INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 63rd MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL OF THE INSTITUTE HELD ON DECEMBER 6, 2016 AND JANUARY 11, 2017 AT ISI KOLKATA

Members/ invitees Present on December 6, 2016			
Ser. No.	Name	Ser. No.	Name
1	Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay	31	Arup Kr. Das
2	Amita Pal	32	Susmita Sur-Kolay
3	Probal Dasgupta	33	Bhabani P. Sinha
4	Utpal Garain	34	Banasri Basu
5	Saurabh Ghosh	35	Arup R. Mukhopadhyay
6	S.M. Srivastava	36	Ashish Ghosh
7	Prasun Das	37	Anup Dewanji
8	Krishanu Maulik	38	Goutam Mukherjee
9	Rajat Kumar De	39	Mridul Nandi
10	Dipti Prasad Mukherjee	40	Mahuya Dutta
11	Smarajit Bose	Members/invitees attending via video-conferencing	
12	Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya	41	Siva Athreya
13	Nabanita Das	42	Rajarama Bhat
14	Supratik Pal	43	Mohan Delampady
15	Amlan Banerjee	44	A.R.D. Prasad
16	Dhurjati Prasad Sengupta	45	B.S. Dayasagar
17	Ritabrata Munshi	46	T.S.S.R.K. Rao
18	Sarbani Palit	47	E.V. Gijo
19	Rana Barua	48	Ashim Roy Chaudhury
20	Debashish Goswami	49	Somnath Ray
21	Swagato K. Ray	50	U.H. Acharya
22	Saswati Bandyopadhyay	51	Ramesh Sreekantan
23	Biswabrata Pradhan	52	Abhay G. Bhatt
24	Rajat Subhra Hazra	53	Debasis Mishra
25	Sandip Das	54	S.K. Neogy
26	Tarun Kabiraj	55	Arup Kr. Pal
27	Deba Prasad Mandal	56	Anish Sarkar
28	Pradipta Bandyopadhyay	57	Arunava Sen
29	Md. Zafar Anis	58	Antar Bandyopadhyay
30	Nikhil Ranjan Pal		

Members/ invitees Present on January 11, 2017			
Ser. No.	Name	Ser. No.	Name
1	Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay	21	Mridul Nandi
2	Amita Pal	22	Sandip Das
3	S.M. Srivastava	23	Ayanendranath Basu
4	Saurabh Ghosh	Members/ invitees attending via Video-conferencing	
5	Kiranmoy Das	24	Mohan Delampady
6	Souvik Roy	25	T.S.S.R.K. Rao
7	Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya	26	Siva Athreya
8	Subhas C. Nandy	27	Abhay G. Bhatt
9	Prasun Das	28	Arup Kr. Pal
10	Krishanu Maulik	29	Isha Dewan
11	Bhabatosh Chanda	30	Antar Bandyopadhyay
12	Rajat Subhra Hazra	31	S. Ponnusamy
13	Arup Bose	32	S.M. Bendre
14	Nabanita Das	33	Amit K. Biswas
15	M.Z. Anis	34	Surajit Pal
16	Alok Goswami	35	Prabuddha Chakraborty
17	Indranil Mukhopadhyay	36	A. Venkateswarlu
18	Rita SahaRay	37	Sujata Ghosh
19	Arup K. Das	38	Mathew C. Francis
20	Goutam Mukherjee	39	T. Karthick

Note: *Agenda items 1-4, 6-11, 13-17 and 23 were discussed on December 6, 2016. Agenda item 19 was withdrawn. Items 28-30 were added to the agenda by the Dean of Studies for the meeting held on January 11, 2017.*

Agenda Item 1:   **Confirmation of the proceedings of the 62nd meeting of the Academic Council held on July 11 and October 5, 2016.**

The proceedings of the 62nd of the Academic council were confirmed as circulath.

Agenda Item 2:   **Matters arising out of the 62nd AC meeting**

As there were no comments, the action taken report was accepted as circulated.

Agenda Item 3:   **Consideration of a proposal for discussion on the contingency grants of Research Fellows**

The proposer, Prof. Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya, stated that though the approval regarding enhancement of fellowships of research fellows had been obtained from the administrative ministry in October 2016, the Institute had been asked to justify increase in special fellowship, and the enhancement in contingency grants

