

## **Minutes of the IRDC Meeting held on Aug 23, 2013.**

List of members present:

Dr.A.K.Chaturvedi (DoRD, Chair), Dr.Y.M.Joshi, Dr. Anandh Subramaniam, Dr. A.Bandyopadhyay (for Dr. K. Subramaniam), Dr.Pratik Sen, Dr.Rajesh Hegde, Dr.V.Sahu (for Dr.Anirban Mukherjee), Dr.Sumit Basu, Dr. Rajeev Gupta, Dr. A. Gaur (for Dr.S.Panda), Dr.Tarun Gupta, Dr. Malay Banerjee, Dr.D.P.Mishra, Dr.Rajiv Sinha, Dr. T.V.Prabhakar, Dr.Deepu Philip, Dr. B.V.Phani, Dr. M.S.Kalra (for Dr.P.Munshi) and Dr. R.Vijaya (Convener).

### **1. Announcements by DoRD:**

i) The exercise of selecting an architect for the Research Complex is over and now it will be taken up for consideration and possible approval by the Building & Works Committee and the Board. Since the selection phase is over, it is proposed to form a new user committee for interacting with the selected architect and finalizing the design of the Research Complex.

ii) Increased collaboration with Defense Research and Development Organization (DRDO) is expected after a recent meeting which was convened by MHRD for this purpose and attended by DRDO officials and Directors of some IITs. The minutes issued by MHRD have been circulated by the R&D office to PIs of all DRDO projects. One of the proposals is to establish a DRDO cell within each IIT similar to the STC cell.

iii) The inaugural issue of the R& D newsletter was released in August, 2013. The next issue is expected in September. It is proposed to include information on new projects, visitors, ICAG, CARE etc. Members are invited to give feedback.

Dr. A.Subramaniam welcomed the idea of empanelment of architects for academic constructions. Dr. A.Bandyopadhyay wanted the inclusion of bio-related projects in DRDO cell.

### **2. Minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed without any modifications.**

### **3. Finalizing the recommendations on the Standing Committee proposal:**

The discussion on this item in the previous meeting was continued. CARE funding is usually decided in Oct-Nov but often there are situations when additional funding becomes available later in the same financial year or even in the first half of a financial year, prior to the CARE call for proposals. So DoRD suggested that the same committee can be asked to function as a Standing Committee for the whole year. All proposals submitted by individuals or groups of faculty members for funding by the institute, whether under the CARE scheme or otherwise, will be evaluated by this committee and suitable recommendations made to the Director.

Once recommended, the equipment may receive funding whenever a funding opportunity is available from the institute. This will reduce the current arbitrariness in such funding. The guidelines for this Standing Committee will evolve over time. CARE funding will, however, remain the same as in the previous years and will be decided as per its existing guidelines.

#### 4. Institute Lecture Series:

DoRD said that the Institute Lecture series is an on-going activity but it can be made better. Currently, we are mainly dependent on distinguished speakers visiting the campus for some other purpose. It is proposed to put a mechanism in place which will proactively and regularly invite distinguished national and international speakers from different areas. Thus we can have 5-6 such lectures per semester and also announce them well in advance. The proposal was accepted in principle.

#### 5. Proposal on PG admission for Project Staff:

In order to improve the quality of project staff, some incentives had been proposed in earlier meetings of IRDC. One of these was to permit the registration of project staff to M.Tech program. Documents had been prepared by IRDC and were discussed by SPGC and in Senate too. The Senate, in its meeting on 9th April 2009, had opined that IRDC should deliberate further and evolve a revised proposal. The IRDC had, in a subsequent meeting dt 16th Sept 2011, come out with a document. Action had been deferred since a PGARC was to come up in 2012-2013. Now that the PGARC is being discussed in departments, IRDC decided to re-look at its own recommendations. Some of the new recommendations are: (i) To view the candidates as sponsored, (ii) To restrict the admission to M.Tech (and not all PG) and (iii) To allow part-time or full-time registration. The discussion will be continued in the next meeting.

The meeting ended with a Vote of thanks to the Chair.