

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Monday, 15th April 2013 at 03.30 p.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice-Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
4. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
5. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
6. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
7. Dr. Jagwant Singh
8. Professor Keshav Malhotra
9. Professor Naval Kishore
10. Dr. Nandita Singh
11. Principal R.S. Jhanji
12. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
13. Shri Satish Kumar
14. Professor Shelley Walia
15. Shri Satya Pal Jain
16. Dr. Tarlok Bandhu
17. Professor A.K. Bhandari Registrar ... (Secretary)

Smt. Gurpreet Kaur Sapra, Director Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh and Shri Tarsem Dhariwal, D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the distinguished members of the House that –

- "(1) Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Chairperson, Department of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, has been nominated as a member on the Advisory Board of the Sahitya Academy, Government of India, Delhi for five years (2013-2017).
- (2) Professor (Emeritus) Gopal Krishan of the Department of Geography, has got ICSSR National Fellowship (full time) for doing research. During the fellowship, he will be paid a consolidated fellowship amount of Rs.55,000/- per month for a period of two years besides a contingency grant of Rs.60,000/- per annum to cover the expenses on research assistance, travel, data collection, computer work, stationery, books etc.
- (3) Dr. Kewal Krishan of the Department of Anthropology, has been felicitated by the American Academy of Forensic Sciences in Washington DC at 65th Annual Scientific Meeting from February 18-23, 2013 for contributing two articles entitled "Stature and Build" and "Forensic Pathology-Principles and Overview" to the Encyclopedia of Forensic Sciences, second edition, published by Elsevier, USA in March 2013.

- (4) The Indian Institute of Banking and Finance, Mumbai, has selected Dr. Tejinderpal Singh, Assistant Professor of University Business School, for Macro Research Award 2012-13 on the theme of his research on "Security and Privacy Issues in Internet Banking: A Study of Online Banking Portals and Customers' Perspective". He has been awarded prize money of Rs.2.5 lacs for it.
- (5) The Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, Government of India has approved the issues of a Commemorative Postage Stamp on Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni of denomination of Rs.5/-, as a one-time exercise. A minimum number of 1 lakh stamps and requisite philatelic ancillaries will be issued.
- (6) Films Division of Government of India, Mumbai has agreed to make a film on Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni with the cooperation of Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Chairperson, Department of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, on her nomination as a member on the Advisory Board of the Sahitya Academy, Government of India, Delhi, for five years (2013-2017);
 - (ii) Professor (Emeritus) Gopal Krishan, Department of Geography, on getting ICSSR National Fellowship (full-time) for doing research.
 - (iii) Dr. Kewal Krishan, Department of Anthropology, on his felicitation by the American Academy of Forensic Sciences in Washington DC at 65th Annual Scientific Meeting for contributing two articles entitled "Stature and Build" and "Forensic Pathology-Principles and Overview" to the Encyclopedia of Forensic Sciences, second edition, published by Elsevier, USA in March 2013.
 - (iv) Dr. Tejinderpal Singh, Assistant Professor, University Business School, on his selection for Macro Research Award 2012-13 by the Indian Institute of Banking and Finance, Mumbai, on the theme of his research on "Security and Privacy Issues in Internet Banking: A Study of Online Banking Portals and Customers' Perspective". He has been awarded prize money of Rs.2.5 lacs for it.

(2) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos.(5) and (6), be noted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Item 2, on the agenda, relating to request of Professor R.K. Kohli to allow him to proceed on deputation up to 31.12.2013, be treated as withdrawn/deleted. In fact, Professor Kohli had withdrawn his request for deputation and had instead requested for six months Extraordinary Leave without pay, which had already been sanctioned. Hence, Item 2 on the agenda should be treated as Item 2 and the same be considered.

Appointment of Dean University Instruction

2. Considered if Professor (Mrs.) Madhu Raka, Department of Mathematics, P.U., Chandigarh, be appointed Dean of University Instructions w.e.f. 16.4.2013 to 30.11.2013 (her date of superannuation), under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“The Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may, from time to time appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of the Dean of University Instruction. The term of appointment shall be for one year which may be renewed for one year more. The amount and nature of allowance to be granted to the Dean of University Instruction for performing the duties attached to the office shall be as determined by the Syndicate at the time of appointment.”

2. The term of appointment of Professor R.K. Kohli, as D.U.I. is from 1.9.2012 to 31.8.2013. He has been allowed Extraordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 13.4.2013 to 10.10.2013.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that he wanted to make just one request that certain persons had served the Panjab University for many years as Professors with distinction. If at all, they get an opportunity to go anywhere on deputation, their requests should be considered sympathetically.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the item regarding request of Professor R.K. Kohli for deputation had been withdrawn and the issue had been discussed in the Senate also. First of all, let them place on record their appreciations for Professor R.K. Kohli, who is a wonderful Scientist and had brought laurels to the Panjab University. Besides that, they were proud that the DAV University, a leading educational institution of the country had selected him as founder Vice-Chancellor. As far as Dr. Kohli's contributions to Science as Professor of Botany, Chairman, Department of Botany & Department of Environment Science as well as Dean of University Instruction and member of the Syndicate and Senate are concerned, of course, he had

an opportunity to work with him, and there is no doubt that Dr. Kohli deserves to be given the highest academic position. But somehow, it was misunderstood when the issue was discussed in the Senate. It was surprising that though Items 2 and 3 were at par, both were requested to be considered under different set of rules. As far as Item 3 was concerned, it was being considered under the same rules. It had been presented in such a way that for Item 2, the rules are good and for Item 3, the rules are bad which had been presented along with the legal opinion taken from the Legal Retainer of the University. His submission in this regard is that if the rules are bad, these are bad for both the items and if rules are good these are good for both the items. It seemed as if they were considering two at par cases with different angles. The office should be very careful that at par items should be considered under the same set of rules. As far as Item 42 was concerned, since Professor R.K. Kohli had already joined DAV University, Jalandhar as Vice-Chancellor, the position of Dean of University Instruction had fallen vacant and the same should be offered to Professor Madhu Raka. Thus, consequently and subsequently the position of Dean Research would also fall vacant, which should be offered to the next senior-most Professor of the University as per decision of the Syndicate. He did not think that there should be any objection to this to anyone of them. Surprisingly, though the item for appointment of next Dean of University Instruction had been placed before the Syndicate, but not the item for appointment of Dean Research in place of Professor Madhu Raka. Let there should not be any *ad hocism* and a message should be sent that whosoever is the next senior-most Professor in the University, he/she be appointed as Dean Research. Though, his personal opinion was that, in general, the position of Dean Research should be offered to the senior-most Professor after the Dean of University Instruction, but it should not be followed as a matter of rule. Anyway, the overall view was that the seniority should be observed. If that was the principle, which they had accepted, then there should not be any hesitation in appointing Dean Research today in place of Professor Madu Raka; otherwise, it would send a wrong signal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to think over it. *Prima facie*, it is not that the senior-most person should be appointed as Dean Research. They were yet to evolve norms for appointment of Dean Research as they had not appointed too many persons as Dean Research so far. In recent times, few persons had been appointed as Dean Research by seniority. Though he had not given a complete thought to it, in case it is a majority decision of the Syndicate that the senior-most person should be appointed as Dean Research, he would not have any hesitation in following that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this had already been decided by the Syndicate that for appointing Dean of University Instruction and the Dean Research, the seniority would be the only criteria.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not necessary that the position of Dean Research should be offered to the next senior-most Professor.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Punjabi University, Patiala, prepared a list of 7-8 senior Professors and from amongst them, they appointed Deans and persons to other prominent positions.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there had been debates at many times about appointment of senior-most Professor as the Dean of University Instruction. If they go through the Calendar, it is not necessary to appoint the Dean of University Instruction, a person, who is senior-most. But the practice in this University has been that only the senior-most person, is appointed as Dean of University Instruction. A couple of times, there was dispute amongst 2-3 persons regarding seniority and the Dean of University Instruction was not appointed till the dispute was resolved. When the position of Dean Research was created, he was the one who had raised the objection that Panjab University, which had a very rich heritage, at one point of time had a Dean Research, who himself was not a Ph.D. and remained Dean Research for quite some time. At that time, the only considered argument which was given by the then Vice-Chancellor and the members of the Syndicate and Senate was that whether Ph.D. or no research publications, the Dean Research is to be appointed by seniority only. Therefore, it was accepted, in principle, that as the Dean of University Instruction, the Dean Research be also appointed on seniority basis. Now, when they are making appointment of Dean of University Instruction on seniority basis and not making the appointment of Dean Research, it would send signal as if without discussion/debate and without conscious decision to that fact that the seniority is not to be followed, they had kept the matter in abeyance and that probably would send a wrong message and the same would not be in a good spirit. He, therefore, pleaded that the appointment of Dean Research should be made keeping in view the traditions of the University whether right or wrong, once they had taken the decision for appointing Dean Research on seniority basis alone, in spite of the fact that there is no provision for appointment of Dean Research on the basis of seniority.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the decision regarding appointment of Dean Research on the basis of seniority had already been taken. At that time they did not record their dissent because they accepted the decision that senior-most person would be appointed as Dean Research.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is a lot of heart-burning amongst the senior teachers in the University. Since there was a tradition of appointing the senior-most Professor as Dean of University Instruction and the next senior-most Professor as Dean Research, the same should be followed.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that Professor R.K. Kohli had proceeded on Extraordinary Leave for 6 months and suppose he came back after 3 months, what would be the position. Though he was not averse to their proposition, kindly consider these factors in totality before arriving at any decision. Had he gone for 3-5 years, the position would have been different.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that when the issue regarding permitting Professor R.K. Kohli to go on deputation was raised in the meeting of the Senate, though he was misunderstood, he had no other reason and his only request was that if Professor Kohli was to be permitted, his colleagues, who had been appointed in the University and had not been granted leave, but have been asked to tender their resignations, should also be granted leave by the DAV Management.

