

Indian Statistical Institute
203, B.T Road, Kolkata – 700 108



82st Meeting of the Academic Council

Date: July 03, 2024

Time: 2:30 p.m.

VENUE: CSSC VIDEO CONFERENCE ROOM, ISI, KOLKATA

Member Present (Physically or Virtually)			
Member Present (Physically)		Member Present (Virtually)	
1	Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay	1	BS Daya Sagar
2	Gopal Krishna Basak	2	Ranjan Sett
3	Pradipta Maji	3	Mohan Delampady
4	Antar Bandyopadhyay	4	Abhay Gopal Bhatt
5	Susmita Sur-Kolay	5	Arindam Chatterjee
6	Rajat Kumar De	6	GIJO EV
7	Biswabrata Pradhan	7	Abhik Ghosh
8	Debashis Paul	8	Deepayan Sarkar
9	Mahuya Dutta	9	Debasis Sengupta
10	Bulusu Uma Sankar	10	Swagata Nandi
11	Sourav Chakraborty	11	Arup K. Pal
12	Mrinal Kanti Das	12	Sumitra Purkayastha
13	Dipti Prasad Mukherjee	13	Isha Dewan
14	G Ravindran	14	Sushmita Mitra
15	Kishore Chandra Satpathy	15	Anisur Rahaman
16	Ansuman Banerjee	16	Anuj Bhowmik
17	Sabyasachi Karati	17	Rudra P Sarkar
18	Mandar Mitra	18	Mahuya Datta
19	Pradipta Bandyopadhyay		
20	Smarajit Bose		

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING

The Dean of Studies presented the proceedings of 81st Academic Council Meeting and the ATR for confirmation. Since no one offered any comments, the proceedings was confirmed. The Dean also reported the following incidents and requested discussion on some of the matters.

Reporting Matter: 1. In the last one and a half years any reported/caught cases of cheating were dealt with as per Institute rules - giving zero in the corresponding exam. Subsequently, some of them had to repeat the year or had to leave the Institute. However, there are still complaints related to cheating which is going to be discussed later.

Reporting Matter: 2. An M.Math Student (Bidesh Ghosh) repeated the first year in Kolkata after taking transfer from Bangalore. There is a rule of taking the maximum of the scores of the current year and the previous year if the student obtains minimum 35% in the current year. There were problems however with matching the subjects that he had taken in Bangalore with that of

Kolkata. A mapping was done by the TC keeping the best interest of the student in mind and this is being reported to the AC so that his provisional marksheets can be sent to him.

Reporting Matter: 3. The CSO Training course for M.Stat 1st year went on this time during the 2nd semester through the VC concurrently with Delhi and Kolkata. Lecturers taught at one place with students there while students at the other place attended the class virtually but live. Invaluable experience was gained on the teaching and training via VC.

However, there were serious complaints from an ADG Dr. Dalip Singh to another ADG Shri Sumedh Nagare to which the Dean's response is given below:

Dear Sh. Soni,

Thank you for informing us regarding the very poor attendance of the students on the said dates. We deeply regret the situation that the officials had to endure despite their enormous effort for the lecture during their extremely busy schedule. It is being taken very seriously at our end. We will bring it to our meeting of the highest academic body (Academic Council) to discuss the issue and the mode of the course in future and get back to you.

Thank you again for your continuous help and support.

With best regards,

The Dean is requesting two sets of recommendation on this for discussion and deliberation later:

(a) Training to be shifted to the December time period in Kolkata for all the students, as used to be done earlier. That way, whoever comes to deliver the lectures will come for a few days and deliver the lectures. It is expected that there would always be a reasonable number of students present during that 3/4 weeks of training.

(b) What may be done regarding the poor attendance of the students in the CSO training.

Reporting Matter: 4. Can a research scholar have a lateral transfer?

If a student has already done a registration and became an SRF in another place (Govt / Autonomous Institutions or equivalent body) what should be the status for the student here,

(a) if the student joins with ISI fellowship;

(b) if the student joins with CSIR/UGC/or other fellowship.

The matter arose when newly joined faculties enquired whether their SRF student from their former Institute would be allowed to transfer to ISI and/or get a degree from ISI. Because of the urgency of the matter the Dean of Studies requested a discussion and deliberation. After discussing the matter, the members in concurrence with the Chair opined that to receive the degree from the ISI, any candidate is required to follow the registration rules of the Institute. Without it, no such provision for a lateral transfer may be possible.