to Rs. 28,000 (from Rs. 20,000) had not been agreed to. He also mentioned that, in a letter sent by the Chief Executive (A&F) to MoSPI on the 21st of June, 2016, incorrect information had been provided in point no. 3 of the letter regarding contingency grants for special fellowships. He felt that this was very damaging to the cause of the Institute as far as this issue was concerned. This had later been contradicted in the letter written by the Director to MoSPI on November 3, 2016, in which she had provided the justification sought for special fellowships, and also requested a reconsideration of the decision on contingent grant. He urged that the Institute should learn from its mistakes and avoid unclear wording as seen in the CE's letter. He suggested that the committee (under the chairpersonship of Prof. Susmita Sur-Kolay) that had been formed to draft a response to the audit query on fellowship enhancement should look into this and report in the adjourned meeting. The chairperson suggested waiting for approval and letting the status quo prevail, without raking up the matter at this juncture, since the Ministry was already looking into it. Profs. Saurabh Ghosh and Debashish Goswami respectively commented on the lack of clarity in the CE's letter and the inaccuracy of the information in it, which the chairperson attributed to a possible communication gap. Prof. Mukhopadhyaya asked what the Institute's policy should be in the interim, till a response is obtained from the ministry, reminding members of the comment made by the President of the Institute in a recent council meeting about any reduction being a breach of the contract made by the Institute with the research fellows. He requested the Institute not to reduce the contingency grant for existing students. The chairperson was of the view that since the ministry has refused the enhancement initially, the Institute must wait for the approval. She suggested that a team from the Institute, led by the Dean of Studies, could meet Ministry officials to follow up on the matter. She also informed that the President of the Institute had advised setting up a corpus fund for such eventualities and had promised a partial matching grant himself. A few members commented that, while the IITs were proposing fellowships as high as Rs. 60,000 per month to attract better students, the Institute and its administrative ministry were taking a retrogressive stand. The Dean of Studies raised the issue of the discrepancy between the fellowship rates (for JRF/SRF with M.Tech./M.E./M.Pharm.)   after enhancement with effect from 1.10.2014, as declared by ISI (Rs. 28,000/32,000) and those announced by CSIR and other agencies (Rs. 25,000/28,000). The previous Dean of Studies, Prof. Pradipta Bandyopadhyay, agreed that there was discrepancy with CSIR, but did not consider it to be a mistake, as the representative of the Ministry in the ISI Council had said that the enhancement could be implemented without approval from the ministry. Prof. Mukhopadhyaya and Dr. Krishanu Maulik noted that, while approval had been taken in 2008, there had been some confusion with respect to the enhancement in 2010 due to some mix-up at the Ministry. Prof. Smarajit Bose suggested that the Institute should own up to its mistakes and move on. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay wanted to know what information should be provided in the prospectus for 2017-18 regarding the contingency grant for research fellows. The chairperson suggested that the last approved amount (Rs. 20,000) should be mentioned, with a footnote indicating that it is likely to be enhanced, subject to government approval.

Resolution: The Institute should be careful to ensure that the information sent to the administrative ministry is correct and complete, and that proper administrative approval is taken before schemes related to stipends, fellowships and contingency grants are implemented. The Dean of Studies is authorized to decide on what should be mentioned in the Prospectus (for 2017-18) regarding the quantum of the contingency grant, in consultation with the committee chaired by Prof. Susmita Sur-Kolay.

Agenda Item 4:   **Consideration of a proposal for reviving the scheme of Research Associates**

Prof. S. M. Srivastava explained the proposal. The Dean recommended that the currently prevailing CSIR terms and conditions should be followed exactly for the research associates of the Institute. Dr. Krishanu Maulik reminded that after approval from the AC, this proposal must also be ratified by the Finance Committee, followed by the ISI Council, before it can be sent to the Ministry for its approval. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh wanted to know how the RAs would be selected. Prof. Srivastava suggested a general announcement on the Institute website, accepting applications twice a year, in February and in August. He also suggested that a committee should be formed to work out the modalities of implementing the scheme.

Resolution: **The research associateship scheme should be revived in the Institute, with terms and conditions exactly as per current CSIR norms.**

Agenda Item 5:   **Consideration of a proposal for conducting a feasibility study of the M.Stat. programme in Chennai**

Prof. S.M. Srivastava explained the thought behind the proposal, mentioning that several external faculty were being needed to conduct the programme in Chennai, on account of a paucity of faculty at that Centre. He had been informed that both the ministry and the Government Auditors were raising objections to this. He felt that this could have been avoided, had the Academic Council been involved in the decision to start the programme in Chennai, and a feasibility study been conducted beforehand. Prof. Ponnusamy disputed the data regarding the appointment of guest faculty that had been presented in the proposal. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay suggested that ISI faculty from other centres who teach in Chennai should also be counted as external faculty. The Director opined that it was perfectly alright for ISI faculty to assist in the teaching of courses at other, particularly, newer centres, in view of the cap on faculty recruitment. Moreover, the dependence on external faculty should be minimized, without curtailing teaching programmes at any of the centres in any way. Prof. Srivastava clarified that he had no desire to stop any such activity, but he did not want any compromise with quality. He requested a feasibility study, possibly through a committee which could suggest improvement in the manner in which the M.Stat. programme could be conducted in Chennai. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh expressed concern regarding the lag in knowledge seen in M.Stat. students who complete their first year in Chennai, in comparison to those who do so at Delhi, and suggested coordination among the M.Stat. teachers in Chennai and Delhi. Dr. Bandyopadhyay felt that such coordination would be difficult. Prof. Alok Goswami concurred, observing that the same teacher may teach a course differently in two different years, and there is nothing wrong if differences are there, as long as the basic minimum is covered in both places. Prof. Ghosh pointed out that his concern was regarding differences within the same batch. Prof. Abhay Bhatt observed that non-B Stream students come from different colleges and universities and these differences in the backgrounds of the students should also be factored in by M. Stat. 2nd year teachers. Prof. TSSRK Rao pointed out that some other programmes, like the MSLIS, were being conducted with very few faculty, and thought must be given to supporting such programmes too. The Director proposed setting up a committee to explore ways of facilitating the running of academic programmes at centres which have an insufficient number of faculty members. It was unanimously decided that the committee would consist of Prof. TSSRK Rao (Chair), Prof. Alok Goswami, Prof. Arup Pal, Prof. Sushma Bendre and Prof. Saurabh Ghosh (Convener). In future, all proposals for starting new programmes should be preceded by a feasibility study. With regard to the temporary paucity of faculty that may occur if several faculty members take long-term academic leave, it was reiterated that the leave application form should be certified by the Dean of Studies.