Dr. R.P.S. Josh said that the teachers of the Colleges, who had been appointed in the Panjab University and other Universities, should also be granted leave by the managements of the Colleges and by the Government, if they were teachers in Government Colleges earlier.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could adopt a Resolution on behalf of the Syndicate, which would be recommendatory in nature, that during the period of probation, if somebody is entitled to Extraordinary Leave without pay, the College Management must favourably consider the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as far as Government is concerned, at least they had every right to inspect that they should restrict themselves because the service conditions of teachers working in Government Colleges in Punjab and U.T., Chandigarh, are beyond their jurisdiction. Therefore, it could be by way of persuasion keeping in view the difficulties of the Government where the recruitments are made through PPSC and UPSC. Hence, even if they passed a Resolution, the end result would be nil. As far as what Dr. Satish Sharma had said that in case the man returned, it is not applicable because Professor Kohli's appointment as DUI was up to 31st August 2013. He would not have raised the issue had the item not come. Since they are making alternative arrangement for Dean of University Instruction, he had suggested that the vacancy created by Professor Madhu Raka should also be filled up.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that appointment of next senior-most person as Dean Research could not be made at the spur of the moment, because there might be an enquiry against the person.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if Professor R.K. Pathak is the next senior-most person and is to be offered the position of Dean Research, it should also be kept in view that they had to appoint a Director, Academic Staff Colleges, in place of him.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the next senior-most person should be offered the position of Dean Research and if he/she declines, the offer should be given to the next person in seniority. As far as grant of leave to the teachers of the Government Colleges was concerned, though it was right that the Syndicate and Senate could not decide the service conditions of the teachers of the Government Colleges situated in Chandigarh, the Vice-Chancellor could use his good offices to persuade and convince the Chandigarh Administration that they are facing this problem and find some solution. In fact, the Chandigarh Administration is not saying that they would not allow retention of lien. They had just raised a technical point that although they are governed by the same service rules which the Punjab Government had and if the Punjab Government permitted, they have no problem in permitting so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would plead the issue with the U.T. Administration.

Dr. Jagwant Singh suggested that they should be told that allowing retention of lien would encourage mobility of teachers.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Professor (Mrs.) Madhu Raka, Department of Mathematics, P.U., Chandigarh, be appointed Dean of University Instructions w.e.f.

16.4.2013 to 30.11.2013 (her date of superannuation), under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the next senior-most Professor be offered the position of Dean Research. In case he/she declines, the offer be given to the next Professor in the seniority list.

Issue regarding sending Professor Paramjit Singh Jaswal on deputation

3. Considered-

- (i) if Professor Paramjit Singh Jaswal, Vice-Chancellor at Rajiv Gandhi National University Law, Patiala be treated on deputation w.e.f. 29.4.2012 to 24.1.2014 (1 year 8 months 27 days).

OR

- (ii) if as per request vide letter No. 8924 dated 5.3.2011(**Appendix-I**) received from the Registrar-cum-Principal Secretary to Hon'ble Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court and Chancellor Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Patiala addressed to the Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh regarding deputation of Professor Paramjit Singh Jaswal, Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, **he be allowed to work on deputation.**

NOTE: 1. Professor Paramjit Singh Jaswal has requested vide letter dated 26.4.2011 to treat him on deputation for a period of five years from the date of his joining as Vice-Chancellor at Rajiv Gandhi National University Law, Patiala w.e.f. 8.2.2011 ending on 7.2.2016, which is also clear from the letter dated 11.3.2011 already written by the Registrar of the said University. Thus excluding the period of leave of 5 years 3 months 3 days already availed by him, out of total seven years, now he can be treated on deputation for the remaining period of 1 year 8 months 27 days i.e. from 29.4.2012 (the date of Syndicate decision regarding deputation) to 24.1.2014 (i.e. the date of completion of total seven years including period of above said leave and deputation). But his term of five years as Vice-Chancellor will be ending on 7.2.2016.

Keeping in view the position explained above, it needs consideration if he may be treated on deputation w.e.f. 29.4.2012 to 24.1.2014 (1 year 8 months and 27 days). If so the EOL already sanctioned to him for the period from

29.4.2012 to 12.2.2013 will automatically be covered into that of deputation period.

2. It also needs to be decided about remaining period of his assignment as Vice-Chancellor w.e.f. 25.1.2014 to 7.2.2016 for the reason that the total permissible period of seven years which includes five years as deputation plus two years of E.O.L., Study Leave, will be ending prior to the date of his completion of period of his assignment as Vice-Chancellor on 7.2.2016.
3. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-I**).
4. The Legal opinion regarding the guidelines of sending/borrow of personnel on deputation, as approved by the Syndicate on 29.4.2012 enclosed (**Appendix-I**).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did not know why the office had not annexed all the papers with the item. In fact, Professor P.S. Jaswal had requested for deputation way back, i.e., in March 2011. Though they had already entered into 2013 and more than two years had elapsed, the item had never been brought before the Syndicate during the last two years. Why it had happened? The office had no answer. He felt that to take such a decision, only the Syndicate or the Senate was empowered. But from the letter, which had been annexed with the item, it looked as if the Hon'ble Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court and Chancellor, Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Patiala and an ex-officio member of the Senate (Panjab University) through Registrar-cum-Principal Secretary, Punjab & Haryana High Court, had written on 5.3.2011 that Professor P.S. Jaswal be sent on deputation. Thereafter, two letters dated 26.04.2011 and 08.12.2011 were received by the University from Professor P.S. Jaswal. No other letter had been annexed with the item. He was sure that the University must have responded to the letter written by Shri Arun Kumar Tyagi, Registrar-cum-Principal Secretary to Hon'ble Chief Justice, Punjab & Haryana High Court. To his knowledge, the University wrote a letter in March 2011 itself that since there is no provision/Regulation relating to deputation in this University, we regret our inability to send Professor P.S. Jaswal on deputation, under the *bonafide* belief that there are no such provision in the University Calendar as far as deputation is concerned. Wherefrom that mandate was taken? On the basis of which decision, the said letter was written? This question had already been raised a number of times, if there has been no provision, how they were accepting people on deputation from Punjab and other States and even from other State-funding Institutions. How and why they had written that there is no provision for sending persons on deputation? If they accept people on deputation in the absence of any provision, why could they not send people on deputation? As far as the rules framed for taking and sending people on deputation were concerned, it was an exercise made in a hurry and that was why ultimately they

came up with such rules which had been declared bad rules by way of legal opinion. Under these bad rules, either all such cases should be considered or all such cases be not considered. He would like to tell that there were clear-cut provisions in the University Calendar for taking and sending people on deputation. When the rules for taking and sending people on deputation were approved in the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of April 2012, he was also a member along with Dr. Dinesh Talwar. Dr. Dinesh Talwar and he did not participate in the discussion while the other members of the Syndicate pleaded for passing these rules. On that very day it was known that these rules would be rendered illegal because these rules are not consistent with the Regulations. Professor P.S. Jaswal's case could not be brought to the Syndicate and that was very unfortunate. On the one hand, they had been keeping a case of deputation hanging in fire for the last two years and on the other hand, a case had been allowed to be discussed in the Senate within one week. He had already said that Professor R.K. Kohli is a great Scientist and there was no doubt about this. Had there been rules, he would have been sent on deputation. In the end, he suggested that let them study whether there are Regulations contrary to what had been written to Shri Arun Kumar Tyagi, Registrar-cum-Principal Secretary to Hon'ble Chief Justice, Punjab & Haryana High Court and keeping in view the sanctity of the Regulation, they should make such rules for deputation which are in conformity with the Regulations and also enforceable. Thereafter, the case of Professor P.S. Jaswal should be considered, if possible, from the back date.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That a Committee, comprising Professor Shelley Walia, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Dinesh Talwar, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Dr. Jagwant Singh, be constituted to examine contradictions between the Regulations and Rules framed by the Syndicate pertaining to sending/taking people on deputation and such Rules be framed which are legally sound and also enforceable.