4.I. General Matters for Discussion and Decision:

Item 4.I.(A): Review of Structure and Content of M.Tech (CrS) Programme

Discussion: The Dean of Studies requested Dr. Sabyasachi Karati to present the matter to the AC members. Dr. Karati explained that since the course began in 2018, it needs a review of its structure and content. He added that there are currently issues with human resources in supervising dissertations and providing System courses.

The Chair asked Dr. Karati about the placement status of the programme. Dr. Karati responded that the programme is admitting students with lower cut-offs, many of whom have poor knowledge of System concepts due to their Mathematics background. The Chair suggested that the AC reconsider the entrance process for the M.Tech. (CS) and CrS programmes to ensure that students do not gain undue advantage with Mathematics background.

Dr. Karati noted that students often lack the basic knowledge of Systems and Security that they should have. Currently, the course structure includes System Course I in the first semester, covering Operating Systems and Architecture, and System Course II in the second semester, covering Computer Networks and Databases. Many other institutes cover these topics in a single semester.

Prof. Susmita Sur-Kolay pointed out that combining two courses in one semester is not ideal, as it may not provide sufficient depth in System Security or Cybersecurity. Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay inquired whether the AC would consider merging the M.Tech (CS) and CrS programmes. The Chair disagreed. Dr. Karati suggested forming a committee with three members experienced in Systems Security, Theory, and Cryptology. Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay recommended that the review committee include members from across all divisions.

Decision: The AC recommended forming a committee with a stronger focus on security aspects, including external experts like Sandeep Shukla (IIT Kanpur), Somitra Sanadhya (IIT Jodhpur), and Debdeep Mukhopadhyay (IIT KGP).

Item 4.I.(B): Review of Structure and Content of M.Tech (CS) Programme

Discussion: Prof. Sourav Chakraborty presented the matter to the AC, stating that the course structure of the M.Tech (CS) programme was changed four years ago and should be reviewed now. He noted that there is a curriculum implementation committee that collects feedback from students and faculty.

Prof. Smarajit Bose suggested that the review committee should also examine the intake/admission procedure and placement data, as most admitted students come from Mathematics and Statistics backgrounds and are facing placement difficulties. The Chair highlighted that the numerous optional subjects create challenges in teaching allocation, as very few students select many of the optional subjects offered each year. The curriculum should be more structured, with some courses offered one year and others the next. The Chair noted that while it may seem that all courses are taught every semester/year, in practice, there may only be a few students enroll in a course (e.g., one or two), hiring external experts becomes financially burdensome for the Institute.

Prof. Susmita Sur-Kolay added that the M.Tech (CS) programme has a large pool of electives, with students having two weeks to choose their electives. The low number of students per elective, compounded by students dropping electives after a few classes, affects teaching allocation. Thus, elective choices should be made before finalizing the teaching allocation.

Decision: The AC recommended forming a committee to review the course structure, with Prof. Mandar Mitra as Chair and Prof. Sourav Chakraborty as Convener with other members spread across the divisions as per their suggestions in consultation with the Dean of Studies.

Item 4.I.(C): Proposal for some changes in PGDAS

Discussion: The Dean of Studies informed the AC that Students have expressed that the current PGDAS program, which offers certificates after six months, does not adequately cover essential programming skills in R and Python, impacting their employability, not helping working students in terms of enhancing skill.

The course consists of three terms of eight weeks each across two semesters (totaling 48 weeks). A four-week gap in the schedule poses administrative challenges. The program has more than 350 active students, with admissions in each semester.

The Dean added that the AC may decide whether to allow students to take additional courses under the existing tuition fees. While Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay noted that this is an administrative decision, he emphasized that students should not receive the PGDAS diploma without proficiency in R and Python.

The Chair requested the Dean to get the approval of the necessary change in the course structure through circulation. Prof. Debasis Sengupta narrates the course structure before the AC members.

Decision: The AC agreed that students focusing on official statistics should be required to learn R and Python during their studies.

[Note: Later course structure was circulated via email to the AC for the approval. The Institute uploaded the modified brochure after the approval of the AC.]

