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. Kiriti Kanjilal
9. Dr. Sujay Deb
10. Ms. Sheetu Ahuja   - Manager (Academics)
11. Ms. Priti Patel   - AM(Academics)
12. Mr. Ashutosh Brahma   - AM (Academics)
13. Ms. Prachi Mukherjee
14. Mr Abhinav Srivastava   - JM(Academics)
15. Yash Gupta   - President (Student Senate)

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:

Item 1   To confirm the minutes of the 6th AAC meeting held on 14th Oct, 2020.

AAC was briefed that there were no comments received on the minutes and hence the minutes were confirmed as circulated.

AAC also noted that the following items were discussed over email and concluded as below:

i.   **The new M.Tech. students (The admission year 2020) have raised concerns over the overload rule regarding the Internship policy which is applicable from their batch.**

The internship rule says, "The student has completed 32 credits towards graduation (by doing 12 graduation credits each in the first two semesters and 8 graduation credits during summer semester after the 1st year) besides successfully completing the OOPD, RM and Refresher Courses, without taking any academic overload (above 20 credits) in any of the first two regular semesters". So, they mostly have a concern with the overload guidelines as there is already a rule available for taking an overload. The rule says, " A student may be permitted an overload of at most 4 credits in a semester in 2nd and subsequent semesters if he/she has CGPA>8.00." Due to this restriction, a student with CGPA above 8.00 and interested to take some more courses in the Winter semester will be deprived of taking it. Moreover, they are only available for one winter semester, so if a student wishes to take any other course which are generally offered in Winter semesters to enrich his/her learning will not be able to take that course if s/he is also interested to go for an internship in 4th semester.

The matter was discussed over email dated 22nd October 2020. The AAC is of the view that the internship policy was decided after multiple consultations with faculty members and was then also discussed and approved in the Senate. Hence it is recommended to try this policy for at least two batches before we think of any change.

The purpose of the policy is to allow academics to run smoothly, while also letting students have an internship opportunity.

ii.   To discuss MTech students to graduate with an Honours degree.
The matter was discussed over email dated 22nd October 2020. The AAC is of the view that MTech Honours degree does not hold any merit and hence recommended to close this item.

iii.   Guidelines for BTech Internships
i. Whether the internship rule will also be applicable when the internship is arranged by the students with their own efforts?

The AAC was of the view that UG students who are fulfilling the internship eligibility criteria can be allowed to accept the internship arranged with their own efforts. However, it was also recommended to seek the view of GM (Placement) on this matter.

The matter was forwarded to GM (Placement) and she has confirmed the following:

As per the campus policy, students can opt for off-campus internship/ placement opportunities, but they require prior approval from the placement office. The approval is given under the following condition:

"The student is required to inform as soon as he/she receives the off-campus offer.
In case the student receives an offer in campus before the off-campus offer, then as per the policy, he/she will have to take the campus offer and drop all other offer(s)."

AAC agreed to the above condition stated by GM Placements.

Item 2   To discuss the following points related to BTPs:

Ms. Prachi Mukherjee briefed the following BTP related points to the AAC.

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?**

After detailed discussions, the AAC recommended the following:
- The main intent behind giving BTP extension is to facilitate students in further improving the quality of the good BTP work or to submit the BTP work for publication in journals/conferences. So the BTP committee and BTP advisor(s) should recommend BTP extension only if the student has already done good work in BTP and he/she wishes to further improve the quality of the work or to submit the work for publication. This condition should be included in the UG manual. Faculty members need to be sensitized in this

regard. DoAA has informed that the Instructor Manual (to be used by faculty members) is under preparation and this point will also be added in the Instruction manual.

- The student seeking BTP extension will be required to submit an interim report to the BTP advisor and the BTP evaluation committee. The BTP evaluation committee may also compare the interim report with the final BTP report, which will be submitted by the student at the time of BTP evaluation.
- Despite the BTP extension, students will have to present their work during the poster presentation session scheduled at the end of the semester.

2. **How many students can register for one BTP as a team?**
AAC noticed that at present, there are BTPs in which up to 5 students are working together. AAC discussed the matter in detail and recommended the following:
- In a BTP, at most 2 students can be allowed to register together.
- If a faculty would like to engage more than 2 students on a project, then the faculty would be required to divide the project into independent modules and advertise each module as a separate BTP. The faculty should allow at most 2 students to register for each module of the project.

3. **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?**

AAC noted that this issue will not arise in view of the recent AAC's recommendation that the BTP advisors are required to constitute the BTP evaluation committee with the consent of the faculty members in the beginning of the semester.

4. **Should there be a CGPA cut-off for BTP given the fact that at least 7 CGPA is mandatory to register for an IP?**

Manager (Academics) informed AAC that many students with CGPA 6 are applying for BTP either individually or in groups.

AAC discussed the matter in detail and is of the view that they do not see any correlation between the CGPA and the BTP outcome of students, and hence recommended not to put CGPA cut-off for BTP.

5. **What should be the latest semester for starting a BTP?**
AAC discussed the matter and has recommended that a BTP should spread over at least 2 regular (i.e., Monsoon and Winter) semesters and can be started any time after the 2nd year.