Deferred item

4. Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 13.2.2012 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the representation dated 25.4.2012 of Dr. B.B. Goyal of University Business School requesting necessary amendment in the orders of P.U. Senate dated 11.6.2012 (Para LII) that the promotion itself being retrospective, the legal consequences of the promotion would also be retrospective. The promotion under CAS is retrospective in the University as per UGC and the punishment in the instant case cannot continue against Dr. B.B. Goyal after 31.12.2001, i.e. the date of his promotion as a Reader.

NOTE: 1. The Senate meeting dated 11.6.2009 (Para LII) has resolved that the decision of the Senate dated 28.3.2009 (Para XXXIII) be modified to read as under:

“That though promotion orders of Dr. B.B. Goyal as Reader be not withdrawn as a measure of concession as he was promoted as Reader by the Syndicate decision dated 15.5.2004 w.e.f. 31.12.2001.

He will continue to draw salary of Rs.12840/- w.e.f. 31.12.2001, i.e. the date of his promotion. The punishment of stoppage of increments with cumulative effective will stand till the said decision of the Syndicate. However, debarring him from undertaking any remunerative work in Panjab University should stand. He will start earning his normal annual increment only after the decision of the Syndicate dated 15.5.2004 whenever it becomes due.”

2. The Syndicate meeting dated 24.3.2012 **vide Para 23 has deferred** the consideration of the item.
3. The Syndicate meeting dated 15.12.2012 (Para 22) has resolved that the consideration of the item on the agenda be deferred and all the relevant decisions of the Senate taken since 2000 should be appropriately enumerated together for a careful comprehension of the issues related to this item.
4. The Senate meeting dated 22.12.2012/20.1.2013 (Para LXVII) has resolved that the recommendation dated 7.1.2012 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in pursuance of Senate decision dated 20.12.2011 (Para XLI) to examine the promotion case of Dr. B.B. Goyal, University Business School, be approved.
5. A detailed office note enclosed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item was placed before the Syndicate dated 15.12.2012 (Para 22), but its consideration was deferred. Thereafter, in one of the Senate meetings the recommendation of B.L. Gupta Committee was approved. Now, recommendation of another Committee was before them, which should be considered.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar asked that did they have any choice but to accept the recommendation of the Committee as the Senate had already promoted him to the rank of Professor.

Dr. Jagwant Singh, agreeing with Dr. Dinesh Talwar, said that he had gone through the entire background of the case and found that Dr. B.B. Goyal had been given everything, including promotions. After going far ahead, they could not revert back. Hence, they had no alternative but to accept the recommendation of the Committee.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that once a punishment is finally awarded, that punishment could not be washed away? Promotion or further promotion of someone was a different thing, but the

promotion/further promotion of an employee could not in any case wash away the punishment already awarded to him/her at a subsequent date.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that two punishments, i.e., stoppage of five increments and no University remunerative work, were awarded to him and to his knowledge those punishments still stood. Besides this, he had gone through the entire report wherein it had been mentioned that the Vice-Chancellor had put all the information, including the punishments awarded to him, before the Selection Committee. Leaving all this aside, the Selection Committee recommended his promotion to the rank of Professor.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he was not going into the details of the case. He had just asked a simple question that if any punishment is awarded to an employee and the employee did not challenge the same in any court of law, could that punishment be washed away by an executive action by promoting him/her? According to him, it could not be done.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that he had gone through the office note and the entire background of the case. Shri Satya Pal Jain's stand was the same, which he had taken earlier and he agreed with him that if any punishment is awarded, the same could not be washed away. However, since the Syndicate and Senate themselves had granted him promotion under the Career Advancement Scheme and they had reached a stage from where they could not go back. According to him, as per original punishment, no promotion could be granted to him during his entire career. But due to one reason or the other everything was processed, interview held and the Syndicate and Senate promoted him. Now, they could not say that his promotion was invalid.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the Syndicate and Senate had awarded punishment for stoppage of five increments and no remunerative University work and the same very Syndicate and Senate had granted him promotions as Reader and Professor. At this stage, they could not say that his promotions are invalid.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that they should act objectively and suggested that the entire case should be seriously examined and placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that Justice S.K. Jain had said in the meeting of the Committee that since the case of Dr. B.B. Goyal was still pending, he should not have been promoted as Reader. Secondly, his five increments were stopped with cumulative effect. Moreover, when the case of Dr. Goyal for promotion as Reader was placed before the Syndicate and Senate, it should have been mentioned that punishment had been awarded to him. According to him, Dr. B.B. Goyal was awarded punishment for awarding 42 marks instead of zero mark and accordingly he deserved to be dismissed from the University service.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since an impression was being gathered by the members as if the Committees had been giving concessions to him one after the other. He would like to go back to 2001 when he was promoted as Reader. Now, they need to do introspection. Were they also wrong somewhere? Who were the people in 2001, who promoted him as Reader? The law is that if

somebody is undergoing a punishment, under the recurrence period, he could not be promoted and if a person is promoted, that too, to a higher cadre, that punishment could not be carried forward because the reward and punishment could not go together.

Shri Satya Pal Jain clarified that the law is that during the period of pendency of the proceedings against him, the person is promoted before any action is taken against him that could not be taken the ground for stoppage of promotion. But if he had already been punished, maybe as Lecturer, Reader or Clerk, Assistant, etc., he could not be promoted.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as they could not stop somebody's promotion during the pendency of the proceedings, similarly the law is that they could not promote somebody who had been punished during the period. Say if five increments have been stopped, for the next five years he had to undergo that punishment and no promotion could be given. The case was made up by the then Vice-Chancellor that he was promoted by mistake. Since the office did not place before the Vice-Chancellor and the Selection Committee the information about the punishment awarded to him and the allegations which were levelled against him. Subsequently, it came to the notice of the Syndicate and the Senate that all the facts were placed not only before the Vice-Chancellor, but also before the Selection Committee. After considering the allegation of increasing the marks and the punishments, the Selection Committee presided over by the then Vice-Chancellor recommended his promotion as Reader. Another law is that when the increments are to be stopped, they had to mention this also that increments falling on such and such dates of such and such amount are stopped even if it is with cumulative effect. If the scale had changed, the quantum of increments automatically changed. Could the punishment be changed subsequently? His stand had been consistent that the Selection Committee, Syndicate, and Senate had committed a blunder by promoting a person, who had been punished so harshly by the University. In fact, the man who was punished so harshly was promoted as Reader within a few months. Once they had committed that wrong, there was a proposal to review that decision of promotion before the Senate dated 11.06.2009 and the Senate again took a conscious decision that promotion order of Dr. B.B. Goyal be not withdrawn and as a matter of concession he was promoted as Reader by the Syndicate in 2004. If they are taking the decisions consciously that, no, they did not want to amend the wrong decisions also, then they had to face the consequences also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he was promoted from Lecturer to Reader and Reader to Professor, some assessment must have been done of the quantum of academic work done by him. Whatever might have happened in 2001, the information might have been provided at the time of his promotion.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that everything had been decided and the only thing which needed to be decided was the date from which he is to be promoted as Reader.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon reiterated that the person who had committed such a blunder, needed to be dismissed from the service.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that an item should have been placed that the mistake committed by the Syndicate and Senate should be rectified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Goyal was seeking further concession on whatever had happened in 2001. The matter had been placed before the Syndicate because only the Syndicate could permit change of date of promotion. If they rejected his request, perhaps, he would go to body other than this, maybe, take a legal course of action.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that, tomorrow, this person would become the Dean Research or Dean of University Instruction of the University and the people would say that this is the person, who had increased the marks from zero to 42 marks. Therefore, they needed to proceed with the matter carefully.

Shri Satya Pal Jain suggested that the matter should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. In the meantime, they would also go through the law and see if a mistake is committed once, should they commit another mistake.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, as informed by Shri Ashok Goyal, the Senate had already considered his case and allowed promotions. We have to move on further. Shri B.B. Goyal is insisting that since his matter relating to prepone date of promotion as a Reader to 2001 had been deferred by the previous Syndicate, the same should be placed before the Syndicate again. It is in that spirit that the matter has been placed before the present Syndicate. So he (Dr. Goyal) also knows that the Syndicate is empowered to consider it. Now, they are saying that the matter be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that his simple question was that if a blunder had been committed, they had every right to reopen it, but could they reopen it more than a number of times. After reopening the case, a conscious decision had been taken not to withdraw the promotion granted to him and, that too, not only by the Vice-Chancellor or Syndicate, but by the Senate as recent as in 2009. In December 2012, they had ratified the decision regarding his promotion. How many times, they would keep on reopening the issue. Though the man should have been thankful to the University, he has filed more than five cases against the University in the Court of Law. Probably, one or more cases are pending. They had been committing blunders where everybody, including the whole office that the Appellate Authority in this case is the Senate and instead of taking the matter to the Senate, the then Vice-Chancellor had himself acted as Appellate Authority and the person again went to the Court and filed contempt of court proceedings. As such, they kept on committing blunders instead of correcting them. Last year, this item was deferred by the Syndicate. Instead of rejecting the item, why the same is being recommended for deferment again? No doubt, the person might have so many grievances, e.g., the enquiry has not been conducted in a proper manner, he had not been given opportunity to defend himself properly. Somehow, the final enquiry report had been accepted by the punishing authority, i.e., Senate that he was guilty of misconduct of increasing the marks from zero to 42 marks. But how long they would keep the issue alive? Majority of the present members were the members of the Syndicate and Senate, which promoted him as Reader and Professor and at that time they did not speak about the blunders.