Resolution: A committee, consisting of Prof. TSSRK Rao (as Chairman), Prof. Alok Goswami, Prof. Arup Pal, Prof. Sushma Bendre and Prof. Saurabh Ghosh (as Convener), would be constituted to explore and recommend ways of facilitating the running of academic programmes at centres which have an insufficient number of faculty members. In future, all proposals for starting new programmes should be preceded by a feasibility study. The leave application form of all faculty members planning to proceed on long-term academic leave should be certified by the Dean of Studies.

Agenda Item 6:   Consideration of the report of the committee constituted by office order no. DS/2016-17/0286(A) dated 26 July, 2016, to consider a proposal for a new 4-year Bachelor's programme in Computer Science

The convener of the committee, Prof. Utpal Garain, presented the findings of a survey made by the committee and its report. Prof. Nabanita Das commented that an integrated 3+2 years' programme would have been more acceptable, but was informed that the committee did not look into this, since it was not within its Terms of Reference. Prof. Dipti P. Mukherjee commented that this should have been proposed as a B.Tech. programme, rather than as a Bachelor's degree programme. The chairman of the committee, Prof. Nikhil R. Pal, mentioned that its Terms of Reference were not clear. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh wanted to know what was unique about the programme, to Prof. Garain responded that it was a mixture of Computer Science and Data Science, and was multidisciplinary in nature. Prof. Rajat De suggested that the name should be B.Tech.(Computer Science) since the phrase **Data Science** may not be fashionable 5-10 years hence and graduating students may find it difficult to get employment as faculty, since institutions will prefer to recruit core Computer Science people, rather than those with multidisciplinary training. Prof. Smarajit Bose highlighted the issue of faculty shortage in Statistics, Mathematics, etc. and urged that the faculty recruitment issue be resolved before thinking of introducing new degree programmes. Prof. S. M. Srivastava also questioned the advisability of introducing a new undergraduate programme, given the faculty crunch, inadequate infrastructural support and paucity of funding. Prof. Bhabani P. Sinha commented that M.Tech. programmes have been running well in the institute for the past 25-30 years, but there has been a fall in the quality of the students entering the programme. He felt that such an undergraduate programme would help improve the quality of student intake for the postgraduate programme, since it could draw bright young students right after they leave school. He also pointed out that though there was a faculty crunch when the M.Tech. programme had been started, the faculty count has increased substantially since then. He urged the Institute to think about a 5-year Integrated M.Tech. programme with an exit option after 4 years with a B.Tech. degree. Prof. Probal Dasgupta urged the introduction of new programmes in order to get more students leading to a much larger pool of graduates to recruit from. Prof. Dipti P. Mukherjee concurred with Profs. Sinha and Dasgupta, mentioning that IISc has a 4 years' BS programme. The chairperson proposed that the committee should be given a reframed mandate to explore feasibility. Prof. Sinha noted that in the past few years, it has been difficult to attract good students to the M.Tech. programme of ISI, as such students prefer to go to IITs, etc. Prof. Susmita Sur-Kolay commented that the proposal was sketchy though the survey was OK. The Chairman of the committee sought a more concrete and detailed proposal. Prof. Srivastava suggested consulting faculty from other divisions as it was a multidisciplinary programme. Prof. Pradipta Bandyopadhyay wondered whether the programme was at all necessary. The Director requested the proposers for a more detailed proposal. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay wanted to know whether the committee had deliberated upon the acceptability of the programme by AICTE, to which Prof. Dipti P. Mukherjee responded, saying that this was not required as it was not a B.Tech. degree. Dr. Bandyopadhyay also pointed out the flaw

in the survey data in respect of concordance of answers. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh requested that all AC-mandated committees be made known to all members of the faculty.

Resolution: **This committee will revisit the issue in greater detail by examining the feasibility of conducting the programmes, after being reconstituted with more members from other divisions.**

Agenda Item 7: Consideration of funding for ISI Research Fellows by external agencies

The Dean of Studies explained the issue concerning offers from different private bodies to fund the fellowship and/or contingency grant of our Research Fellows, for example, the TCS Research Scholar Programme. In some cases, the funding may be guaranteed for certain a number of years which may fall short of the time given to ISI-funded fellows, or may cover only a part of the fellowship and/or contingency grant. Approval was therefore being sought for such fellowship funding with proposal for payment for the shortfall from the Institute fund. The AC was requested to consider and give in-principle approval for the matter. In addition, it may consider forming a standing committee to look into such individual proposals and give approvals, while reporting them in the very next meeting of the AC. Prof. Pradipta Bandyopadhyay informed that, in the case of the NBHM fellowship, which has a shorter duration, extension is given directly. Prof. Sur-Kolay suggested that the JRF (CS) Selection Committee can recommend recipients of such external funding. The Director suggested that such funding should be advertised on the Institute website and mentioned in the prospectus, and a standing committee as proposed could be constituted with the Dean of Studies as the chairperson. Prof. Abhay Bhatt and Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay mentioned that CSIR, NBHM fellowships are not topped up at the Delhi Centre.