6. **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)?**

AAC noted that at present, there are visiting and guest faculty members (VF/ GF) at IIIT-Delhi, who do not have PhD degrees. Moreover, visiting and guest faculty members are hired only for a limited duration. At the same time, many of the visiting

and guest faculty members at IIIT-Delhi are eminent researchers, and it will be a great learning experience for students to work with them on BTP/IP/IS/URs. To ensure the quality of BTPs and to protect students' interest, AAC recommended the following:

- While evaluating a candidate for a visiting or a guest faculty position, the standing committee should also assess whether he/she can supervise BTP/IP/IS/URs in any of three categories (research, engineering, and entrepreneurship). The appointment letters of visiting and guest faculty members should explicitly mention their roles and responsibilities like teaching, supervising BTPs under Research/Engineering/Entrepreneurship categories or supervising IP/IS/URs during their tenure at IIIT-Delhi. While signing for a BTP, the visiting or guest faculty members should make sure that the student should be able to complete the BTP during their tenure at IIIT-Delhi.
- BTPs in the research category should be guided only by faculty members with PhD Degrees.

7. **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

AAC noted the concern raised by the Senate that both A and A+ grades should not be considered towards BTP awards and hence recommended to review the existing criteria of BTP awards.

AAC discussed the matter and recommended the following:

- A nomination can be considered for the Best BTP awards if all the evaluation committee members are recommending a BTP for the award. BTP award may be given irrespective of the BTP grade.
- BTP evaluation committee members will be required to give their nominations and comments for the Best BTP award through individual forms (e.g. Google form).
- Ideally, a BTP grade should be decided by the consensus among the BTP evaluation committee members. AAC recommended that in a BTP evaluation committee, one of the members (other than the BTP advisor) will be appointed as a Committee Chair, who will assign the final grade to BTP after consultation. If the Chair finds it difficult to finalize the grade by consensus of the committee members or there is a conflict, then the averaging of grades will be done with the BTP advisor having the double weightage and the ceiling of the average will be considered.
- Regarding considering BTP under the popular votes category for the best BTP award, AAC noted that in the past, there were very only a few numbers of votes, and hence it does not make sense to consider a BTP for the award

based on a fewer number of votes. Hence AAC recommended to discard popular votes from the above criterion.

8. **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?**

   AAC recommended that if a BTP is given award, then all students registered in the BTP will get the award irrespective of their grades.

9. **At present, UG students can do BTP spread over 2 semesters (without any break). In this regard, if a student is going on internship for one regular semester, can his BTP be considered with a break of the semester in which he was on an internship?**

   AAC noted the present clause of UG regulations which says that UG students can do BTP spread over 2 semesters (without any break). AAC discussed the matter in detail and recommended that if a student has taken a semester leave, then the semester leave will not be considered as a gap and the student will be allowed to continue the BTP after semester leave.

Item 3   To discuss the proposal for having a common code for the following courses in the ERP

The following common course codes are proposed for the courses like Research Credits, IP, IS, BTP, etc.

Program	Credits	Present nomenclature	Proposed
PhD	Research Credits	CSE799/ ECE799/ MTH799 …..	PTH799
	IP/ IS (4 credits)	CSE790/ ECE790/ MTH790	PIP790
	IP/ IS (2 credits)	CSE790A/ ECE790A/ MTH790A	PIS790
MTech	Research Credits	CSE699/ECE699/ MTH699	MTH699
	IP/ IS (4 credits)	CSE690/ ECE690/ MTH690	MIP690
	IP/ IS (2 credits)	CSE690A/ ECE690A/ MTH690A	MIS690
BTech	BTP	CSE399/ ECE399…	BTP499
	IP/IS/UR	Multiple codes	BIP399/BIS390/BUR498

For 2 cr, 6 cr & 8 cr courses, suffixes A, B & C respectively will be added.

Manager (Academics) briefed the AAC that in the present ERP system, there are Department wise multiple codes for IP/ IS/ Thesis registrations (as mentioned above) and these codes are not being used for any specific purpose. In view of the same, we should float a common course code in each of the above-mentioned categories for which student of all the departments can register.

AAC discussed the matter in detail and approved the above proposal.

Item 4   To discuss the FORM 10F requirement for PhD Thesis examiners.

In this regard, we have received the following response from the Finance Section:

"*Since you have stated that you are buying the amazon vouchers in India by account payee cheque, income can in my view be said to be applied in India.*

However under section 40 A(3), payments to a person in a day other than by account payee cheque should not exceed 10,000 Rs. It would be advisable to adhere to this limit of per person per day with respect to such vouchers to avoid disallowance of the same.

So, per person per day, you may give Amazon vouchers dollars' worth less than 10,000Rs to be on the safe side. The voucher should narrate the service rendered by the faculty member so that it is not construed as a gift."

Chairperson AAC briefed about the challenges presently being faced while processing the payment of honorarium to PhD thesis examiners. At present, all thesis examiners (from outside India) are required to submit their details in FORM 10F along with their Tax Residency Certificate (TRC). She also informed that many of the examiners are not able to share the details as asked in FORM 10 F and TRC, and hence the honorarium processing is getting delayed in the absence of these forms. This also adversely affect the perception of our institute in the international academic community.

As an alternative to this issue, she also proposed to provide Amazon Vouchers to examiners in place of honorarium after taking due consent from them. Arising out of discussion, PG-Chair informed AAC that as per confirmation of CoF, the honorarium to examiners in absence of these documents can be processed with a TDS of 20%.

AAC discussed the matter in detail and recommended the following:
- For examiners who are unable to provide TRC and FORM10F, the institute should bear the additional tax liability and make sure that the examiner receives the exact amount of honorarium as mentioned in the guidelines. The institute should release the pending honorariums of all examiners as early as possible.
- In the meantime, the institute should officially check how the other sister institutes like IITs are handling this matter.
- The examiners should be asked if they are comfortable in taking Amazon vouchers towards the honorarium.

Rest of the items stands deferred.

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