



Minutes of the 4th meeting of the PGC of IIT-D held on 8th December, 2014 at 11.00 a.m. in the meeting Room (Director's office), 5th Floor, R&D Building, IIT-D Campus, Okhla Industrial Estate, Phase-III, New Delhi

Following members were present:

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------|
| • Prof. Ashwin Srinivasan | - | Chairman |
| • Prof. Samaresh Chatterji | - | Member |
| • Dr. Mayank Vatsa | - | Member |
| • Dr. Debajyoti Bera | - | Member |
| • Dr. Vikram Goyal | - | Member |
| • Dr. Sriram K | - | Member |
| • Dr. Sujay Deb | - | Member |
| • Mr. K P Singh | - | Academic In-Charge |
| • Mr. Ashutosh Brahma | - | JM-Academics |
| • Ms. Anshu Dureja | - | JM-Academics |

At the outset the Chair PGC welcomed all to the meeting. Thereafter, the various issues were discussed and the following decisions/ recommendations were made.

1. It was informed that Prof. Samaresh Chatterji will function as Chairman, PGC with immediate effect in addition to his duties as DOAA.
2. The minutes of the 3rd meeting of the PGC was confirmed as circulated.
3. Chair PGC apprised the members of the earlier recommendations of the PGC regarding guidelines to deal with the Ph.D. evaluation reports/form and subsequent observations/suggestions of the Director. After detailed discussions the PGC recommended revised guidelines for dealing with Ph.D. evaluation reports as per **Appendix**. No change was recommended in the existing Ph.D. evaluation form.
4. PGC examined the cover page of M.Tech. /Ph.D. thesis and observed that there was no need to have hard copy of the M.Tech./Ph.D. thesis.
5. PGC considered the FAQs for M.Tech. students prepared by Academic Division and approved the same with minor changes. The PGC further desired that similar FAQs for Ph.D. may also be prepared

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

Revised guidelines to deal with PhD Thesis Evaluation Reports

Guidelines to deal with the reports:

- i. The student should address all the issues raised by the examiners; prepare a summary sheet listing the comments made by the examiners and his/her responses thereto. He should clearly state how he/she has addressed each issue raised by the examiner. Modify his/her thesis, wherever required. He/she has to submit the revised version of thesis within three months. If more time is needed, a request may be made for the same.
- ii. The revised version of the thesis and the summary sheet showing the changes made by the student, to be forwarded by the supervisor with his endorsement that the changes have been made to his/her satisfaction. The same will be then sent to **all** the examiners at least 1 week before the defense.

“Category (C)” – Additional Provision

- iii. To resend the revised thesis along with the summary sheet (received through the supervisor) to all the examiners who made the remark as Category C. They will be given 4 weeks time to submit their reports on the new form.

If more than 4 weeks time is needed to arrive at the decision, the examiner may write to the Institute informing us of the need for more time. If the Institute does not hear back from the examiner in 4 weeks time, then the Institute will assume that the revisions are adequate, and have addressed the issues raised.

- iv. The PhD defense of the student will be scheduled once all examiners have agreed that the thesis addresses the issues that they each have raised.

Note: The existing PhD evaluation form need not be changed.