Resolution: **All such extra-mural funding, which is governed by its own terms and conditions, should be advertised on the Institute website, and Institute research fellows should be permitted to opt for them. A standing committee with the Dean of Studies as the chair should be constituted to look into such individual proposals and give approvals, while reporting them in the very next meeting of the AC. The committee is empowered to decide whether shortfall, if any, will be covered by Institute funding.**

Agenda Item 8: Consideration of a proposal for offering PhD degree from ISI in Geosciences

Prof. Dhurjati Prasad Sengupta described the salient features of the proposal. The Director wanted to know whether the proposed subject area was related to statistics. Prof. S. M. Srivastava was of the opinion that the Indian Statistical Institute Act, 1959, should be amended to allow ISI to award Ph.D. degrees in all subject areas in which it provides research fellowships and research is carried out in the Institute. It was proposed that a committee should be formed with Prof. S. M. Srivastava as the chairman to recommend appropriate amendment of the ISI Act. The proposers were requested to rewrite their proposal appropriately and forward it to the committee constituted by Office Order no. DO/2016/654 dated December 2, 2016, to evaluate similar proposals.

Resolution: The proposal should be rewritten appropriately and forwarded to the committee constituted by Office Order no. DO/2016/654 dated December 2, 2016, to evaluate similar proposals for the award of Ph.D. degrees by ISI in non-core areas.

A committee should be formed with Prof. S. M. Srivastava as the chairman to recommend appropriate amendment of the Indian Statistical Institute Act, 1959, so as to allow ISI to award Ph.D. degrees in all subject areas in which it provides research fellowships and research is carried out in the Institute.

Agenda Item 9: Consideration of a proposal for introducing an existing part-time certificate course in SQC with six-sigma Green Belt in two new locations

Dr. Somnath Roy presented the proposal. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay wanted to know whether the Academic Council had given its approval to the part-time certificate courses being offered in Bangalore and Chennai, as no documents to this effect seem to be available. He was of the opinion that a teaching programme in which remuneration is given to its faculty should be treated as an externally-funded project and hence kept outside the purview of the AC. ISI faculty are not given extra remuneration to teach in ISI programmes. He also questioned why Coimbatore had been selected as one of the venues, as there was only one faculty member there. Prof. Abhay Bhatt also questioned the choice of Chennai as the other venue, since ISI faculty in Chennai were also needed for teaching in other programmes. Prof. Susmita Sur-Kolay felt that the fee charged could cover the remuneration for external faculty. Prof. Mahuya Dutta was of the opinion that it was not externally funded as there is no fund from outside. Teaching is a part of the duties of ISI faculty, so extra remuneration should not be given. There is a fee for the PGDBA programme, but its teachers do not get additional remuneration, so there is no reason why an exception should be made for this programme. Dr. Arup Das clarified that remuneration is given since it is an evening course conducted beyond office hours. The Director was of the opinion that this is not an externally-funded project but a continuing education model, in which teachers could be selectively incentivized. Prof. Bhatt felt that AC should consider the academic part only, remuneration being an administrative matter. Prof. Srivastava proposed a feasibility study. The Director suggested an initial feasibility study in Chennai. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh wondered whether this would affect the running of the first year of the M.Stat. programme in Chennai. Dr. Roy assured him that there would be no problem since the proposed course would be conducted on weekends. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay wanted the policy on extra remuneration to be decided. Dr. Krishanu Maulik mentioned that, according to the regulations of the Institute, such remuneration comes under the purview of the JCC. Prof. Bhatt reported that discussion in the 61st meeting of the AC on this issue with respect to a similar programme (Certificate Course on Business Analytics in collaboration with SAS Corporation) in Chennai got deferred. Hence the two should be discussed together. This matter too was deferred to the next AC meeting.

Resolution: Discussion on the proposal was deferred to the next AC meeting. The issues of remuneration, etc. for this programme as well as the proposed Certificate Course on Business Analytics in collaboration with SAS Corporation in Chennai should be discussed together.

Agenda Item 10:   Consideration of a proposal for revision of the eligibility rules for repeating a year

Prof. Smarajit Bose explained the background behind his proposal. He shared his own experience about teaching a B.Stat. 1st year course in the first semester of 2016-17. The three students who are repeating from the previous year had poor attendance and were also performing poorly. He wondered whether the Institute is doing a disservice to the future of these students by not being strict regarding their attendance. He felt that a second chance should not be given to students who are not at all interested in improving their academic performance by attending lectures regularly. Attendance must be made mandatory. Prof. Mahuya Dutta was of the opinion that there should be a minimum attendance requirement. Unfortunately, submitting attendance-related information is not mandatory for teachers. Some members from Delhi expressed the opinion that attendance seems to have become linked to stipend alone, but second chance should be given to students along with a strict rule for attendance. Dr. Rajat Hazra said that quite a few teachers do take attendance, and linking it to appearance in examination will make the attendance requirement more effective. Prof. Bhatt felt that it was up to the student whether to use or waste the second chance. Prof. Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya suggested linking it to placement, to the option of repeating a year, as well as to direct admission to M.Stat./M.Math in the case of B.Stat,/B.Math. students. He also advocated taking steps against defaulting teachers. Some members were not sure whether these were practicable solutions. Prof. Pradipta Bandyopadhyay, the previous Dean, informed that if a teacher does not submit attendance data, students are given 100% attendance, since they cannot be penalized for the negligence of the teacher.   Prof. Raja felt that students should be given a chance to repeat in case of poor performance, as is given in most universities.

