However, the same will not be counted towards their department credit requirement.
- Since the rules were not clear till now, hence the above rules will be applicable from 2019 batch onwards.

For iii. Dr Kiriti Kanjilal briefed AAC that at present, SSH department is offering enough 300 or above level courses, and hence this issue will not be there for BTech CSSS students from 2019 batch onwards. The Manager (Academics) added to this that in the present time table, there are many 2xx level courses on float from SSH Dept and the same are being taken by 2018 batch UG students, and it is not clear whether these courses will be counted towards the course requirements of 2018 batch students.

After a brief discussion, AAC recommended that all these existing cases should be put further for special consideration. Manager (Academics) and Dr. Kiriti will sit together and resolve the course numbering issue and make a bucket of courses for special consideration of AAC.

Item No.7 To discuss the matter of sharing the performance of UG students with their parents.

AAC Chair initiated the discussion on the question of sharing the performance of UG students with their parents. Thereafter, the DoAA briefed AAC of the background and quoted a recent case where he received a query from a parent of a UG student inquiring the details about the academic performance of his ward. AAC discussed the matter in detail. After considering the views expressed by the members, AAC recommended the following:

- After the announcement of end semester results, a message should be sent to the parents (through email/ whatsapp message) that “the result of your ward is declared and is available on the ERP of the student”. The Academic Section will discuss with DOAA to work out the mode of communication by which the message can be sent to the parents.
- A similar messaging needs to be done for informing parents regarding the fee payment schedule.

Item No.8 If PG students can do an audit course for credits in next semester. Also, can they sit through a course and can do the same course for credits in the next semester.

Admin-PhD briefed the members of AAC regarding the background of the item. Considering the nature of Audit course, the views expressed by the members and after detailed deliberations, AAC did not agree to allow a student having passed the Audit course with ‘S’ grade to register the same course for credits in the next semester. However, a student having “X” grade in the Audited course can take the course again as a credit/audit course.

Item No.9 To consider the request of M. Tech. CSAI candidate from Navy, Mr..Sachin Gupta, to consider him for an exemption from the Grad Algo course.

AAC Chair presented the item and initiated discussion. Thereafter, Dr Saket Anand briefed the members about the case. He informed that Mr. Sachin Gupta is a Naval candidate in the MTech (CSAI) program under the MoU signed between IIITD and Indian Navy in the year 2019. As per MoU, the graduation requirement will be same as applicable for a regular full-time student as defined in the PG regulations of the IIITD. He also briefed the AAC that the student is of ECE background and was out of touch of academia for a long time. Citing these reasons, the student has made a request to waive the Grad Algo course requirement. He added that since this course is a requirement for MTech CSAI program, the student has registered for the course in current semester on his advice. It was also noted that the Indian Navy wanted them to do courses from applied perspectives.

During the course of discussion, some members pointed out that he has not yet appeared in any evaluations of the course Grad Algo, and therefore asking for waiver appears to be premature. Some other members suggested for considering some alternative course, which are more applied in nature for such candidates.

After detailed deliberations, AAC concluded that since the student is presently registered in the course Grad Algo, his request for waiver can be considered after the result of the mid-semester examination.

Item No.10 To discuss the current TAship point mentioned on IIITD website

AAC Chair presented the agenda and informed that currently below point is mentioned on IIITD website. With the recent changes in the internship rules where GATE students are bound to do TA duty in the first 3 semesters, failing which they will not be considered for internship, we should update the below point mentioned on IIITD website.

"The Institute also believes that a student should be given an option of pursuing M.Tech without assistantship so he/she can focus full time on the program, and possibly finish the program sooner, as compared to a student who is on Assistantship and so has to do part-time work in lieu of the assistantship."

Thereafter, DoAA briefed the AAC that in Monsoon 2020 semester, there are many cases where M.Tech. students who were assigned TAship, have opted out from TAship after the TAship allocation. This has created lots of problem in the system and hence the above note which is mentioned over website needs an updation. After detailed deliberation, the AAC recommended the following:

- GATE / Non-GATE students should not be allowed to drop from TAship once the TAship is assigned to the student.
- Students who are not willing to do TAship in the coming semester has to inform their respective Admin a semester before regarding their availability for TAship.
- For the website updation, the following text need to be added "However, Teaching assistantship is a duty. Once the teaching assistantship is assigned, the student is bound to meet all the requirements of the duty."

Item No.11 To discuss the policy of M.Tech and Ph.D. theses submission in the Library and making these theses public. And inclusion of TRs.

Item stands deferred.

Item No.12 Guidelines for B.Tech. Internships.

Item stands deferred.

Item No.13 To discuss the following points related to BTPs:

1. Follow up item from 37th -A UGC Meeting, Agenda Item 8.: In case of BTP extension of one month, a poster presentation is mandatory. Can such students submit their BTP reports after the extra month or should they have to submit an interim report as per the BTP submission date mentioned in the calendar?

Item Stands deferred.

2. Procedure to be followed if the advisor of continued BTP wants to change the evaluators assigned earlier.

The DoAA presented this item to the AAC. He also briefed the members of a recent case where a request for changing the BTP evaluator has been received at his end. After detailed deliberation, the AAC recommended the following:

- ◆ Once the BTP committee is finalized for a semester, it should not be allowed to be changed. However, since the BTP spreads over 2 semesters in general, there may be a change in the BTP evaluators for the next semester.
- ◆ From now on, all BTP advisors will be required to submit names of BTP evaluators to the Academic section within 3 to 4 weeks from the start of the semester. Once the BTP evaluation committee is finalized, it cannot be changed during the semester.
- ◆ AAC also recommends exploring if the details of the BTP evaluation committee can be collected through ERP for the incoming semester. During the current semester, the process will be done as usual. Further, the DOAA is requested to suitably inform the faculty from whom the request for change of BTP evaluators was received by him.

