Following were present:

1. Prof. 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 Rahul Purandare
6. Dr. Kiriti Kanjilal
7. Dr. Debika Banerjee
8. Dr. Sujay Deb
9. Dr. Ganesh Bagler
10. Dr. Sriram K
11. Mr. K P Singh   - Academic In-charge
12. Ms. Sheetu Ahuja   - Manager (Academics)
13. Ms. Priti Patel   - AM(Academics)
14. Mr Abhinav Srivastava   - JM(Academics)
15. Mr Yash Gupta   –Student Senate President
16. Mr. Jay Rawal   –Student Senate Vice- President

At the outset, Prof. Anuradha Sharma (Chairperson-AAC) 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 8th AAC meeting held on December 9, 2020.

Since there were no comments, the minutes of the 8th meeting were confirmed as circulated.

A.   The following items were discussed over email and concluded as below:

i.   AAC approved the following four courses:
1. Trustworthy AI Systems: By Prof. Anantram
2. Introduction to Blockchain and Cryptocurrency: By Dr. Donghoon
3. Meta Learning : By Guest Faculty, Dr. Gautam Shroff
4. Advanced Embedded Logic Design(Some changes) : By Dr. Sumit Darak

ii. **To discuss an observation regarding Course Outcomes of OOPD course offered by Dr. Naveen Prakash.**

The AAC approved the current COs (as communicated to the students at the beginning of the semester) for the purpose of taking feedback in the Monsoon Semester (AY 2020-21). However, it is recommended that the department should discuss the matter and propose the updated course description for approval of the AAC.

Action: The department of CSE has to initiate the course approval process for the OOPD course.

iii. **To consider the request of Credits Transfer of 2 PhD students ; Namrata Bhattacharya & Pranjal Bhatia (Reference email dated 20th December 2020).**

The AAC discussed this item in detail. It was noted that the course "IFN001 Advanced Information Research Skills (AIRS)" is a mandatory requirement towards the Joint Ph.D. program with QUT and is similar to the course titled "Research Methodology (RM)" offered by the Institute. Since RM is a mandatory course for Ph.D. students, the AAC has recommended the following:
i). The course "IFN001 Advanced Information Research Skills (AIRS)" will be allowed to be transferred against the "Research Methods" course only, and will not count towards the PhD course credit requirement.
ii). The above recommendation will be applicable to all Ph.D. students admitted under the Joint Ph.D. program with QUT. A note of the above decision shall be kept in the QUT document for future reference.

Action: To inform the student and to update the QUT document.

iv. **To consider adding the course "Modeling and Analysis of Random 5G Network (ECE 541/5GN)" as a CSP elective (Reference email dated 16th December 2020).**

The AAC approved adding the course "Modeling and Analysis of Random 5G Network (ECE 541/5GN)" as a CSP elective.

Action: To be updated on IIITD website.

v. **To consider revised BTP guidelines that are prepared based on recent recommendations of the AAC (Reference email dated 17th December 2020).**

Ms. Sheetu Ahuja, Manager (Academics) presented the revised BTP guidelines and clarified some of the concerns raised by the members. After detailed discussions, the AAC recommended the revised guidelines after incorporating the changes suggested below:

1) To add a subheading in the BTP guidelines document regarding how to present BTP and how to prepare a BTP report. This will include the following points:
   i. For presentation, a single BTP may be given a maximum of half an hour and a joint BTP may be given a maximum of one hour. In case of a joint BTP, both the students will be required to present their BTP work.
   ii. In case of the 2nd or 3rd semester of the BTP, student(s) should give a quick review of the work done in the previous semester(s) in the beginning of the presentation.

BTP report should be prepared in the approved Latex template and BTP guidelines should include the link of the approved Latex template.
   iv. The title page of the BTP report needs to be updated and should clearly mention the BTP category.

2) The BTP advisor(s) will upload the final BTP grade in the ERP system and the grades will be sent to examinations@iiitd.ac.in with all examiners in cc to let the academic section may cross-verify.
3) In the case of a gap due to semester leave, the student will be allowed to continue the BTP with the consent of the advisor.
4) In the case of a change of advisor, the student concerned will have to take the NOC from the current advisor and the consent from the new proposed advisor.

After making the above changes, the final version may be attached to the minutes as an Appendix.