Even the then Vice-Chancellor knew that he had been punished. Why did he take the matter to the Selection Committee, and, thereafter, to the Syndicate and Senate? He would like to say on record that he had no sympathy with this man, but when the question of technicalities and legalities came, whatever his wisdom said, he had recorded in the report along with the wisdom of all the members of the Committee, including the Registrar and the Dean, College Development Council.

Professor Shelley Walia said that is it not sympathetic ground that they promoted him as Reader in spite of the fact that he was undergoing punishment. Then again on sympathetic ground they promoted him as Professor. To the argument given by one of the members, he said that the punishment continued even after his promotions as Reader and Professor, whether that is not a legal point?

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that they had come to know that he had filed five cases in the Court. But as far as the present item is concerned, there is no mention about it. They were saying that blunders had been committed, but before committing another blunder they wanted to examine the whole issue. Secondly, he would also like to see the orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court. Even if any laxity was found on the part of the office, including the former Vice-Chancellor, he would be the last person to defend him. He suggested that the entire information, including the orders of the High Court, should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that keeping in view the kind of punishment awarded to Dr. B.B. Goyal, he would not have spoken for him at all. The kind of statement Shri Satya Pal Jain had made on the floor of the House that the then Vice-Chancellor had made a mistake on the basis of whatever record had been made available to them, he said that blunders were committed for which the office, the Vice-Chancellor, the Syndicate and the Senate were guilty. Even after reopening the case, no corrective measures were taken. The question which bothered him was that in the previous meeting of the Senate, they approved his promotion and now only the issue before them was to decide the date as per rules of Career Advancement Scheme of the U.G.C. On the basis of punishment awarded in 2001, which they did not carry properly, the person had been promoted as Professor under the Career Advancement Scheme under the subsequent notification that he had served for a certain number of years as Reader. On the basis of his promotion under the CAS, his date is to be decided.

Agreeing with Dr. Jagwant Singh, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Dr. B.B. Goyal had already been promoted as Reader and Professor, the only issue was of date. If, as suggested by some of the members, the case is to be reopened, whether the case of promotion as Reader would be reopened or the promotion case of Professor?

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred and as suggested by Shri Satya Pal Jain, the matter be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting along with the complete background, including the orders of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court.

Request of Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor, Department of Evening Studies for grant of Earned Leave on account of additional charge

5. Considered request dated 7.1.2013 (**Appendix-II**) received from Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor and Chairperson, Department of Evening

Studies for grant of Earned leave under Regulation 11 at page 138 Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on account of additional charge as Chairperson of the Department of Indian Theatre w.e.f. 16.2.2012 to 1.8.2012 (F.N.).

NOTE: 1. Regulation 11 at page 138 Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“11. A to C xxx xxx xxx

(D) Earned Leave

(i) Earned leave admissible to a teacher shall be –

(a) 1/30th of actual service including vacation plus

(b) 1/3rd of the period, if any, during which he is required to perform duty during vacation.

Note: For purpose of computation of period of actual service, all periods of leave except casual, special casual, special academic and duty leave shall be excluded.

2. An office note was enclosed (**Appendix-II**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that several persons had been given additional charge. Therefore, before arriving at any decision, they should see the consequences.

Professor Shelley Walia said actually he also fell in this category as he remained the Director, Academic Staff Colleges, Dean International Students, Honorary Director of Alumni while holding another post. Meaning thereby, he was also holding dual charge. But he had never raised such a demand. This issue needed to be given a serious thought as it would open a Pandora's box. However, he did not think that this person deserved to be given this benefit of Earned Leave.

On a point of order, Dr. Jagwant Singh enquired whether the position of Chairperson had been accepted as non-vacational.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the organization from which he had come, there also persons who were assigned several additional responsibilities, but no such benefits are given there. Further, the Dean of University Instruction was also being given additional charge of several Teaching Departments.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that it had been mentioned by the Registrar in his noting that if a teacher is given the additional charge of non-teaching post, he/she is given the benefit of earned leave. Earlier, when Professor S.K. Gupta was given the charge of Director Sports, he was given the benefit of 1/3 of summer vacations. His contention in this particular case was that Dr. V.K. Chopra, who is

teaching in the Department of Evening Studies, was given the additional charge of Department of Indian Theatre. According to him, the work of Director Sports and Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre is equal. Besides, he worked in the Department of Indian Theatre from 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. and from 5.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m. in the Department of Evening Studies. The Director Sports attended to the grounds just in the evening, whereas he as Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre did not have such a luxury as he had to devote his entire time from 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. in the Department. If they had any rules to give Earned leave to the teachers, who had been given the additional charge of non-teaching posts, why not the said benefit be not given to a teacher who is given the additional charge of a teaching position.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. V.K. Chopra was given the additional charge of Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre and was not asked to perform additional teaching duties.

To this, Dr. Dinesh Talwar enquired whether the Director Sports performs any teaching duties.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there was no doubt that Dr. V.K. Chopra was given the additional charge of Department of Indian Theatre. There were several teachers, who had been given the additional charge of non-vacational posts. Forget about teaching and non-teaching posts, since all the non-teaching posts are non-vacational, the Director Sports is a non-teaching and non-vacational post. Since the positions of Chairpersons of the Departments are vocational, nothing is given to them. But the case of Dr. V.K. Chopra is a peculiar one because when the Regulations/Rules were framed, the nomenclature of Department of Evening Studies was Evening College and was not considered a part of the University Teaching Departments and it was not expected that the teachers of Evening College would also be given the additional charge of other Department. In the instant case, the man had really devoted his time while discharging the additional duties though only of Teaching Department. But for that he had to spend extra time. It had been mentioned in the regulations, especially in the case of College teachers, that in case he is given any extra work, he will be paid for that extra work and that formula applied in this case as well. Since they are not giving anything to the Chairperson, being the administrative Head of the Department, strictly speaking they could not give anything to him, but they should not forget the most important element that he had discharged additional duties. There were some Professors, who had been given the additional charge of Dean, College Development Council, Associate Dean, College Development Council, Director, Academic Staff College, etc., which are non-vacational positions. Frankly speaking, they never granted the benefit of 1/3 Earned Leave of the period of vacation to any of them because they never claimed. Sometimes it is considered an honor that he/she is holding that charge or he/she was not aware of it that they are entitled for Earned Leave to the extent of 1/3 of the vacation. But this man had claimed for discharging additional duties and they could not expect anybody to work from 9.00 a.m. to 9.00 p.m. If earned leave could not be given to him, an allowance of Rs.5,000/- p.m. at par with those who had been given the additional charge of Director, P.U. Regional Centres, and go there only once a week, should be given to him for the period he had discharged the additional duties. In future, if any teacher is given the additional charge of non-vacational post, he/she should be given

Earned Leave to the extent of 1/3 of the period he/she actually perform the additional duties.

The Vice-Chancellor said that an honorarium could be paid to Dr. V.K. Chopra, but it should not be cited as a precedent.

Dr. Satish Sharma suggested that for granting 1/3 earned leave to the persons, who were to be given additional charge of non-vacation positions, a policy should be framed.

Professor Nandita Singh said that there is an Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, wherein they are offering B.A.B.Ed. course. One person from the Department of Education had been given the charge of that Institute as Co-ordinator. In this way, he/she is discharging duties of both the Professor in his/her Department as well as of the Co-ordinator. But no honorarium/incentive is being given to him/her. Similarly, she was also holding the charge of Co-ordinator, Centre for Swami Vivekananda Studies, but she had never asked for any honorarium. But in the instant case, since the person is working from morning to evening, he could be given some honorarium. She, however, suggested that, in future, the honorarium or any other kind of benefit should be decided before taking over the assignment and not thereafter.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it was wrong to say that the person concerned had worked from 9.00 a.m. to 9.00 p.m. In fact, the persons who are given additional charge came to the Department concerned just for half an hour or so and sign few papers and leave.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the request of Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor and Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies, for grant of earned leave for the period he had discharged the additional duties of Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre, i.e., from 16.02.2012 to 01.08.2012 (F.N.), be **not** acceded to in the absence of any provision. However, an honorarium be paid to Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor and Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies, for the period he had discharged the additional duties of Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre, i.e., from 16.02.2012 to 01.08.2012 (F.N.) and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to decide the quantum of honorarium per month to be paid to him, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar recorded his dissent with the remarks that if 1/3 earned leave for the period of discharging additional duty of non-vacational position could be given to a teacher, why the same could not be given for the vocational position, especially when the person had worked from 9.00 a.m. to 9.00 p.m.