3. How many students can register for one BTP as a team?
4. Over the past few years, many faculty members have been assigned close to 5-10 BTPs for evaluation. It becomes increasingly hard to evaluate so many BTPs. As a consequence, faculty ultimately rely on the BTP advisor to award the grade. Should we take an Easy Chair approach where faculty can bid for BTPs to be evaluated and if possible, it can be restricted to 2-3 BTPs or so?
5. Should there be a CGPA cut-off for BTP given the fact that at least 7 CGPA is mandatory to register for an IP?
6. What should be the latest semester for starting a BTP?
7. Should we restrict BTP advising to only a few visiting/guest faculty members (e.g. the ones who are experts in their core disciplines and come from sister institutes like IITs)?
8. At present, below is the criterion followed by the committee for deciding BTP awards. Once there was a concern raised by the Senate regarding this criterion and hence this needs discussion.
All BTPs in the following three categories be forwarded to the Committee for consideration:
 - a. All A+ Grades
 - b. All A grades
 - c. All Popular Votes
9. In case of a joint BTP, if the student participants are having different grades (e.g. one student is having A grade and another is having B), will the award be given to both the students or only to the student with the higher grade?

Item 13.3 to 13.9 stands deferred.

Item No. 14 To discuss the number of 300 level courses a PhD student can take.

Item stands deferred.

Item No. 15 (i) To discuss Ph.D. programs other than regular and sponsored programs

AAC Chair briefed AAC regarding this item. AAC considered the item and looked into the recommendations received from various departments in this regard. After detailed discussions, AAC

is of the view that there are several challenges associated with the self-funded Ph.D. program. Hence AAC is not in favour of the self-funded PhD program.

(ii). To discuss the proposal for some changes in PG regulations to encourage more sponsored candidates from industry for PhD

AAC Chair presented this item to AAC. She also informed that this proposal came from Prof. Jalote. AAC considered the proposal, and after detailed discussions, agreed to the following:

- For admission to the PhD program, if an applicant has BTech/BE in a relevant discipline and relevant technical experience in industry for 4 years or more, then the applicant is deemed to have completed an MTech.
- For PhD students, there is no limit on the number of credits they can take through online courses, provided the courses are done with the approval of the advisor. (The number of credits for a course will be as per Institute guidelines for credit for online courses).

AAC further discussed the matter and recommended the following:

- **Students coming with an MTech degree and a relevant technical experience in industry for 4 years or more may be given a relaxation (up to 8 credits) in the course work requirement.**
- There should be a specific list of companies/research labs from which the candidates can be accepted under this program.
- A greater number of IP/ IS (up to 16 credits) should be allowed for these candidates.
- Students should be required to come to the institute for at least 30 days per year.

AAC further recommended sharing this proposal with departments for their quick feedback if any.

Mr. K. P. Singh is also requested to check the validity of this program as per NEP guidelines.

Item No. 16 The Senate in its 42nd meeting discussed the matter related to attendance of B.Tech students and suggested to take it up for discussion in FM.

To consider the recommendation of the UGC for modification of Attendance Policy Dr. Anubha Gupta, ADOAA apprised the members of the existing Attendance Policy approved in 29th Senate held on 21st April, 2015 and the new Attendance Policy now recommended by the UGC in its 23rd meeting held on 13th February, 2019. She informed that the number of students not attending the courses is gradually increasing. The number of letters to students having less attendance are also increasing. During the course of deliberations, she also answered the queries made by the members. The Senate members suggested finding out the correlation between student attendance and grades and find out the attendance data during the start of the semester and towards the end. The Senate also suggested that it should be upto the instructor to take the attendance or not. After detailed deliberations the Senate desired to refer the matter to FM to relook into the recommendation of the UGC for imposition of penalty of reduction of one letter grade upon securing less than 75% attendance in all core and elective courses.

Item stands deferred.

Item No. 17 To discuss having a common code for the following courses (in ERP)

Program	Credits	Present nomenclature	Proposed
PhD	Research Credits	CSE799/ ECE799/ MTH799	To have a common nomenclature
	IP/ IS (4 credits)	CSE790/ ECE790/ MTH790	To have a common nomenclature
	IP/ IS (2 credits)	CSE790A/ ECE790A/ MTH790A	To have a common nomenclature
MTech	Research Credits	CSE699/ECE699/ MTH699	To have a common nomenclature
	IP/ IS (4 credits)	CSE690/ ECE690/ MTH690	To have a common nomenclature
	IP/ IS (2 credits)	CSE690A/ ECE690A/ MTH690A	To have a common nomenclature
BTech	BTP		To have a common nomenclature
	IP/IS/UR		To have a common nomenclature

Item stands deferred.

Item No. 18 To discuss Honors in M.Tech. program

Below are the proposed requirements which are mostly in line with our BTech program. M.Tech. students can graduate with Honors degree, requirements for which may be as follows:

- 1) The student must earn an additional 8 discipline credits
- 2) The student must have done 16 credits of Thesis
- 3) At graduation time students must have at least 8 CGPA (As per the records of last 4-5 years, around 50% students graduate with at least 8 CGPA)
- 4) The student must not have any F grade (This is not there in the UG program. Since in M.Tech. students must do less courses, this might be added. Just a suggestion).

Item stands deferred.

Item No. 19 Convocation Awards

Arising out of discussions, some members suggested that more awards should be given to encourage and motivate the students. Both UGC and PGC may examine the suggestion and make appropriate recommendations for further consideration of the Senate. (Item from 44th Senate Meeting)

Item stands deferred.

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