

LNMI Institute of Information Technology, Jaipur
(Deemed University)

Twenty Second Meeting of the
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
(At 03:00 PM)

Date: April 09, 2011
(Saturday)

MINUTES

The LNM Institute of Information Technology, Jaipur

Minutes of the 22nd meeting of the Academic Council held on April 09, 2011.

The following were present:

1. Prof. Sudhir Raniwala	In Chair
2. Prof. P K Chatterjee	Member
3. Prof. M S Gaur	Member
4. Prof. Ravi P Gorthi	Member
5. Prof. S K Gupta	Member
6. Mr. Satish Kumar	Invited Member
7. Mr. Divyanshu Pandey	Invited Member
8. Prof. R Sharan	Member
9. Mr. Keshav Sharma	Member
10. Dr. Anupam Singh	Member
11. Mr. Gaurav Somani	Member
12. Mr. Bijoy Jha	Secretary

The following members could not be present in the meeting and were granted leave of absence:

- 1) Prof. V Sinha
- 2) Prof. O P Katyal
- 3) Prof. R Tomar
- 4) Prof. A P Singh

At the outset Chairman welcomed all those present and called the meeting to order.

Thereafter, agenda items were taken up for consideration.

Agenda Item No 1: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 21st meeting of the Academic Council, held on January 15, 2011.

The comments of Prof V Sinha on Item No 3(a) of the Minutes of the 21st meeting were considered by the Academic Council. The AC observed that these comments have been incorporated in Agenda Item No 4 of the 22nd meeting. Hence, no change in the minutes is required.

The minutes of the 21st meeting of the Academic Council, as circulated, were approved.

The Academic Council also considered an observation of the AC PGC concerning a typographical correction in section 2.3 (1) of the PG Manual (which was approved by the AC in its 20th meeting at Agenda Item No 6). The Academic Council concurred with the observation of the AC PGC. The corrected version of section 2.3 (1) of the PG Manual is:

“2.3. Eligibility for Admission

1. The “specified minimum” marks/CPI (Cumulative Performance Index), referred to in subsequent sections, implies a minimum of 60 percent marks/6.5 CPI (on a 10 point scale) as long as it is not less than the minimum pass marks/CPI; otherwise, the “specified minimum” marks/CPI implies the minimum pass marks/CPI.”

Agenda Item No 2: Announcements, if any, by the Chairman.

**Vivacity 2011:* Students Techno-Cultural function Vivacity – 2011 was successfully held during the period 24-27 February 2011. About 5000 student participants, which surpassed previous years’ figures, from local as well as institutions from outside Jaipur participated in Vivacity – 2011.

**Summer Training in Kazakhstan:* A decision to discontinue the summer internship program in Kazakhstan, after the summer of 2010, was taken. However, on the request of the Institute, ArcelorMittal Kazakhstan has kindly agreed to host up to 20 persons including faculty-in-charge.

**Completion of construction work of two basket ball courts:* Two cemented basketball courts have been constructed. The event *DESPORTIVOS'11*, a new annual sports event, was successfully conducted on these two courts during the period 11-13 February 2011.

- *Admission – 2011:* The UG admission process to admit 300 UG students for the year 2011 has been set in motion, under the guidance of the UG Admission Committee, constituted by the Director. The PG admission process for the year 2011 has also been initiated. About 200 PG applications for admission to the M Tech, M S, and Ph D programmes have already been received.
- *Progress on construction work of Hostels:* The construction work of new boys' hostel and girls' hostel are not progressing at the desired pace. However, the progress is being closely monitored by Mr Vijay Bhatnagar, Chairman PMMC.

The Academic Council expressed its serious concern about the slow progress of the hostel construction activity. In this respect, it was suggested that some alternative plans be chalked out so that admissions in 2011 are not affected. The Academic Council also desired that the Governing Council be apprised about the slow pace of construction activity and its adverse effect on the admissions in 2011.

Agenda Item No 3: To receive the report on actions taken on the decisions of 21st meeting and earlier meetings.

Some comments were made while considering the action taken on Item No 9 of the 21st meeting of the AC. The Academic Council desired that the AC EPC should draft the proposal for introducing M Tech Inter-disciplinary Programs with intake of B Sc pass

candidates. This proposal should be commensurate with the minutes of Item No 9 of the 21st meeting of the AC, and, the comments made by the GC as reported in the action taken report.

Agenda Item No 4: To consider finalization of the UG/PG curricula.

The Academic Council considered the proposed UG/PG curricula of all the programmes of the Institute. During discussion, several suggestions for improvement of the proposed curricula were made. These suggestions refer to:

- Change in the nomenclature of some courses, to reflect its contents;
- Shifting of some courses from one semester to another, wherever required;
- Providing breakup of the theory and lab credits in CSE courses, wherever required;
- Restricting the total credit requirements for graduation in B Tech programmes to the range 160—164;
- Distinction be made between UG/PG elective courses;
- Eligibility conditions and the period of option for B Tech (Hons)/Dual Degree Programmes be spelled out clearly;
- The nomenclature of Dual Degree Programmes needs clarification;
- The areas of specialization be spelled out;
- The lists of Program Electives should conform to the areas of specialization, to the extent possible.

The Academic Council desired that the curricula of all the programmes of the Institute, incorporating the suggestions made above, be brought for its approval in the next meeting, to be convened very shortly.

The Academic Council also resolved that the revised UG curriculum, as above, shall be effective for the 2010 batch onwards. For the 2008 and 2009 batches, the existing curriculum shall be used.