Resolution: It was resolved that *status quo* would be maintained in the matter of eligibility conditions for repeating a year.

Agenda Item 11:   Consideration of a proposal for allowing maximum score of 100% in supplementary mid-semester examination this year for students affected by the Dengue outbreak

Prof. Smarajit Bose explained the reason why he had brought this proposal to the AC. In the first semester of the academic year 2016-17, there had been a serious outbreak of Dengue in the ISI Kolkata hostels, and quite a few students, having missed the mid-semestral/semstral examinations, had appealed to be allowed to take supplementary examinations in one or more courses. He felt that these students should be given some additional consideration since they had contracted this disease while living on campus. Prof. Srivastava supported the proposal only for dengue-affected students. Prof. Raja objected on the ground that a similar proposal from Bangalore last year had been turned down. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay also expressed his objection since this issue was never raised despite Dengue outbreaks on Delhi campus in the past 7-8 years. Dr. Krishanu Maulik mentioned that such proposals had been discussed several times in the past and had been turned down.

Resolution: The proposal for allowing maximum score of 100% in supplementary mid-semester examination this year for students affected by the Dengue outbreak was turned down.

Agenda Items 12 & 14: Consideration of a proposal for the modification of the structure of the M.Tech.(CS)/ JRF (CS) afternoon written test PCB/CSB for Admission

Prof. Nabanita Das explained the rationale behind these proposals, which were discussed in conjunction, since selection procedures for the JRF and M.Tech programmes in Computer Science have the same structure. Prof. Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya elaborated upon the proposal. Dr. Krishanu Maulik expressed concerns regarding logistic issues that might arise due to the proposed modification, particularly in respect of registration numbers of applicants, which are coded using acronyms of the programme that has been applied for. Dr. Rajat Hazra suggested that the syllabi of the JRF(Math) and the Mathematics part in the JRF (CS) selection tests should be compared. Prof. Goswami pointed out that it will be the prerogative of the respective selection committee to decide on the cut-off on the written test score to be used to shortlist candidates for interviews. The proposal was accepted.

Resolution: The following modification of the structure of the afternoon written test CSB for admission to the JRF (CS) programme was approved:
An applicant may appear for
- either the written test for JRF(CS), namely, MMA+CSB, where the Group B part of the CSB test will consist of only questions in Computer Science and related areas at the M.Tech. level; or
- the written test for JRF(Statistics)/JRF(Mathematics)/ JRF(Physics): or
- GATE/CSIR (NET)/ UGC (NET)

Interview conducted by the JRF(CS) Selection Committee is mandatory for all candidates who qualify the cut-off for the respective written tests.

Agenda Item 13: Consideration of a proposal for the procedure to opt for dissertation/project in M.Tech.(QROR) 2nd year

Prof. Arup Das gave an overview of the proposal. There was a lot of confusion among members regarding various aspects of the issue. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay suggested sending it back to the syllabus review committee, which could convey its decision to the AC subsequently. Prof. Das presented four possible options with respect to the dissertation-project combination in M.Tech.(QROR 2nd year), namely, (i) Dissertation only for 6 months and 400 marks; (ii) Project only for 6 months and 400 marks; (iii) Dissertation for 2 months and 100 marks, Project for 4 months and 300 marks; (iv) Dissertation for 4 months and 300 marks, Project for 2 months and 100 marks. There would be one single supervisor, who will conduct the evaluation. The Director suggested that, for the current year, the prevailing system be followed, and a proposal should be evolved for the future through discussion with members of the Division or the Syllabus Review Committee.

Resolution: It was resolved that for the current academic year, the prevailing system should be followed, but the matter should be referred to the M.Tech.(QROR) Syllabus Review Committee for resolution.

Agenda Item 15:   Consideration of a proposal regarding RFACs for disciplines having both JRF admission test and PhD/DSc committee in ISI

Prof. Susmita Sur-Kolay presented the rationale for the proposal. Prof. Srivastava commented that his unit is perfectly satisfied with the *status quo*, in which the RFACs are constituted division-wise and also centre-wise in the case of the Theoretical Statistics and Mathematics Division. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay concurred. Prof. Bhabani Sinha pointed out that research fellows in Computer Science are scattered across several divisions, and there is no uniformity in the evaluation procedure followed by the RFACs of all these divisions. Such uniformity is extremely essential. Prof. Rajat De expressed his support for the proposal. Prof. Srivastava, Prof. Saurabh Ghosh and Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay opposed any change in the existing structure of RFACs for Statistics or Mathematics. It was decided to form a committee consisting of Professors in-charge and Conveners of the five PhD-DSc Committees to examine the issue.

