1. Ratification: Antaragni '16 Dates

The dates as proposed by the Festival Coordinator in COFA and further recommended by the COFA are 21st - 24th October 2016. The dates stand ratified over the mailing list.

1. Regarding the agenda of having minors on degree

A letter written by the Chairman, Senate regarding the inclusion of Minor certificates during awarding of degrees was sent.

This proposal went through various forums on the Institute (DOAA, SUGC, Senate) and has now been accepted by the Senate, and the DOAA has been directed to submit a new format for degrees in accordance with this decision.

1. First Pre-Term Report of the Students' Gymkhana

The First Pre-Term Report of the Students’ Gymkhana was floated on the student mailing list. Here is the link to it:

<http://students.iitk.ac.in/ss/home/misc/pre-term-report_16-17/>

1. Call for Nominations: Core Team: Entrepreneurship Cell, Academics and Research Cell

Nominations were called for various posts in the Academics and Research Cell core team.

1. Regarding increase in fees of IITs

After the recommendation from the institute three separate letters of Resolution were sent to the Director, the Chairman, BOG and the Chairman, IIT Council (HRD Minister).

The resolution was modified slightly. The updated resolution reads as follows:

“The Students’ Senate recognizes and accepts the principle that IITs need to become financially autonomous. However, the Students’ Senate believes that the IITs should look for more avenues to create this autonomy apart from student fees. The Students’ Senate expresses its discontent on the process that was carried out for the increase in fees and on the steepness of the hike that is being enforced instead of a more gradual increase. In particular, the Students’ Senate laments the fact that the students were not involved in the decision making process at any point despite being the primary stakeholders in the decision in terms of effect.

With the above caveats, the Students’ Senate resolved to seek clarifications to the decision taken, and further resolved to seek amendments to the decision to the benefit of students. In particular, the Senate decided to send the following points of discussion to the Institute and the Ministry for their consideration.

1. The Senate believes that there should be multiple slabs for fee waivers which should be distributed on a linear scale percentage-wise, amongst an income group from below ₹1,00,000 up to ₹10,00,000.
2. Noting that, in general, more than one student from a family seeks higher education at the same time, the Senate believes that the waivers, loans and scholarships should also take into account the number of dependents that the earning member(s) of the family is(are) supporting.
3. Under the Vidyalaxmi Scheme, the Government has guaranteed zero-interest loans for students studying in IITs. However, the Senate believes that the implementation of this policy may not truly be zero-interest in the current form of the policy, and thus the Senate believes that more clarity on the implementation and effectiveness of this scheme is necessary before proceeding.
4. The Senate believes that loans would only create an increasing pressure amongst the students to seek a job over pursuing entrepreneurship or higher studies. Hence start-up enterprises and research work (both done in India and done by Indians abroad) might take a toll due to this. To prevent this, the time period of paying the loans could be extended on the basis of the income of the student after he/she passes out.
5. The Senate notes that the fee increase seems to be in response to the decreased grant received by the IITs from the Government through the Union Budget. The Senate believes that it is unfair of the Government and the IIT System to place the onus of covering the financial distress of the IITs on undergraduate students, who do not, at present, have financial independence. The Senate thus desires that the Ministry or the Institute provide some form of assurance that undergraduate students will directly benefit from the relative financial burden that is being placed on them, and that these funds shall be utilised for academics (particularly teaching), infrastructure (hostel, gymkhana or otherwise) and/or placements.”

We are forwarding this resolution to you for your information and necessary action.

1. Review of Modified Awards Criteria

The Academic Senate had appointed a sub-committee of professors to look into the scholarship and awards eligibility criteria and modify them as deemed fit. The committee had made some recommendations, on which Senate Scholarship and Prizes Committee (SSPC) had asked for students’ review.

Mr. Rutuj Jugade raised the following issues with the recommendations:

1. For Academic Excellence award:

I believe that the award should not be awarded to UG students in their first year. The purpose of this award is to recognize meritorious students based on their academic performance. If the institute is to recognize/award merit, it must be on the basis of an evaluation done independently by the institute itself. The JEE is not such an evaluation and hence performance in this examination must not be used as a criteria for awarding the academic excellence. Further, the JEE-AIR of a student is not a reflection of their performance as a student of IIT Kanpur. Quite often it has been seen that the two are not at all correlated.

2. For Convocation Awards:

For a single award/medal/scholarship involving both 4-year and 5-year UG programs (e.g. PGM), making students of 2 different batches compete with each other seems unfair. The basis for such awards is the CPI, which his calculated on a relative grading basis in IITK. The two batches in their UG years have been subject to different competition (each their respective batch). For most of their coursework (IC and DC), they have been graded with respect to their peers in the same batch. Hence, their CPI largely reflects where they as a student stand amongst their batch. Using this as a measure to judge students of two different batches may result in a biased decision.

These were duly conveyed to SSPC.

1. Membership of FAC(A)

\* Dr. Ritwij Bhowmik, Department of HSS (Festival Chairman)  
\* Dr. Anshu Gaur, Department of MSE (Member)  
\* Dr. Manindra Agrawal, Department of CSE (Member)  
\* Mayank Jain, Caretaker General Secretary, Cultural Council (Member)  
\* Ashutosh Ranka, President, Students’ Gymkhana (Member)  
\* Prakhar Singhal, Festival Coordinator, Antaragni ’16 (Member)  
\* Ryan Pal, Festival Coordinator, Antaragni ’16 (Member-Secretary)

The membership was approved over the mailing list.

1. About Defiance of Techkriti'16 team

The President suggested that we discuss the same in a COFA (T) meeting. The conclusions can then be discussed in the Senate.

1. Regarding F grade rule in MCM scholarships

Senate decided to go forward with Anurag Sahay's proposal and President Students’ Gymkhana would write the letter.

1. Ratification: Techkriti '17 Core Team

The names of students for the Techkriti '17 Core Team got ratified over the mailing list.

1. Complaint against a Faculty member

A formal complaint against Professor Ishan Sharma was lodged with the ombudsperson, along with an informal discussion with the Director Sir.

1. Regarding the SSAC rule in the new SSPC Manual
2. Regarding Gopal Das Bhandari Award

The name of Professor Sumit Ganguly, Department of Computer Science and Engineering was recommended for the prestigious Gopal Das Bhandari award.

1. Gymkhana budget 2016-17

The Gymkhana Budget 2016-17 was floated over the Students’ Senate list by Finance Convener Shyam Sihotia.

1. Hall Allocation Policy