Agenda Item No 5: To consider smaller size classes for the English course.

The Academic Council noted the proposal and approved its continued use for the Academic Session 2011-2012. However, it was pointed out that all the first year students need not go through the proposed English course. The AC UGC should discuss and make recommendations for modalities of deciding the requirements of the English course.

Agenda Item No 6: To consider the guidelines for “Best BTP Award”.

The Academic Council considered and approved the AC UGC proposal for award of the “Best BTP”. The approved proposal is given in Annexure I. The Academic Council also resolved that the approved proposal be implemented for 2008 batch onwards.

Agenda Item No 7: To consider some recommendations of the Infrastructure Planning Committee, appointed by the Director.

The Academic Council noted that the Director had appointed a Infrastructure Planning Committee, to work out the infrastructural requirements when 300 students are admitted every year. Some recommendations of this Committee require approval of the Academic Council. All such recommendations were considered by the Academic Council in details. The following recommendations of the Committee were approved by the Academic Council, for 2011 batch onwards:

Admission Policy: The current practice of admitting UG students to the Institute, and not to any specific Programme, be changed as follows: Initially, the students will be admitted to the Institute with a clear understanding that no more than 150 students will be allowed in any single Programme. At the end of first year, the students will be allowed to choose the discipline, in the order of merit as given in the initial admission offer (not the CPI at the end of first year). However, the maximum number of students allowed in any single Programme (150 for 2011) will be lowered in subsequent years, in phases.

Since the original admission policy has already been announced for the 2011 batch, it was agreed that appropriate action will be taken to implement the changed policy, much before the admission offers are made.

Class Size: The 300 students admitted each year, will be divided into two groups, say A and B, consisting of about 150 students each. Group A will have its theory classes in the morning session and its labs in the afternoon session (roughly as at present). Group B will have its labs in the morning session and its theory classes in the afternoon session.

Evaluation Load: All desirable efforts be made to decrease the evaluation load, in view of the increased number of admissions. In particular, from July 2011 onwards, there shall be only one mid semester examination of one and a half hour duration (in place of the current practice of two mid semester examinations of one hour duration each). The end semester examination will continue, as at present, of three hours duration.

In view of the increased duration, the mid semester examinations also will be conducted over a period of six days (compared to three days at present). The necessary changes in the approved Academic Calendar be made.

Further, no student should be required to write more than two examinations on a single day. If necessary, a seventh day may be used to resolve any hardship cases.

Tutorials: Efforts be made to ensure an effective tutorial system of small classes, for each first year course.

Lab Classes: It is desirable and possible to reduce the duration of the lab classes from the current three hours to two hours. The faculty involvement, in the lab classes, should be more at the planning stage rather than the actual execution. The execution work should be done by PG students and trained technical staff, under the overall supervision of the concerned faculty.

The faculty members of each discipline be requested to identify the labs for which the duration can be reduced from three to two hours.

Agenda Item No 8: To consider the timings for access to Internet/LAN.

The issue was discussed in details. Since curtailing the time for access to Internet/LAN can cause hardship to some genuine students, it was decided that the Students' Senate will submit a proposal to the Academic Council, in this regard, taking into consideration the faculty opinion on this issue.

Any other item, with the permission of the Chair: Award of Chairman's Gold Medal for 2011 Convocation.

The Academic Council approved the recommendation of the AC UGC that the Chairman's Gold Medal 2011 be awarded to Mr Krishna Teja (Y07UC059).

The Academic Council noted that the AC UGC has also recommended that Mr Jatin Sharma (Y07UC048) should receive an "honorable mention". The Academic Council desired that more details are required for this.

There being no other items on the agenda, the meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

Bijoy Jha
(Registrar)

Minutes, as recorded, approved.

Chairman

Annexure-1

Best BTP process proposal:

The Dean (Academic) initiates the process for the Best BTP Award. There should be one BTP Award irrespective of Discipline. Nominations: Students who complete a BTP as required in the curriculum will be eligible to nominate themselves for the Best BTP award.

Coordinators will arrange for short-listing the projects to be sent to the Institute Level Committee. Ideally each Coordinator should nominate one project for further consideration.

The Institute Level Best BTP Award Committee will consist of 5 Faculty Members. There should be one Faculty Member from each of the Disciplines (CCE, ECE, HSS, Mathematics, Physics). Ideally each Coordinator will represent the Discipline unless someone else is nominated by the Coordinator for this purpose.

The Best BTP Award Committee asks for presentations/demos and reports of all nominated projects and recommends the BTP which should receive the Best BTP award and the following timeline should be followed for this process.

Nominations must be received at least 1 day before the beginning of the End Semester Examinations.

Coordinators must complete the evaluations within their disciplines during the Examination period and submit the nominations to the Best BTP Award Committee by the end of the End Semester Examinations.

The Best BTP Award Committee meets soon after the End Semester Examinations (by May 10th) to identify the Best BTP. If this Committee receives nominations, then they must identify exactly one BTP to which the Best BTP Award is to be given.

Nominations should include a Title, Abstract and a 1 Page Report and a Comprehensive Project Report. Evaluation will be based on both the written and the oral presentation.

Broad factors to used in identifying the Best BTPs are:

- Novelty of Idea/Innovation
- Technical mastery displayed
- Potential Impact (In areas of research, education, industry/market)
- Quality of Work
- Presentation and communication of ideas

The Committee will be the final authority in awarding the Best BTP.

