

**Minutes of the General Body Meeting of the Faculty Association
held at 4:30 pm on 28/07/2005 at the Chokshi Hall, Indian
Institute of Science**

1. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January, 2004.

Dr. B. Ananthanarayan, secretary, reported that the minutes were circulated and no comments were received. No comments were received from the floor of the house. Confirmation of the minutes was proposed by Prof. T. A. Abinandanan, seconded by Mr. K. R. Shivakumar. Minutes were confirmed unanimously.

2. Statement of accounts for the year 2004-05.

The statement of accounts was presented by the Treasurer, Dr. A. K. Nandakumaran. The approval of the statement of accounts was proposed by Dr. N. Suryaprakash, and seconded by Mr. C. Rajanna. The statement of accounts was approved unanimously.

3. Secretary's report.

The Secretary, Dr. B. Ananthanarayan, reported that there had been three executive committee meetings since the last GBM, and the minutes of all the meetings are available on the website of the association. There were no meetings held with the Director, due to the change in Directors during this period.

4. President's remarks.

The President, Dr. V. Kumaran welcomed the delegates, and thanked the previous director, Prof. G. Mehta, for his services to the institute. He also congratulated the new director, Prof. P. Balram, on his appointment. He recalled the grant of Rs. 100 crores to the institute, and noted that the purpose of this was to make IISc into a world class institution. He proposed that FA should discuss this matter internally, especially with respect to what is necessary to make the institute into a world class institution, and provide positive inputs

5. Discussion on faculty promotions:

- (a) Mr. K. R. Shivakumar presented a memorandum from the Technical Officers to the Secretary. The Secretary assured that the Executive Committee will examine the matter and take action.
 - (b) Dr. M. Ravishankar felt that promotions should be given on a time-bound basis, without any evaluation. Since faculty are engaged in research work, the outputs of which are not time bound and depends on the kind of work that has been investigated, the promotion shall not become a constraint on the quality of work and hurt the very essence of reasearch. Hence a time bound promotion policy shall be followed.
 - (c) Prof. J. Haritsa said that there are three changes that need to be made to the promotion policy. Firstly, it is necessary to provide an annual feedback to young faculty regarding their performance by the Divisional Chairmen, so that they know early on about their performance. Secondly, it should be mandatory for the Divisional Chairmen to read out individual referee reports to the faculty, whether they are promoted or not. Thirdly, the term 'Out-of-turn promotion' should not be used, since it implies a promotion acquired undeservedly. Instead, it would be better to call it 'Accelerated promotion'.
 - (d) Prof. A Raychaudhuri felt that teaching should also be considered when promotions are considered, and a mechanism should be evolved for this.
 - (e) Prof. S. V. Kailas felt that more focus should be given to human resource development, as opposed to carrying out research. However, opinions were divided on this, as Prof. P. R. Nott felt that research and human resource development are not mutually exclusive, and it is possible to carry out both simultaneously.
 - (f) Prof. M. Ghosh felt the COP should give a recommendation after the peer review process. However, there was not unanimity on this either, since it was felt that having independent opinions from the COP and the referees would be preferable.
6. The General Body discussed the issue of the faculty representation on the council.

The president stated that the Faculty Association cannot have representation on the council, since it is an independent registered body. The only possibility is for some faculty representation on the council with some mechanism to discuss who the representatives are. The EC discussed this and felt that direct popular elections would not be appropriate as a mechanism. One possibility is for the representatives to be chosen by the Department Chairmen, for example. However, it would be difficult to create modalities for this. For this reason, the issue was not taken up further in the EC. If there are any further suggestions on this issue, the EC will deliberate and take up the issue further.

7. The Vice-President, Dr. Shivaprakash, briefed the General Body about the latest changes in the house allotment rules, where the classification into transit accommodation was abolished, and Tunga and KRVH were classified as DDQ apartments. He also said the FA had taken up the issue of permitting Scientific Assistants to be eligible for D type quarters.
8. Dr. K. V. S. Hari requested that the newsletter be revived. Volunteers were sought for taking charge of the newsletter and running it, but there were no volunteers from the General Body.
9. Dr. P. S. Kulkarni wanted a review of the allotment procedure for the new D and E type quarters. He was of the opinion that it was not sufficient to alert by notices to the department and by general broadcast mail, but at least two or three e-mails should be sent and the eligible faculty should be individually contacted.
10. Prof. A. Chakravarthi wanted a review of the process of selection of Honorary Professors. He informed the General Body that this position was instituted in order to help students, who would have the opportunity to work with faculty who were active but were nearing retirement. Since this was a facility provided for students, the desires of students should be the primary criterion in selecting Honorary Professors. The EC agreed to look into the matter and take it up with the Director if required.