

Office of the Dean Academics
Minutes of the Second meeting of
Postgraduate Curriculum Review Committee

January 22, 2013

The second meeting of the Postgraduate Curriculum Review Committee (PG-CRC) was held in the Board room at 1530 hrs on January 11, 2013. The following members were present:

(Italics indicate inability to attend).

Prof. Anurag Sharma, Prof. Bhim Singh, Prof. Naveen Garg, Prof. B. Bhattacharjee, Dr. B.P. Patel, Prof. P.M.V. Subbarao, Prof. V.K. Jain, Prof. D.T. Shahani, Prof. M.G. Dastidar, *Prof. Maithili Sharan, Dr. Shalini Gupta, Dr. Pritha Chandra*, Prof. D. Ravi Kumar, *Prof. Joby Joseph*, Prof. M.R. Ravi.

The following items were discussed.

1. Confirmation of minutes of first meeting dated 5.12.12

Minutes of the previous meeting dated December 5, 2012 were confirmed as circulated.

2. Discussion on structure of M.Tech. programmes and PG courses in the new curriculum.

A detailed discussion was held regarding the structure of the **PG courses** in the new curriculum. The following were recommended:

- i. PG courses should be different from UG courses: there should be fewer courses in each semester involving a substantial self-study component.
- ii. Self-study component should be explicitly defined in the course structure using L-T-P-S numbering in place of L-T-P of UG courses.
- iii. The self-study component could be used in various ways to make the PG students work on their own. Some examples:
 - a) Extensive home assignments such as take-home open-ended problem solving / design exercises, computer programme assignments, projects, etc.
 - b) Study from prescribed study material outside the topics covered in classroom teaching.
 - c) Watching NPTEL and other such educational videos for material not being covered in lectures.
- iv. It was recommended that the self-study component should be evaluated by a common evaluation such as a written examination, with a weightage commensurate with the number of credits assigned to the self study (S) component of the course.
- v. The contents of self-study could be different for different students depending on their level of preparedness for the course: for students with weaker background on the subject matter it could be a review of undergraduate study material on the subject, and for brighter students it could be open-ended problem solving etc. as decided by the course teacher. This could also address the issue of presence of UG students in PG courses.

A detailed discussion was also held about the structure of **M.Tech. Programme** in the revised curriculum. The following recommendations were made:

- i. There should be fewer courses per semester in the PG programme, each course demanding substantially more effort compared to the present structure, as detailed above.
- ii. Two types of Masters' programmes were recommended: One course-work oriented programme and the other Research / Project oriented programme. Only students with a certain minimum level of academic accomplishment in the first two semesters would be allowed to register for the one-year long (18 credits) project in the III semester, while the others would need to do additional course work, and would be allowed to register for only a shorter project (6 credits) in their IV semester.
- iii. The following semester-wise distribution of courses was recommended:

Project / Research Oriented programme:

I semester:	3 lecture courses + lab component as required	16 credits
II semester:	3 lecture courses + lab component as required	16 credits
III semester:	2 lecture courses + Project part I (6 credits)	16 credits
IV semester:	Project part II (12 credits)	12 credits

Coursework oriented programme:

I semester: 3 lecture courses + lab component as required 16 credits

II semester: 3 lecture courses + lab component as required 16 credits

III semester: 3 lecture courses + lab component as required 16 credits

IV semester: 2 lecture courses + Project (6 credits) 12 credits

- iv. Projects must be graded only as satisfactory or unsatisfactory (S / Z grades).
 - v. The projects should be deemed completed only when all the work is logically complete, and not when the time period is over. They must be periodically evaluated. In the evaluation done in May, an assessment of the progress must be made, and only such projects showing good progress should be allowed to carry on to completion. The others should be given an unsatisfactory (Z) grade, leading to extension of M.Tech degree by another semester.
 - vi. Students whose projects need an additional period for completion (without Z grade) should be provided encouragement for the good work by allowing extension of stay and assistantship if feasible. Those with Z grade should not be extended these privileges.
3. **Proposal for an integrated M.Tech - Ph.D. Program**
Discussion on this item was deferred to the next meeting.
4. **Any other item:**
It was recommended that all the course templates prepared in the new curriculum must be kept internally accessible on a website.

The meeting ended with thanks to all the members.

Comments on the above minutes should be sent to the undersigned within one week of circulation of these minutes.

M.R. Ravi
Associate Dean Academic (Curriculum)
and Convener, PG-CRC.