Resignation of Ms. Geetanjali Bhagat, Assistant Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies

6. Considered if the resignation of Ms. Geetanjali Bhagat, Assistant Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies, be accepted w.e.f. 1.5.2013, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Cal. Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three month’s notice shall not be required.”

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-III**).

RESOLVED: That the resignation of Ms. Geetanjali Bhagat, Assistant Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies, be accepted w.e.f. 1.5.2013, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. I, 2007.

Declaration of the post vacant held by Dr. Promila, Associate Professor, Department of Lib. & Inf. Science

7. Considered if the post held by Dr. Promila, Associate Professor, Department of Library & Information Science, be declared vacant w.e.f. 8.9.2012, under Regulation 11.9 at page 120 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, as she has neither joined back till now nor has the department received any intimation from her side.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 11.9 at page 120 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“If any employee overstays his leave or is otherwise absent from duty for more than a week, his post shall be liable to be declared vacant and he shall forfeit his salary during the time he so remained absent.”

2. Letter dated 4.3.2013 received from Chairperson, Department of Library & Information Science is enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to page 62 of the Appendix, stated that in fact it related to inviting quotations from the Advertising Agencies. He never knew that they were quoting something like this in black & white on record of the University that they were inviting quotations from the Advertising Agencies and the Advertising Agencies were giving their competitive rates, while it is banned. They could not ask for quotations from the Advertising Agencies. No Advertising

Agency could charge lesser than what the prescribed rates of the newspapers were. Whatever the commission they were earning, they could also not share it with any institution. In case this paper is sent to their Apex/controlling body, their agency would be cancelled. They need the services of the agency because in lieu of the commission which they were getting, they were able to give us the design in a shortest possible size. They should be careful in future.

RESOLVED: That the post held by Dr. Promila, Associate Professor, Department of Library & Information Science, be declared vacant w.e.f. 8.9.2012, under Regulation 11.9 at page 120 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, as she has neither joined back till now nor has the department received any intimation from her side.

Request of Ms. Shveta Mahendra, Stage Craft Teacher, Department of Indian Theatre for promotional avenues

8. Considered minutes dated 25.1.2013 (**Appendix-V**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for examining afresh the application/request of Ms. Shveta Mahendra, Stage Craft Teacher, Department of Indian Theatre, for promotional avenues.

NOTE: The request of Ms. Shveta Mahendra, note of D.U.I. along with office note enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that Ms. Shveta Mahendra possessed only B.A./B.Ed. qualification. How she was teaching postgraduate classes? Whereas the teachers who were working in the affiliated Colleges since 1981-82, had been asked to fulfil the condition of securing 400 points for appointment as Principal and they all had been rendered ineligible though they had experience of more than 30 years. In the instant case, though the candidate was not eligible for appointment as teacher, she was teaching for the last more than 16 years. Secondly, such persons if designated as Lecturers/Assistant Professors, would be re-employed for five years after superannuation at the age of 60 years. However, if she was not designated as Lecturer/Assistant Professor, she would be retiring at the age of 60 years. But once she was designated as Lecturer, she would retire at 65 as the same thing had been done in many cases. Whereas, in the Colleges nobody is allowed to be appointed as Lecturer without UGC-NET. He pleaded that she should not be re-designated as Lecturer/Assistant Professor. Moreover, the item had come when she is going to retire.

Agreeing with Dr. Dinesh Talwar, Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that it did not look nice.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she is a teacher of performing art. The issue should be considered in that perspective.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that the reasons for re-designating her as Assistant Professor had been mentioned at Pages 71 and 72 of the Appendix (in the D.U.I.'s note). She was working only on an ex-cadre post which was being re-designated.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though it looked very odd for re-designating a person with B.A./B.Ed. qualification as Assistant Professor/Professor, he would like to remind them that Shri Balwant Gargi, who had worked as Professor in this Department, was just a matriculate. Hence, they should not be surprised. Secondly, it had also been mentioned in the office note that Diploma in Dramatics from

N.S.D. had been equated with M.A. in Theatre that too vide letter dated 4th February 1982. He would like to tell them that diploma at N.S.D. was a three year diploma and not a postgraduate diploma. The qualification for NSD Diploma was +2, which had been equated subsequently with M.A., but here in the University their own Diploma had already been equated with M.A. On page 67, it had been mentioned that the essential qualifications for the post of Stage Craft Teacher are M.A. in the Theatre or One year Postgraduate Diploma in Indian Theatre with two years experience or Diploma from NSD. Now, the question of re-designation remains. In fact, it should have been done right in the beginning as they had taken care of the Curators by re-designating them as Assistant Professors-cum-Curators so that they could become Readers and Professors. Heavens are not going to fall, if she is re-designated a Lecturer for development of Indian Theatre and she also get re-employment up to 65 years. Further, it should be done retrospectively, especially in view of the fact that she possessed better qualifications than others, who earlier worked there.

Agreeing with Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that while examining such cases, he found that the University office at times showed lack of understanding of different qualifications for different disciplines and ended up doing injustice to a number of candidates. There were similar candidates in the affiliated Colleges, who deserved such benefits. He agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal that though they should look for academic qualifications prescribed by the U.G.C., for disciplines like Music and Dance they had made provision under Regulation 4.2 for traditional and professional artists. According to him, she fulfils the qualifications for re-designating as Lecturer/Assistant Professor from the day one, but it was not done due to their wrong perception. He pleaded that they should put their record straight from the date she joined the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that though all the benefits could not be given to her from 1999, her pay could be fixed notionally.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that, legally, what Shri Ashok Goyal had suggested is correct because it was done in similar cases. But his only concern was the period for which the University had treated her ineligible and had not given her due. He pleaded that a Committee be constituted so that she could be given all the benefits.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Jagwant Singh, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that her salary should be fixed notionally from the date of her joining and in this way she could be given all the benefits.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that her salary from 1999 to 2013 should be fixed notionally in the grade of Assistant Professor.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Satya Pal Jain and Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in few newly introduced subjects like Fashion Designing, the UGC did not conduct NET. Hence, NET qualified teachers were not available in such subjects. He pleaded that the candidates, who had passed M.A. in Fashion Designing with 55% marks, should be made eligible for the post of Assistant Professors in the affiliated Colleges where M.A. Fashion Designing/Clothing & Textiles were taught.

Professor Naval Kishore clarified that in the subjects where UGC-NET qualified teachers were not available, e.g. Clothing & Textile, Fashion Designing, the candidates who possessed M.A. with 55% marks in the relevant subject are eligible for the post of Lecturer/Assistant Professor.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it had been clearly mentioned in the U.G.C. Regulations that the subjects in which UGC did not conduct NET, NET is not essential qualification for appointment as Assistant Professor in those subjects. No clarification is required to be sought from the U.G.C. in this regard. If the Dean, College Development Council was of the view that NET was essential qualification for appointment as Assistant Professors in all the subjects, then probably he was on the wrong footing. In fact, it is the subject of Clothing & Textile and not the Textile Engineering. The U.G.C. conducted NET in Clothing and Textile and not in Fashion Designing. If they go by this, no NET qualified candidates are available. Unless and until it is clarified by the Dean, College Development Council Office that where the subject of Fashion Designing is offered, they had to appoint the candidates who had qualified U.G.C. NET in the subject of Clothing & Textile subject. The advertisement should also be issued accordingly. This decision is to be taken as a policy and whosoever is appointed as member of the Inspection Committee for grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation should be informed accordingly. Actually, the problem had arisen because the experts who had inspected the colleges for grant of affiliation/ extension of affiliation in the subject of Fashion Designing were not from the relevant disciplines.

On a point of order, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in the subject of Fashion Designing UGC-NET is not conducted by the University Grants Commission. He, therefore, suggested that wherever the posts of Lecturers/Assistant Professors in the subject of Fashion Designing are to be filled up, the appointments should be allowed without U.G.C.-NET or the candidates who have qualified U.G.C.-NET in the subject of Clothing & Textile be made eligible. This decision should be taken as a policy matter, so that the Selection Committees might not face any difficulty in recommending appointments in such subjects.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon suggested that, in fact, they should have the same nomenclature of the courses both in the University as well as affiliated Colleges, which are recommended/approved by the U.G.C. Otherwise, the U.G.C. would not recognize those courses.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they had requested time and again that they should frame guidelines for filling up posts of Assistant Professors in those subjects (e.g. Bioinformatics, Fashion Designing, Computer Science, etc.) in which the U.G.C. did not conduct NET. He, as a member of the Inspection Committee, visited the College, which had applied for ICT, whereas they had given the nomenclature of IT. Ultimately, the Inspection Committee recommended approval for IT, but the U.G.C. rejected the same.