Action:
   i. **To be taken to the Senate.**
   ii. **To review the approved Latex template of the BTP report including the title page.**

Item 2 **To discuss below concerns regarding creating a bucket for Science /Bio Slot in time table.**

Ms. Sheetu Ahuja, Manager (Academics) presented the background of the Sci/Bio slot in the B.Tech. CSE, ECE and CSAM programs. It was noted that the Sci /Bio slot is not mandatory for CSE and ECE programs, however, in the graduation requirement of CSAM, it is clearly mandated that a CSAM student needs to do a science/bio course elective mandatorily.

During the course of discussion, it was mentioned that AICTE may have such a requirement of Sci/Bio courses, which the Academic section should cross check. Further, the AAC recommended that if there is no such AICTE requirement, then the Science/ Bio Slot will be converted to a free slot for elective courses.
To verify this, the Manager(Academics) was requested to check the AICTE curriculum about the requirement of offering Sci/Bio courses in B.Tech. program.

Action: The Manager (Academics) has to check if AICTE has mandated any Sci/Bio requirement in BTech programs.

Item 3 **To consider taking feedback from TAs (through the opine survey), which may help to get a sense of how TA's are being utilized. This may also help in addressing TA grievances (if any).**

The AAC was briefed about the background of the proposal to start taking feedback from TAs (through the opine survey) w.e.f. Winter Semester (AY 2020-21) due to the following reasons :

i). In the recent semester, there were few concerns raised by the TAs regarding their work overload.

ii). Also, in the past, TAs have reported several incidents, where they faced some issues with the course instructors.

The AAC was also informed that before starting this feedback implementation, all faculty members will be informed in advance. Also this feedback will not be linked to the yearly review rating of the faculty members and Teaching Excellence award.

During the course of discussions, it was clarified that the feedback obtained will be analyzed by the DoAA's office.

After detailed deliberations, the AAC agreed that we should have a system in place to take TAs feedback. This feedback will also help in improving the TA management within the system. However, the questionnaire for taking feedback needs to be designed carefully.

It was further recommended that Ms. Priti Patel will draft a questionnaire and share with all AAC members over Google Doc for their inputs, so that the TA feedback form can be finalised over email.

Action:
   i.   **Ms. Priti Patel to prepare a draft feedback form for sharing with AAC.**
   ii. **Faculty to be informed after finalizing the feedback form.**

Item 4   **To discuss the recommendation of the Department of CSE regarding the exit policy for Ph.D. students .**

The AAC was briefed about the recommendations of the Department of CSE regarding the exit policy for Ph.D. students. The AAC discussed the matter and the suggestions made by the Department of CSE in detail.

After a detailed discussion, the AAC is of the view that none of the suggestions proposed by the CSE Department are providing concrete solutions to address these concerns. In fact, a few suggested options may lead to legal actions and may be very difficult to implement and time consuming.

Further, the AAC has recommended that the Department may propose some better options to handle the concerns as highlighted by the Department. The same may be discussed in future AAC meetings.

The AAC noted that students exit the PhD program in the first year in most of the cases. So the AAC recommends that
   A. All PhD students will be required to do 2 mandatory TAships during their 1 year of Ph.D.
   B. Students who are on Institute fellowship can avail the TAship waiver of 2 TAships only after completing their comprehensive exams successfully.

Action:
   i.   **To inform the Department of CSE regarding AAC's recommendation.**
   ii. **TAship waiver point - Will go to the Senate.**

Item 5   **To discuss guidelines related to Conflict of Interest for PhD thesis evaluation.**

The AAC was briefed that there are a few important COI related points that are presently not covered by the current PhD thesis evaluation guidelines, so these guidelines need to be revisited with regard to the Conflict of Interest.

The AAC discussed the matter in brief and agreed to add the following clauses in the Ph.D. thesis evaluation guidelines to ensure CoI checks during the Ph.D. Thesis evaluation process (in addition to the present clauses related to CoI)

  i.   The proposed examiner is in a blood/legal relationship with the student/ advisor(s).
  ii.   The proposed examiner was a Ph.D. student of the advisor within the past ten years.
  iii. The proposed examiner and the Ph.D. advisor(s)/ student have a common affiliation within the last five years.
  iv.   The proposed examiner works in the same department and/or institution as the other proposed examiner.
  v.   The proposed examiner is married to, closely related to or has a close personal or professional relationship with the other proposed examiner.

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