Resolution: It was resolved that a committee consisting of Professors in-charge and Conveners of the five PhD-DSc Committees would be constituted to examine the issue of having discipline-wise RFACs rather than division-wise RFACs (as is the prevalent norm) and make recommendations.

Agenda Item 16:   Consideration of a proposal for confirmation of pass-fail rules and rules regarding unsatisfactory conduct for all degree programmes of the Institute, pending submission of report by the Brochure Committee

It was unanimously decided that this is an administrative matter and was approved.

Resolution: The pass-fail rules for all degree programmes of the Institute as well as rules regarding unsatisfactory conduct, were confirmed as circulated, pending submission of report by Brochure Committee.

Agenda Item 17:   Consideration of a proposal regarding audit/non-credit courses taken by students outside their prescribed syllabus in other degree programmes

Deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 18:   Consideration of a proposal for change in M.Tech. (CS) programme

Deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 20:   Consideration of the report of the committee constituted vide office order no. DS/2016/205 dated 31 March, 2016

Deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 21: Consideration of a proposal prompted by a request from the National Security Council Secretariat to conduct a dedicated M.Tech. programme in Cryptology and Security at the R.C. Bose Centre

Dr. Debrup Chakraborty presented the highlights of the proposal sent by three members of Academic Council, namely, Prof. Bimal Roy, Prof. Subhamoy Maitra & Prof. Tapas Samanta (prompted by a request from National Security Council Secretariat) for a new M.Tech. program on Cryptology & Security. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh and Dr. Krishanu Maulik suggested that a feasibility study should be conducted before the proposal can be discussed. When Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay wanted to know which of the five core areas this programme could be categorized into, he was informed by Dr. Chakraborty that Computer Science was the appropriate area. Then Dr. Bandyopadhyay wanted to know, given that ISI already had an M.Tech. programme in Computer Science, why this was not being proposed as a specialization or track of the same. Dr. Chakraborty said that this was mandated by the National Security Council and, while there would be a possible collaboration with IIT Kharagpur and IIT Kanpur, the degree would have to be awarded by ISI since the IITs have resource constraints. Dr. Maulik pointed out that there were resource constraints in ISI as well. Prof. Alok Goswami questioned whether ISI could award degrees in Cryptology, given that the ISI Act does not empower it to do so, and implementation of the proposal could cause legal issues. Dr. Rajat Hazra suggested that it could be started on an experimental basis as a specialization in the M.Tech.(CS) programme, along the lines of tracks in the M.Stat. curriculum. This was supported by Prof. Srivastava, who felt this to be the proper course of action, presuming that the proposed programme was quite likely to have many courses in common with the M.Tech.(CS) programme Prof. Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya mentioned that Cryptology was already effectively being considered to be a part of Computer Science, since Ph.D. theses in Cryptology were being submitted to ISI in that area. He pointed out that the current structure of the M.Tech.(CS) programme did not have any scope for specializations/tracks. Moreover, he was of the opinion that the entire structure of the programme needed to be revamped. The programme was a disaster and needed to be reviewed thoroughly. He was supported by Profs. Nabanita Das and Sandip Das. Prof. Mukhopadhyaya also commented that, since a Government Agency had proposed the programme, the Government should be asked to amend the ISI Act first, before ISI could consider implementing the proposal. It was proposed that a committee would be set up to examine the feasibility of the proposed programme, with Prof. Rana Barua, Prof. Palash Sarkar and Dr. Debrup Chakraborty as members. Another committee would be constituted, with Prof. Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya as Chairman and Dr. Arijit Bishnu as Convener, to review the structure of the M.Tech.(CS) programme and to examine how to incorporate the proposed programme within its framework.

Resolution: It was resolved that a committee would be set up to examine the feasibility of the proposed programme, with Prof. Rana Barua, Prof. Palash Sarkar and Dr. Debrup Chakraborty as members. Another committee would be constituted, with Prof. Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya as Chairman and Dr. Arijit Bishnu as Convener, to review the current structure of the M.Tech.(CS) programme and to examine how to incorporate the proposed programme within its framework.

Agenda Item 22: Consideration of a proposal on structure and guideline for M.Math. project

Deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 23: Approval of list of successful candidates to be awarded degree/diplomas in B. Stat./ B. Math./ M. Stat./ M. Math./ MS(QE)/ M. Tech (CS)/ M. Tech (QR&OR)/ MS(LIS)/ MS(QMS) /PhD/ Certificate/ PG Diploma in next Convocation

It was pointed out the list of PhD awardees in Mathematics was missing. The Dean agreed to get this list approved by circulation through e-mail to all AC members.

Resolution: The lists of successful candidates to be awarded degree/diplomas in B. Stat./ B. Math./ M. Stat./ M. Math./ MS(QE) /M. Tech (CS)/ M. Tech (QR&OR)/ MS(LIS)/ MS(QMS)/ PhD/ Certificate/ PG Diploma in next Convocation that were previously circulated, were approved. The list of PhD awardees in Mathematics would be circulated through e-mail to all AC members for approval, in addition to the list of all other PhD awardees who complete the formalities before the convocation.