Professor Naval Kishore said that since they were facing problems in certain subjects, e.g. Computer Science, MCA, Fashion Designing and 2-3 other subjects, a Committee was constituted, under the Chairmanship of Professor Renu Vig, to consider the issue. The Committee had made its recommendations and the same would be sent to the Vice-Chancellor for taking decision.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that despite there being clear rules and regulations, the University had done injustice to more than one candidate on the question of eligibility by rejecting their cases. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that before the Dean, College Development Council, the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) must have more clarity on such issues.

Dr. R.P.S. Josh said that though the Syndicate had taken the decision to grant approval to the appointments of teachers about two months ago, no action had been taken by the Colleges Branch so far.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Shveta Mahendra, Stage Craft Teacher, Department of Indian Theatre, be re-designated as Assistant Professor and her pay be fixed notionally from the date of her joining (02.03.2000) in the grade of Assistant Professor.

Issue regarding confirmation of Assistant Registrars

9. Considered and

RESOLVED: That the following Assistant Registrars be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch/Department	Date of Promotion	Date of Confirmation
1.	Shri Devinder Singh Pathania, Conduct	03.06.2011	03.06.2012
2.	Shri Karnail Singh Rana Examination-I	05.12.2011	05.12.2012
3.	Mrs. Soma Sharma U.M.C.	05.12.2011	06.12.2012
4.	Shri Rajinder Kumar Agnihotri U.S.O.L.	19.12.2011	19.12.2012
5.	Mrs. Sarvada Sharma Computer Unit	04.01.2012	04.01.2013
6.	Mrs. Surinder Rani Re-evaluation	04.01.2012	05.01.2013
7.	Mrs. Hasan Devi Examination-IV	03.02.2012	03.02.2013
8.	Mrs. Veena Mehta U.S.O.L	03.02.2012	04.02.2013
9.	Mrs. Sushma Anand C.E.T.	03.04.2012	03.04.2013

NOTE: The date of confirmation of these Assistant Registrars is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.

Withdrawn Item

10. Item 10 on the agenda was withdrawn, viz. –

10.

To consider if the term of contractual appointment of Shri Sandeep Chopra, Law Officer be extended for another period of one year w.e.f. 16.4.2013 to 15.4.2014 with one day break on 15.4.2013 (being Sunday on 14.4.2013) and his existing emoluments be increased by 10% per month as per previous practice or

till the post is filled through selection, whichever is earlier.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 14.11.2012 regarding the payment of Landline Telephone bills installed at residence of officers

11. Considered following recommendation of the Committee dated 14.11.2012 (**Appendix-VI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to take an appropriate policy decision regarding the payment of Landline Telephone bills installed at residence of concerned officers:

1. As the facility of fixed mobile allowance has already been allowed to all the University employees, therefore facility of residential landline telephones be withdrawn except in following cases:

- (i) Vice-Chancellor
- (ii) Secretary to Vice-Chancellor
- (iii) Dean of University Instruction
- (iv) Special Officer to Vice-Chancellor
- (v) Registrar
- (vi) Dean Student Welfare
- (vii) Dean Student Welfare (Women)
- (viii) Dean of College Development Council
- (ix) Dean Alumni Relations
- (x) Controller of Examinations
- (xi) Finance & Development Officer
- (xii) Chief Medical Officer
- (xiii) Director Public Relations
- (xiv) All Wardens of (Boys/Girls) Hostels
- (xv) Manager Press
- (xvi) Deputy Registrar (General)
- (xvii) Deputy Registrar (Colleges)
- (xviii) Deputy Registrar (Secrecy)
- (xix) Deputy Registrar (Exams.)
- (xx) Assistant Registrar (Conduct)

2. The officers who were earlier allowed the residential landline telephone facility but now have been allowed only the fixed mobile allowance, shall be entitled to claim reimbursement of expenditure on official calls made in excess of the limit of mobile telephone allowances.
3. Facility of ISD and internet connection at residential landline telephone shall be allowed only with permission of Vice-Chancellor.

NOTE: The Committee further proposed that a matter may be taken up with the mobile service provider such as BSNL or other company for giving some specific scheme for close user group of Panjab University employee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are certain positions and the persons working on them may request for Landline Telephone at a later stage. He, therefore, suggested that a provision should be made so that if any request came at a later stage, he/she could be given the Landline Telephone.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the provision as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal would be made.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that inter-com facility should be made available to the Senate members, who are residing at the Panjab University Campus. If it is not possible in one go, it should be done in a phased manner.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the problem was that they did not have sufficient lines.

RESOLVED: That the above recommendations of the Committee dated 14.11.2012, as per **Appendix-VI**, be approved with the addition that a provision be made to allow Landline Telephone, if any request came from any of the remaining Officers at a later stage.

**Proposal dated
10.10.2012 of the
Divisional Engineer
(Horticulture), P.U.
Construction Office**

12. Considered proposal dated 10.10.2012 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Divisional Engineer (Horticulture), P.U. Construction Office for sanction of Rs.5 lac out of Development Fund for purchase of Ride-on Mover (Lawn Tractor) for maintenance of lawns like lawns of Guest Houses, Professor R.C. Paul Rose Garden, Professor G.P. Sharma Herbal Park & Student Centre which are visited by students and high dignitaries.

- NOTE:**
1. The Ride-on Mover, the lawns can be maintained effectively at low cost. The Ride-on Mover is urgently required in this division with the increase in the area of South Campus. The Ride-on Mover is a substitute for the additional labour requirements. The Ride-on Mover is a modern day machine which is now-a-days used extensively for moving of grass being compact in size as compared to conventional tractors, economical to run, easy to maneuver and requires low maintenance. The use of this machine will increase the efficiency of the horticulture division.
 2. Specifications of the Ride-on Mover enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).

RESOLVED: That the proposal dated 10.10.2012 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Divisional Engineer (Horticulture), P.U. Construction Office for sanction of Rs.5 lac out of Development Fund for purchase of Ride-on Mover (Lawn Tractor) for maintenance of lawns like lawns of Guest Houses, Professor R.C. Paul Rose Garden, Professor G.P. Sharma Herbal Park & Student Centre which are visited by students and high dignitaries, be approved.

**Amendment in the rules
for CIIPP Cell**

13. Considered that, in order to transfer a sum of ₹50.00 lac (money generated by CIIPP (University share from

consultancy, Administrative charges and surplus from various activities)), the Rules for CIIPP Cell, be amended as under so that the money generated under this section is to be transferred to Foundation for Higher Education and Research, as per Rule 13 of CIIPP:

Existing Rule of CIIPP	Proposed Amendment of CIIPP Rule
On the completion of the consultancy of the Project, a copy of the synopsis of the work, keeping in view the confidentiality clause of the project and the audited statement of Accounts will be submitted to the University/ CIIPP for its records. Any unutilized amount will be transferred to the fund "Foundation for Higher Education & Research Account" of the University.	On the completion of the consultancy of the Project, a copy of the synopsis of the work, keeping in view the confidentiality clause of the project and the audited statement of Accounts will be submitted to the University/ CIIPP for its records. Any unutilized amount will be transferred to the "Development Fund Account" of the University.

NOTE: The Income generated by CIIPP (University share from consultancy, administrative charges and surplus from various activities) is deposited in Foundation for Higher Education and Research. In 2011 sanction was granted by the Vice-Chancellor to transfer a sum of ₹50 lakh to this fund vide letter No. IIP/11/138 dated 9.6.2011. **But the money could not be transferred because a limit of principle amount in the fund has been fixed to ₹25 crore.** In view of this, to transfer the amount of ₹50 lakh the amendment in the CIIPP rules was considered vide Syndicate dated 29.2.2012 (Para 33) (**Appendix-VII-A**).

RESOLVED: That, in order to transfer a sum of ₹50.00 lac (money generated by CIIPP (University share from consultancy, Administrative charges and surplus from various activities)), the Rules for CIIPP Cell, be amended as under so that the money generated under this section can be transferred to Development Fund Account, as per Rule 13 of CIIPP:

Existing Rule of CIIPP	Proposed Amendment of CIIPP Rule
On the completion of the consultancy of the Project, a copy of the synopsis of the work, keeping in view the confidentiality clause of the project and the audited statement of Accounts will be submitted to the University/ CIIPP for its records. Any unutilized amount will be transferred to the fund "Foundation for Higher Education & Research Account" of the University.	On the completion of the consultancy of the Project, a copy of the synopsis of the work, keeping in view the confidentiality clause of the project and the audited statement of Accounts will be submitted to the University/ CIIPP for its records. Any unutilized amount will be transferred to the "Development Fund Account" of the University.