Item 4.I.(D): Proposal for Replacing the "Introductory Computer Programming" Course in M.Stat. NB-Stream with the online "Introduction to R and Python" Course

The Dean of Studies introduced the matter to the AC and requested the Head of TSMUD Prof. Shanta Laishram to present the details to the AC. Prof. Laishram along with the Associate Dean Prof. Deepayan Sarkar explained that the existing Introductory Computer Programming course is challenging to schedule, requiring weekend classes due to faculty non-availability otherwise. ISI Delhi lacks sufficient resources to run the programming course effectively. Thus it was proposed to replace the Introductory Computer Programming course with an online R and Python course offered by Coursera. Prof. Debasis Sengupta confirmed that there are no legal issues with ISI students taking this online course. Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay commented that M.Stat. brochure needs to be updated to include this online course instead of the related existing offline course, if approved.

The Chair suggested having a local guide for the students' advantage for this online course to which Prof. Deepayan Sarkar agreed to be an instructor besides Coursera for ISI students for R and Python.

Concerns were raised by Prof. Smarajit Bose and Prof. Abhay Bhatt about potential clashes between the online course and ISI mid-semester or semestral exams. to which Prof. Debasis Sengupta and Prof. Deepayan Sarkar explained that there would not be any problem in this regard. It was further noted by the Chair that ISI has agreements in place regarding exams taken by ISI students.

Decision: The AC approved the implementation of the R and Python course via Coursera, as a trial basis, so that students' feedback may be taken and the matter reviewed if necessary, or let it continue otherwise. The M.Stat brochure would be required to be updated as suggested, - that

Introductory Computer Programming of M.Stat be changed to R and Python course provided by Coursera, starting in the 2024-25 academic year, subject to review with the student's feedback, in the next year, if necessary.

Item 4.I.(E): Proposal for

(i) the approval of the syllabus of 1st year of B.SDS programme,

(ii) the consideration of request to allow modifications for the remaining years that should be done before the next admission process for 2025-2026 starts

Discussion: The Dean of Studies requested Prof. Isha Dewan to present the report of the committee before the AC. Prof. Dewan explained that this is a small committee (consists of 3 faculty from Delhi and 3 faculty from Kolkata) under the guidance/advice of Prof. Arup Pal and Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyaya for the syllabus of probability and mathematics courses in BSDS. The Committee worked on the syllabus of the courses offered in the 1st and 2nd Semesters only. The report was circulated by the Dean of Studies. Prof. G Ravindran opined that many topics of Optimisation and Numerical Methods are at an advanced level; since this is an undergraduate 1st year course students may not have enough knowledge related to Optimisation problems. While the topics under item 1 to item 5 are understandable but from 6 to 8 are of quite advanced nature. Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay aired the view that under the Optimisation topic items 6, 7 & 8 are very important, as it is a Data Science programme and there would not be much theory to be taught in this course, referring to the preamble of the programme. The Dean of Studies added that the syllabus may be reviewed after 3 years and in the meantime correction and modification can be done like other courses (such as, M.Stat., PGDAS).

Prof. Debashis Paul referred to courses in the 6th semester that may need to be revised and moved to earlier semesters and a few other courses may need to be brought in with relevant material that would require changes in the course structure which was not part of the mandate of the committee. The Chair said, as the programme structure has been already published we may not just be able to take out some courses from one year and put it to another semester of a later year. Prof. Dewan added that the committee has a view that internal notes can cover the learning goals of a particular topic but they will not be provided in the public platform for the students or for viewing from anywhere in the world. Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay asked whether the AC can empower the committee to change the entire structure from the second year as the current year's admission is at the doorstep. He further added that in favour of structural change a line may be written in the prospectus allowing the Institute to make necessary changes.

Decision: (i) (First year syllabus of BSDS) was approved with minor modification/correction in the Optimization and Numerical Methods syllabus. Formatting of the elective subjects may be done if approved.

[Note: Formatting was done after the approval was obtained via circulation by email].

(ii) (Rest of the syllabus) was approved to be revised with minimal possible adjustments in programme structure, to be completed before the prospectus for the admission of the academic year 2025-26 is published.