Agenda Item 24: *Post facto* approval of a Student Exchange Agreement between Université Paris Dauphine, Paris, France and the Indian Statistical Institute

Prof. Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya was of the opinion that the MOU was one-sided, and did not benefit the students of the Institute in any way. Dr. Krishanu Maulik pointed out that the agreement had not been routed through the Academic Council on either occasion, that is, neither when it was originally made in 2011 nor when it was renewed in 2016. He felt that such programmes put additional strain on the resources of the Dean's Office. The Director reported that the option for internship for our students was included at the time of renewal. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh wanted to know what the eligibility conditions were for the programme. Dr. Rajat Hazra, who had exchange students from this programme in his class, wanted clarification on the pass-fail rules for these students. The agreement was approved *post facto*, with the stricture that, in future, such MOU's involving students should be ratified by the AC first.

Resolution: The agreement was approved *post facto*, with the stricture that, in future, such MOU's involving students should be ratified by the AC first.

Agenda Item 25: Consideration of the report of a committee constituted by office order no. DS/193 dated April 2, 2013, to suggest the salient features of a possible Institutional Policy regarding students with special needs and their academic responsibilities.

Prof. Isha Dewan gave an overview of the recommendations of the committee. Prof. Abhay Bhatt describe the necessary background in terms of a court case that had been filed against the Institute in this connection, and the accessibility audit conducted at the Delhi Centre by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. Dr. Krishanu Maulik pointed out that the information provided regarding educational qualification of scribe/reader/ etc. in the last paragraph on page no. 3 of the report was dated, as it had been quashed subsequently by the Bombay High Court in a verdict given in 2014.

Resolution: It was resolved that the report of the committee should be accepted, excluding the part referring to the educational qualification, etc. of scribe/reader/lab assistant in the last paragraph on page no. 3 of the report. The opinion of the concerned ministry should be sought about this issue in the light of the Bombay High Court verdict.

Agenda Item 26: Consideration of a proposal for fixing the duration of the mid-semestral and semestral examinations.

Deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 27: Consideration of the report of a committee constituted by office order no. DS/2015-16/0650 dated November 19, 2015, to look into the feasibility and other aspects of a proposal on a two-year M.Sc. (by research) programme in Theoretical Computer Science at the ISI Chennai Centre

Deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 28: Consideration of the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Awards regarding changes in the selection criterion for the Nikhilesh Bhattacharya Medal in view of the revision of the B.Stat. syllabus.

Prof. Saurabh Ghosh, the convener of the Standing Committee on Awards, explained that the selection criterion for Nikhilesh Bhattacharya Gold Medal needed to be modified in the light of the revision in the syllabus for the B.Stat. programme. The committee, taking into account the wishes of Dr. Dhrubabrata Bhattacharya, who instituted the award in memory of his older brother, recommended that scores in the 12 Statistics courses should be used instead of the core courses. This recommendation was accepted, and was to be implemented starting with the batch which graduated in 2015-16.

Resolution: It was resolved that the criterion for selection of the recipient of the Nikhilesh Bhattacharya award should be changed to "the student scoring the maximum in the 12 statistics courses" (listed below):
1. Statistical Methods I-IV
2. Linear Statistical Models
3. Economic and Official Statistics & Demography
4. Parametric Inference
5. Sample Surveys
6. Statistical Quality Control and Operations Research
7. Nonparametric and Sequential Methods
8. Design of Experiments
9. Statistics Comprehensive

This new criterion would be applied starting with the batch which graduated in 2015-16.

Agenda Item 29: Consideration of the report of a committee constituted by office order no. DS/2016-17/0694 dated November 17, 2016, to look into and make recommendations regarding the eligibility conditions for JRF (Mathematics) and all other undergraduate, post-graduate and JRF programmes of the Institute.

Prof. Alok Goswami, the chairman of the committee, explained the background behind the formation of the committee. In an earlier meeting, Prof. Mahuya Datta had objected to the wording and details of a proposal