Revised guidelines for the award of Ph.D. Degree

14. Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 11.2.2013 (**Appendix-VIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to

examine and recommend the changes in the existing guidelines approved by the competent authority for the award of Ph.D. degree (which are in conformity with U.G.C. Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of Ph.D. degree Regulation 2009):

1. that the guidelines for Registration, confirmation of registration, appointment of supervisors, etc. under the Standard and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree (In conformity with UGC Minimum Standards and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree Regulations 2009) (**Appendix-VIII**), be approved.
2. xxx xxx xxx
3. that all those candidates, who had been enrolled under the old Regulations, but had done Ph.D. course work before submission of their theses, be awarded Ph.D. degrees under the new U.G.C. (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree) Regulation 2009.
4. that the faculty members working in allied subjects be allowed to supervise Ph.D. students enrolled/registered in inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary subjects such as Environment Studies. There is no need of having a joint supervisor from the parent Department. The academic issue, i.e. submission of synopsis, etc. of these Ph.D. students be taken care of by the relevant bodies of the Department where the student is registered. However, the administrative issues such as scholarships/financial assistance/ attendance papers be signed by the Chairperson/Head of the Department of the supervisor. The supervisor must be invited in the meetings of Research Degree Committee, RMC, etc.

Initiating discussion, Professor Shelley Walia, referring to the recommendation of the Committee at Page 94 that since the period of two-years for submission of synopsis/confirmation of registration is a sufficient period, no extension beyond the two-years be usually given to the candidates enrolled under New Regulations, said that the word 'usually' is wrong and the same should be deleted. He further stated that there were certain cases where the Supervisors of the candidates had written that they did not deserve any extension, but the Vice-Chancellor by using his discretionary power had granted them extension. In fact, the candidates had actually never come to the department but kept on asking for extensions. Since six monthly reports were being given by the Supervisors, the office should be given clear instructions not to give any relaxation to the candidates so that the sanctity of the Supervisor's report is respected and taken to be the final verdict on the progress of the student. If the Supervisor regrets extension beyond two-years, the word usually should not be taken into consideration as the decision to not grant extension should be final and not tentative as the word; usually; implies. Referring to proposed Guideline/Regulation 2 at Page 97, he stated that putting up a list of candidates to be supervised by each faculty member on the Notice Board would invite litigation, but they did not fall within the purview of their specifications, what will happen? Therefore, it was wrong to put up the list of candidates to be supervised on the Notice Board because otherwise, they would claim that they all should be enrolled. In Guideline 6 at Page 98, it had also been mentioned that

the Supervisor for a selected candidate shall be decided by the Academic and Administrative Committees during the interaction, subject to the consent of the Supervisor/Co-Supervisor. He, therefore, pleaded that these Guidelines should be relayed to every department of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that what Professor Shelley had pointed out was very relevant. But he would like to draw the attention of the House to Guideline 3, wherein it had suggested that the candidates who had qualified entrance test of the University, got National Fellowship like U.G.C./CSIR/DST or JRF, etc., and those who had been exempted from the entrance test, all are at par. Thereafter they would have to face the interview. Meaning thereby, the candidates would be selected purely on the basis of interview. It had also been mentioned that the interview would carry 20 marks, which indicates that 80 marks were for something else. However, it did not say that if a candidate got zero marks out of 20 marks, would he be selected or not. He, therefore, suggested that it should be mentioned that 100% weightage would be given to the entrance test, but the minimum marks should also be prescribed for interview. Referring to the provision that whether interview is to be conducted once, twice or thrice, be left at the sole discretion of the Administrative and Academic Committees, he said that perhaps it had been suggested so that as and when there is any vacancy, the same could be filled up by holding the interview. His suggestion in this regard is that where in the Department the course work is of one semester, it is possible, but in those departments (University Business School), where the course work is of two-semesters (one year), the interview could only be conducted once in a year. He, therefore, suggested that it should be corrected as “whether interview is to be conducted once, twice or thrice, be left at the sole discretion of the Administrative and Academic Committees of the Departments except those Departments where the course work is of two-semesters. Referring to Guideline 2, he stated that the only thing which had been excluded from the existing provision is that ‘only the pre-determined number of candidates be admitted’ as the same is part of the U.G.C. Regulations. The U.G.C. Regulation says that the number of vacancies had to be announced before the conduct of Entrance Test. But there is some practical difficulty with the teachers that they are not in a position to decide whether they will be left with some vacancies or as per their expectations there would be some vacant slots. In fact, it should be left to the teachers because sometimes they feel that since eight candidates are allowed by the U.G.C., they started multiplying the number of teachers with eight for calculating the number of vacancies. But that should not be the criterion. Therefore, information which had to be asked, as per proposed Regulation, it should be added that the Chairpersons should be advised that the information should be sent after taking consent from all the teachers as to how many students they would need; otherwise, it could be of advisory nature so that at least they could have cushion of one or two students. Further, instead of holding the interview once, twice or thrice, they should hold the interview once in a year and in accordance with number of slots vacant, they should take the top students and keep the rest on the Waiting List. However, it might put pressure that one particular teacher had taken eight students and the other had only five and he/she would be forced to take three more students.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that as per Guideline 24, the examiners for evaluating a Ph.D. thesis are not to be repeated within a

period of one year, but since the number of examiners was very small in certain subjects, they should not put this condition as it would lead to delay in the award of Ph.D. degree. Last year, 19 theses were delayed for months together only due to this reason. Referring to Guideline 27 that a faculty member can supervise maximum of 8 Ph.D. students.....a member from outside the University can supervise maximum of four students, he enquired who are these members from outside the University? Whether they were teachers of affiliated Colleges? If yes, the College teachers could guide only four students and, that too, as Joint Supervisors.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this meant that they are saying that a faculty member can supervise maximum of 8 Ph.D. students, irrespective of whether he was from the University or its affiliated Colleges. Therefore, Guideline 27 would be amended as under:

“A faculty member of the University and its affiliated Colleges can supervise maximum of **eight** Ph.D. students. A member from outside the University can supervise

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Talwar, referring to Guideline 30, said that one of the examiners had not evaluated the thesis of the candidate for more than 3 years, despite several reminders. It was all due to internal politics. For such cases, they must incorporate a Clause.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the English written at page 100 (if a candidate already confirmed registered) is not understandable, the same should be got corrected.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that he had got an opportunity to examine one similar case in one of the Committees. Now, since Ph.D. had been made a compulsory qualification, even a delay of one day could spoil the career of the candidate. They had made several academic reforms. Once the candidate submitted the thesis in the University office, the second part of the procedure was also of equal importance. Could they do something for the purpose, e.g., establish a Special Cell wherein they could expedite the sending of theses to the examiners ensuring that reports come in time to the University and the viva is conducted within 15-20 days and the item is immediately brought to the Syndicate because Syndicate is the final authority for considering the report of the examiners, including viva-voce, for award of Ph.D. Degrees. Could they fix some dates within which each and every process is completed. He further enquired could they delegate this power of the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor, subject to the approval by the Syndicate? Because sometimes the meeting of the Syndicate might be held after 30 days or sometime it might not be held, why the candidate should suffer.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon suggested that a Committee comprising Deans of the Faculties should be constituted under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor for the purpose. Of course, the recommendations of the Committee would be placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Shelley Walia said that though everything was in place, it is not being implemented. According to him, if the Chairperson of the Department conducted the viva of the candidate that meant the degree is awarded. In many cases, the Chairpersons

issued a certificate to the candidates that he/she had successfully cleared the viva.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar, referring to Guideline 34 (a) and (b), pleaded that the regular teachers of affiliated Colleges, who hold the Ph.D. degree and are teaching postgraduate classes, should be exempted from the condition of published research work such as books, articles or research papers in refereed research journals/patents at least three years preceding their appointment as Supervisor/Co-Supervisor.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that in the Career Advancement Scheme of the U.G.C. for College teachers, there was no research component.

The Vice-Chancellor said that unless and until one is active in research, how could he/she guide the Ph.D. students?

Referring to Guideline 34 (4), Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that now postgraduate classes had been started in the affiliated Colleges and they possessed almost same facilities which the University teaching Departments had. Secondly, when the University teams came to the Colleges for inspection at the time of granting affiliation/extension of affiliation for M.Sc. courses, then what was the necessity to inspect the College again for recognizing as approved Research Centre.

The Vice-Chancellor said that M.A./M.Sc. infrastructure did not mean that it is research infrastructure and research could be done with it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if any College teacher did not have the research work during the preceding three years, he should be allowed to guide the student subject to the condition that he would publish research paper/s within a period of one or two years.

Referring to Guideline 35 (15), Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that they had to think seriously for conducting course work for the College teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was encouraging the Colleges to conduct course work. If it could not be conducted by one College, it could be done by making a consortium of Colleges at a time. The pre-Ph.D. classes could be held as per suitability, even in the evenings or on holidays.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that they were conducting pre-Ph.D. course work in their College from 2.00 p.m. onwards.