Item 4.I.(F): Proposal for the approval of the general rules including pass-fail rules for the B.SDS

Discussion: The Dean of Studies requested Prof. Mohan Delampady to present and explain this matter to the AC. He requested Prof. Deepayan Sarkar who is the convener of the committee to elaborate this matter. Prof. Sarkar informed that the motivation of the rules are written in the first page of the report. The Chair requested Prof. Sarkar to highlight the difference between the existing pass-fail rule and this new rule. Prof. Sarkar informed that since Prof. Mohan Delampady has worked on it in depth, he would be able to respond to it better. This rule is somewhat similar to that of PGDBA. Prof. Delampady said that the main thing that they borrowed from PGDBA is the backlog concept. The exam schedule is the same as other bachelor degree programmes (like B.Stat & B.Math). Prof. Deepayan Sarkar said that the passmarks and supplementary rules are the same as that of B.Stat. and B.Math., the idea of failing in the course is also the same. The difference between the existing programme and the B.SDS lies in failing a year may not mean failing the course in the new one. If a student fails in a particular year s/he can be promoted to the next year subject to clearance of backlogs. The time of backlog clearance is proposed during the summer break. If a student fails in the 1st semester s/he may leave the course. After completing 3 years successfully students will get a degree of B.SDS without honours, if they wish to leave after 3 years. In the fourth year they will not get a chance for any failure. If they fail then they will get only a 3 year B.SDS degree without honours and those who successfully complete 4 years will get a degree of B.SDS (Hons.). Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay said that a backlog can never happen within the same year. When a student sits for a backpaper exam and fails, she or he may continue that paper to the next year as backlog, so backlog could not happen in the same year. Prof. Biswabrata Pradhan commented that there has to be some restriction on the number of backpapers like that of other programmes. The Dean of Studies pointed out that if there are 3 backlogs and two sets of backpapers (every year) it will be extremely difficult for the Dean's Office to conduct the exams at the end of the year along with the admission process. He further added that all other Institutes/Universities have a separate exam office, admission office etc., whereas at ISI everything is conducted by the Dean's office. Prof. Pradhan suggested that we should not have the backpaper at the end of year besides the regular backpaper. Prof. Bhatt said that at the end of the first semester a student may be allowed to carry two backlogs, in the second semester backlogs may remain at most 2 and in the 3rd semester at most 3 backlogs and so on. Many AC members opined that the rule for the 4 year (there is no backlog, only backpaper) is not fair for the students who fail in one subject, fail the 4th year and lose their Honours degree. Prof. Deepayan Sarkar said that a student has to clear all the backlog before the 4th year commences. Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay opines in support of the Dean's view saying that there should be a separate exam cell for conducting exams for this course.

Decision: (General rules including Pass-fail rules) was discussed and deliberated with recommendation by the AC for deletion of the end of the year back paper clearance proposal, keeping other parts almost as it was proposed in the AC.

[Note: During the approval via circulation by email the Convener of the pass-fail committee wrote: "We have tried to incorporate the suggestions made in the AC meeting, and also added a few new clauses that clarify ambiguities in the earlier draft (these are marked in red). Internal notes for the administration are marked in magenta, and should be removed before publication."

Everything was done as indicated by the Convener before posting it on the website.]

Item 4.I.(G): Travel Grants from ISI for externally funded fellows

Discussion: The Dean of Studies presented the matter before the AC, explaining that one of the students has surveyed in detail and showed that several Institutes provide travel support to externally funded fellows. The Chair read out the eligibility criteria from the Travel Grant rule where it clearly mentions that 'A PhD student must be a full time research scholar fully funded by the Institute.' Following this rule non-ISI funded scholars who had passed the entrance test but

chose to be funded externally are not eligible for the ISI Travel Grant. Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay proposed that if the travel grant rule was approved by our Academic Council then this particular restriction may be removed, if it was not approved by the AC then recommendation for removal of restriction should go to our council for their approval.

Decision: The AC empowered the Dean of Studies and the Director to modify the criteria for Travel Grant Rule.

Item 4.I.(H): Ratification of PGDBA grading system

Discussion: The Dean of Studies presented the case before the AC. The Chair opined that, as it is a tri Institute programme and since the other two institutions have no objection then ISI may also agree.

Decision: The AC ratified the PGDBA grading system.

Item 4.I.(I): Proposal for instituting an award in honour of Prof. K R Parthasarathy

Discussion: The Dean of Studies presented the case before the AC and informed the AC that there is a committee to look after the matter. Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay said he has been the convener and Prof. Arup Bose who has superannuated on 31st March 2024, had been the chairman of the Committee, so the committee needed to be reconstituted. The Chair asked about the recommendation of the committee. The Convener said that the recommendation is affirmative. The Dean of Studies said that the family of Prof. K R Parthasarathy wishes to donate 10 lakhs for instituting this award and they suggested, about 65,000 to 70,000 thousand per year (interest on Rs. 10 lakh) may be used for awarding candidates and a panel of eminent professors may be formed who would select the best thesis in Mathematics.