suggesting revised eligibility conditions for JRF in Mathematics, that had been placed in that meeting. Dr. Rajat Shubhra Hazra had commented in that meeting and later also checked and found that the proposal was comprehensive and well-worded. Prof. Bhabatosh Chanda, a member of the committee, expressed concerns regarding the job prospects in colleges and universities of students with an M.Tech. degree followed by a Ph.D. in Mathematics. However, he recommended acceptance of the proposal. Prof. Goswami also highlighted proposed changes in eligibility conditions for other programmes, emphasizing that these are minimum requirements for applying, and do not automatically guarantee selection. A reduction in subjective conditions like "outstanding maturity" and so on, had been one of the objectives. For example, a Post-Graduate Diploma in Statistical Methods and Analytics (PGDSMA) had been proposed as an eligibility condition for M.Stat. The former is a one-year programme different from the original 2-year programme and possibly not approved as an eligibility condition by the Academic Council. Prof. Sushma Bendre confirmed this and mentioned that the current version of the programme does not prepare a student for M.Stat. but for the job market. Prof. Chanda mentioned that eligibility conditions similar to JRF (Mathematics) were considered for JRF (Statistics) and were being proposed. Prof. Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya opined that a student of the PGDSMA programme should be allowed to apply, and can drop out if not fit, provided he/she is selected. Prof. Goswami felt that the possibility of having the one-year PGDSMA programme as an eligibility condition for M.Stat. should be debated as a proposal by the AC. Several members voiced their confusion regarding the phrase "Statistics as subject" mentioned in the proposed eligibility conditions for M.Stat., even pointing out that the lack of clarity may lead to legal issues. Prof. Goswami felt that the Dean's Office and the selection committee could decide whether this condition is satisfied by a candidate. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh pointed out that it was not possible for the Dean's Office to answer individual queries regarding the phrase. Prof. Chanda felt that the proposed wording was identical in spirit to the existing phrasing. Prof. Goswami said that committee tried to come up with the best possible solution, but a new committee could be formed to ensure proper wording. Prof. Chanda suggested including a legal expert in the committee. Prof. Mukhopadhyaya warned that leaving the decision regarding eligibility conditions to committees can lead to diametrically opposite views. However, the spirit of interpretation could be discussed in the Academic Council and noted. Prof. Ghosh lauded the proposals as providing the best possible solution by trying to be inclusive, allowing those who do not have conventional training in Statistics to apply, and possibly even succeeding in being selected and doing well in M.Stat. Prof. Goswami emphasized that these are only eligibility conditions, and the selection tests should be able to identify candidates with high chances of succeeding in completing the programmes. Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay questioned the need for having a phrase like "Statistics as a subject", since the selection test should be able to filter. Prof. Goswami concurred with this. The Director wondered whether Probability as a subject" could also be a qualifier for some eligibility condition. She also wondered how "outstanding maturity", as mentioned in some eligibility conditions, could be verified. Prof. Goswami clarified that this was to be used only in the case of undergraduate students who wish to apply directly for Ph.D. programmes. Till date, it has been used only in the cases of only two students, Subir Bhandari (who was subsequently asked to complete the M.Stat. programme before working for his Ph.D.) and Prabir Das (who completed his Ph.D.). It was proposed that this should be dropped. Prof. Srivastava wanted it to be retained. Several members spoke for and against this. Ultimately, the Director suggested the formation of a three-member committee, consisting of Prof. Rita SahaRay (Chair), Prof. TSSRK Rao and Prof. Isha Dewan to deliberate on the two contentious issues, leaving the phrase as it is for the forthcoming admissions.

Resolution: The recommendations of the committee were accepted *in toto* for the forthcoming admissions. A three-member committee, consisting of Prof. Rita SahaRay (Chair), Prof. TSSRK Rao and Prof. Isha Dewan, would be formed to deliberate on whether the two phrases "Statistics as a subject" and "outstanding ability in

Statistics/Mathematics" would continue to be used in the eligibility conditions for certain programmes.

Agenda Item 30:   Approval of the corrected list of successful candidates to be awarded the M.Math. degree in the next convocation and a status report by the Associate Dean (Examinations) on the submission of scores by teachers for the first semestral examination, 2016-17

The Dean of Studies informed the members that the list of successful candidates to be awarded the M. Math. Degree in the next Convocation that had been previously circulated as a part of agenda item no. 23 on December 6, 2016, contained an error. Hence a corrected version of the same was being circulated for approval.

The Associate Dean (Examinations), Dr. Krishanu Maulik, presented a status report on the submission of scores by teachers for the first semestral examination, 2016-17. He informed that the post-backpaper results of all programmes, except the M.Tech. (CS) I and II years and M.Tech.(QROR) II year had been announced. For the latter, the dates of the backpaper examinations had been declared, but for the M.Tech.(CS) (both years), scores were yet to be submitted by teachers, mainly because deadlines for assignments had spilt into the next semester. He invited suggestions from the members in this regard. Prof. Alok Goswami expressed concern at this disturbing situation. Prof. Abhay Bhatt felt that the Academic Calendar announced by the Dean's Office at the beginning of the semester should be strictly adhered to, and assignments should, therefore, not be allowed to run into the next semester. His view was supported by Dr. Antar Bandyopadhyay. Prof. Nabanita Das felt that the time available for evaluation was too short and possibly there was miscommunication between the teachers and the Dean's Office. Dr. Maulik conceded that there was scope for miscommunication, since the scale of operations is much larger in Kolkata as far as examinations are concerned. Hence there is a severe need for e-governance. He sought the cooperation of all teachers. Dr. Rajat Hazra suggested that the Academic Calendar for the full academic year should be announced at the beginning of the year. Dr. Prasun Das pointed out that, till e-governance is implemented, the Dean's Office will need hard copies of scores in time in order to finalize results. Prof. Saurabh Ghosh stated that since the semester length is fixed, teachers should be able to know beforehand if their marks submission would be delayed for some reason, and to inform the Dean's Office accordingly, in advance.

Resolution: The corrected list of successful candidates to be awarded the M. Math. Degree in the next Convocation was approved as circulated.

It was resolved that the Academic Calendar would be made locally at all Centres, assignments and backpapers should be graded by the respective deadlines declared therein and, for all programmes, classes would commence in the new semester only after all backpaper examinations for the previous semester had been completed.

Sd/-
Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay
Director, Indian Statistical Institute &
Chairperson, Academic Council