Decision: The AC resolved that the recommendation of the Committee be followed along with the family's suggestions in this regard.

4. II. Student matters:

Item 4.II.(A): Malpractice in exam

Discussion: The Dean of Studies presented the cases before the AC and said that instances of cheating in exams seem to have increased in recent years. The cases that are caught are punished by awarding zero in the respective exams as per the general rules laid out in the student's brochure. Consequently some of them had repeated the year and a few of them had to leave the Institute. Complaints are still coming regarding cheating. A case of changed seating arrangement during midterm exams, where students sat according to a seating arrangement different from the one prepared by the Dean's office, was brought to the attention of the Dean of Studies through the email by an anonymous student. It was found to be correct. To deal with this matter the students were called and asked to own the responsibility of this misdeed within three days or face consequences. In a TC meeting held immediately after this incident it was suggested that the exam be cancelled and be held again. The Dean communicated the same to the Chair and received her concurrence. Due to the lack of direct evidence (such as CCTV footage or any confession) punishment could not be rendered.

The Dean of Studies described another incident where a student (from the same batch) had his mobile with him during the exam, but when challenged by the invigilator the mobile could not be

found. The invigilator informed the Dean's office immediately and wished the student frisked. But it could not be done as frisking has not been the practice so far.

The Dean requested the AC to take a decision for such action in any such incidents.

Decision: The AC emphasized that all steps should be taken to curb such misdeeds by the students. The AC recommended forming a preliminary fact finding committee to handle these types of issues if and when they occur in future, and the recommendation of the committee should be abided by. The Chair also recommended that if frisking is required then security personnel may be called.

[Note: The seating arrangement prepared by the Dean's office is now signed by the appropriate authority.]

Item 4.II.(B): Appeal of Prisha Reddy

Discussion: In concurrence with the Chair no discussion took place on this issue in view of confidentiality of the matter.

Item 5. Miscellaneous

Item 5.(A) (As written in the Index of the 82nd AC meeting): **Whether a student can discontinue on his/her own and rejoin the programme through the entrance exam (with stipend).**

Suggested: **Whether a student can discontinue on his/her own and rejoin the same programme by qualifying in the entrance exam (with stipend).**

Discussion: The Dean of Studies explained that the situation arose due to a recent incident where a student voluntarily discontinued, possibly to preempt expulsion because of poor performance. The policy decision needs to be taken whether such students are eligible for (i) readmission; (ii) stipend during the 2nd iteration.

After discussions and deliberations the Chair opined that the students may be eligible for readmission if they again qualify in the entrance examination but with the maximum period for which a student will get a stipend from the Institute is the minimum period that is necessary to fulfil all requirements of the programme.

For example, for the MTech CS program, this minimum period is 2 years, even though a student is permitted to take up to 3 years to complete the course. Thus, an MTech CS student is eligible to receive a stipend only during the first two years, subject to satisfying the related rules, that (s)he spends in the program, irrespective of whether (s)he has re-enrolled number of times afresh as a new, first-year student during this period.

The minimum duration that a student needs to complete the B.Stat. is 3 years. Thus, a B.Stat student will be eligible to receive a stipend for only the first three years, subject to satisfying the related rules, that (s)he spends in the programme, irrespective of the number of times that (s)he takes admission/re-admission to the B.Stat programme during this period.

The AC further deliberated that at the time of admission, a student will have to submit a signed statement, listing the periods, if any, during which (s)he was previously enrolled in the same programme. This statement will be used to determine the maximum period for which the student will be eligible for a stipend. If a student's statement is found to be inaccurate, (s)he will face disciplinary action / be expelled from the Institute.

Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay pointed out that this policy may result in the unfair treatment of two students of similar merit: if (i) Student A and Student B both perform poorly, (ii) Student A leaves the programme voluntarily before expulsion, while (iii) Student B persists in trying to pass, but is unsuccessful and is asked to discontinue, then the proposed policy would permit only Student A to start afresh, subject to above stipend clause, but not Student B. To ensure fairness, it was resolved to revoke the current restriction that prohibits a student who has been asked to discontinue due to poor performance, from seeking readmission to the same programme.

Decision: The AC decided to allow the readmission, through usual process, (i) to students who have been asked to discontinue due to poor performance or who have voluntarily withdrawn and (ii) that the maximum period for which a student will get a stipend from the Institute is the minimum period that is necessary to fulfil all requirements of the programme. At the time of admission, a student will have to submit a signed statement regarding the previous enrollment in the same programme, listing the periods, if any. This statement will be used to determine the maximum period for which the student will be eligible for a stipend. If a student's statement is found to be inaccurate, (s)he will face disciplinary action / be expelled from the Institute.

Item 5.(B): Whether full dissertations be kept in ISI Institutional Repository.

Discussion: The Dean of Studies presented a case before the AC where someone claimed a degree with a dissertation, which is posted on the Institutional Repository, to be her/his degree. Prof. Ansuman Banerjee narrated that the PhD thesis of a student of Prof. Susmita Sur-Kolay was uploaded to an ISI web site. Someone copied the thesis and posted it along with her name. Deliberations were held whether the full thesis should be uploaded on the ISI website or not. The Chief Librarian said that the ISI Library has been posting the dissertation for the last 10 years. Not only ISI, but other universities also post their students' thesis on the web. Some copying a thesis or faking a degree is a crime and the student should go to file a cyber complaint. He further added the NDLTD (Network of Digital Library Thesis and Dissertation) is an open depository where there are 64 lakhs of full text theses available. He also informed that the Secretary has issued an order for the centrally funded Institutes that all thesis must be posted in the Shodh Ganga site, and for not doing so the respective institute may lose the ranking.

Decision: The AC decided that as per present practice, the full dissertation should be uploaded in the public domain. When a case like this arises, the Institute will decide on an appropriate course of action.

Item 5.(C): General absence from classes

Discussion: The Dean of Studies said that absence from classes is generally quite frequent among the final year and the third year classes. This is because there is no punishment (stipend cut etc.) as they are either transitioning to a Master's programme or leaving the Institute. In the last year it was noticed that some of the students' attendance was too low. The Chair said that the stipend may be discontinued and examination fees can be introduced to stop this. The Dean of Studies said that stipend discontinuation is done except for the last semester (and it cannot be done for B.Stat 3rd year batches, as per earlier AC resolution). Prof. Antar Bandyopadhyay said that the Institute should form a policy of attendance to straighten this situation.

Decision: The AC decided to form a committee which would look into these cases and formulate an attendance policy.

Item 5.(D): Other issues with the permission of the Chair

Item 5.(D) (1): CSO training

Discussion: The Dean of Studies reported the matter involving CSO training and complaints of the CSO lecturers regarding the very poor attendance despite their effort to deliver the lectures during their extremely busy schedules. The Dean requested deliberations by the AC regarding the following:

(a) Whether training to be shifted to the December time period in Kolkata, as used to be done earlier. That way, whoever comes, they will come for a few days and participate in the lecture. It is expected there should be a reasonable no. of students present during that 3/4 weeks of training.

(b) What can be done with the students regarding attendance. Requesting suggestions from the members.

Decision: The AC recommended the time of the CSO training to be shifted to December as before instead of the 2nd semester. Due to shortage of time the discussion regarding the students' attendance is decided to be carried over to the next AC meeting.

Item 5.(D) (2): Plagiarism check

The Chief Librarian raised this issue in the reporting matters and it was later discussed in the miscellaneous items where he informed that Ithenticate (or no similar software) that had been used to check plagiarism are not available as their contracts could not be renewed without having the due permission from the appropriate authority. Members opined that the permission should be acquired as soon as possible otherwise students are suffering, their PhD thesis could not be submitted. Moreover students and faculties cannot make similarity checks before submitting their papers. The Chair and the other members opined while papers may be checked with the softwares available in the library or in the open source, but the students should be allowed to submit their thesis till Ithenticate (or similar level softwares) are available for plagiarism check before submission.

Decision: After discussion and deliberation the AC resolved to allow the students to submit their thesis without checking for plagiarism till a reasonable plagiarism checking software is available to the students through the Institute.

The meeting closed as there were no further issues to be discussed.

Sd/-

Gopal Krishna Basak
Dean of Studies, ISI
and
Convener of the AC

Sd/-

Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay
Director, ISI
and
Chair of the AC