Professor Nandita Singh, referring to Guideline 34 (4) at Page 104, said that in case a Supervisor is from an affiliated College, the University shall satisfy itself that the requisite infrastructure and academic facilities for supervision of research are available in that College. She stated that in Education Faculty they had Supervisors from different Colleges. As per this condition, they are required to fulfil this condition including that they had published research work during the last three years. They could not check this whether the College had requisite infrastructure because the person might change his/her College after sometime. If they inspected the infrastructure of

a College and allow all the teachers to become Supervisors, but later on some of them shifted to other Colleges, what would happen to the students who were enrolled under them? She, therefore, suggested that instead of inspecting the infrastructure of the College, there should be a Nodal Agency, which should see whether the infrastructure was available in the teaching Department of the University where the research is to be carried out and the Supervisors from the College/s should have tie up with the concerned University Department. Further, the Supervisor should be active in research which is more important rather than infrastructure of the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since Career Advancement of the College teachers is primarily through research, they had to enable them; otherwise, they would be a dissatisfied lot. Moreover, he did not want too much of policing but at the same time there should not be dilution of standard.

Professor Nandita Singh said that they had 60 Supervisors and only six out of them were from the Department of Education and the rest were from the Colleges. They had devised a mechanism and allowed all those teachers to become Supervisors, who wanted.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that, in continuation to what Professor Nandita Singh had stated regarding Guideline 34 (4) at Page 104, it had been mentioned under Guideline 37 (b) that even if a College has not been recognized as Research Centre, its eligible teachers/ Principal should be allowed to act as Supervisor to guide Ph.D. research. Hence, there is contradiction between the two.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that, to be doubly sure, the members should be requested to send their suggestions in writing so that the same could be placed before the Committee.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the provision made under Guideline 37 (b) should be adopted because if the Head of the Department did not want to carry out research, he would not allow the other faculty members to do so by not getting the College approved as Research Centre in that subject.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let all the suggestions be collated and a few members of the Syndicate, especially from the Colleges, should sit with the members of the Committee and all the inputs which was being generated through discussion as well as the suggestions sent by the members in writing be placed before the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there were some existing provisions which were being followed without any difficulty and the points referred to by Dr. Tarlok Bandhu and Dr. I.S. Sandhu are part of the existing provisions. The points needed to be checked were those where they had incorporated changes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should adopt them but leave the things for improvement on the basis of whatever was being stated or would be submitted by the members. He would have certain members of the Syndicate included in the Committee, particularly from the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that these recommendations had not come for the first or second time. In fact, these had come for the third time. Even then there were certain shortcomings. He, therefore, proposed that a Committee of Syndics should be constituted so that everything is in order.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that a Committee comprising the Deans of Faculties and certain members of the Syndicate should be constituted for the purpose. But they had to ensure that when the cases are filed in the court, these Rules become Bible. Whatever is being followed in the Departments even after approval from the competent authorities, is negated by the Court. He was referring to University Business School where two years back, they said that even if their system was twenty year old, their Ph.D. course work is of two-semesters. He, therefore, suggested that it should be written that the course work is minimum of one semester except two semesters for University Business School. He pleaded that these things needed to be taken care of.

Professor Keshav Malhotra, referring to the Note mentioned at Page 108, said that exemption from course work had been given to M.Phil. students. He suggested that for this a special head needed to be created so that everybody is clear about it. Secondly, since the University started conducting Joint Entrance Test much later, several students had done M. Phil. after clearing Department Entrance Test, which resulted into their ineligibility. He, therefore, suggested that it should be mentioned that all those students who had done course work during their M.Phil. programme with or without Entrance Test, are exempted from Ph.D. course work.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Dinesh Talwar. He wanted to draw the attention of the House towards the remaining points, e.g., in Guideline 6 (Page 99), there was no reference of Colleges and they needed to correct it. Referring to Guideline 17, he said that his question was what is the status of the candidate after the period of five years, i.e., during extension period? At what point of time the seat with a particular supervisor is to be treated as vacant. Is it after five years or after eight years? In fact, the period after five years (after normal period) to eight years was a condonation period. Therefore, it needed to be changed. Because they were already experiencing this problem as a number of students were not getting supervisors, especially from the affiliated Colleges. Resultantly, many of their students were going to other universities. If they extended this period to eight years, they were going to face shortage of research supervisors. During the extension period, the candidate may or may not come. He, therefore, suggested that the regular period was five years and after the five years, the seat should be treated as vacant. This needed to be examined.

The Vice-Chancellor said that till the candidate was registered, they could not do anything in this regard.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that it was not the first Committee, but seventh or eighth Committee, which had made recommendations after the U.G.C. Guidelines. One of the Committees comprised the Deans of 11 Faculties, even that could not reach at any decision. How long it would take? Would the Committee to which the matter is supposed to be referred, be the last one?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that the inspection of the Colleges for recognizing them as Research Centres was absolutely necessary because most of the Colleges having Master Degree courses did not fulfil the conditions and majority of them did not have requisite two Ph.D. teachers. Similarly, requisite number of books was not in their libraries. If they allowed them, it would dilute the standard. Secondly, there should be a mechanism in place for equating Ph.Ds. of other universities with Panjab University because several universities award degrees without submission of synopsis, etc. Such universities also did not have regular Professors for guiding research.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that though they knew there were certain lacunae, as Vice-Chancellor's nominee how could they check whether the person concerned had taken leave for doing Ph.D. and had done Ph.D. from a University of repute?

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that the recommendations of the Committee dated 11.2.2013 be approved with the provision that if certain amendments are needed, these would be relooked into and brought back to the Syndicate. He would speak to Professor Madhu Raka and would include her in the Deans Committee as Dean of University Instruction along with three-four members of the Syndicate, especially from Colleges.

This was agreed to.

Professor Naval Kishore said that a Committee was constituted for arranging Course Work for the teachers of the Colleges during vacations. The Committee had made its recommendations, the same should be allowed to be placed before the above said Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the recommendations of the Committee referred to by Professor Naval Kishore would also be placed before the above-said Committee.

Decision with regard to enhance the pass percentage of Entrance Test of English (under O-CET)

15. Considered if the pass percentage of Entrance Test of English (under O-CET) be increased from 20% to 35% (30% in case of candidates belonging to Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes/Backward Classes).

NOTE: 1. The Board of Control in English dated 18.12.2012 (**Appendix-IX**) has resolved that the pass percentage of the Entrance examination be increased from 20% to 35% for M.A. English Entrance Examination-2013.

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).

Professor Shelley Walia said that the proposal is for 35% and previously it was 20%. He would like to suggest that it should be made 40% so that only good students come up.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the pass percentage of Entrance Test of English (under O-CET) be increased from 20% to 35% (30% in case of candidates belonging to Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes/Backward Classes).

Request from the Director & Vice-Chancellor of Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering & Technology, Longowal for inclusion of SLIET, Longowal as participating institute for OCET-2013 for M.Sc. admissions

16. Considered letter No. SLIET/DIR/467 dated 7.3.2013 (**Appendix-X**) received from Director & Vice-Chancellor of Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering and Technology, Longowal, Distt. Sangrur, Punjab, addressed to the Vice-Chancellor for inclusion of SLIET, Longowal as participating Institute for OCET-2013 for M.Sc. admissions for improving the quality of admissions.

NOTE: The Prospectus of PU-OCET (P.G.) -2013 is already under process and is going to be made available on the website from 5th April, 2013.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that since they were paying hefty amount to CAT for getting admission to MBA done, they should also charge considerable amount from Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering & Technology. If they did not charge any amount, every institution would make similar request.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a request had come from a Centrally funded institute to a senior institute, it should be allowed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since the Panjab University was in deficit, they should be cautious about its funds.

It was clarified that if they included Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering & Technology, the number of applicants would increase tremendously, which would ultimately enhance the income of the University.

RESOLVED: That the request of Director & Vice-Chancellor, Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering and Technology, Longowal, District Sangrur, Punjab, for inclusion of SLIET, Longowal, as participating Institute for OCET-2013 for M.Sc. admissions for improving the quality of admissions, be acceded to.

Recommendations of the meeting of the Principals of Colleges of Education dated 28.02.2013 and Committee dated 6.2.2013 to devise means and ways for streamlining the education process in the Colleges of Education

17. Considered minutes –

- (i) of the meeting dated 28.1.2013 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Principals of all the Education Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University.
- (ii) of the meeting dated 6.2.2013 (**Appendix-XI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to devise means and ways as would help in streamlining the education process in the Colleges of Education affiliated to Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that both the above recommendations would be placed before the Senate in its special meeting dated 27.04.2013. He was seeking the permission of the Syndicate today to take these recommendations to the Senate meeting. Whatever would be their comments on these issues, would be recorded and placed

before Senate in its special meeting. Now, they were free to articulate their concern.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that though the University had time and again reiterated that salary to the teachers be paid as per U.G.C. norms and through cheques, none of the Colleges of Education, including Self-financing, were paying salary to their teachers as per UGC, NCTE and Panjab University norms. As far as payment of salary through cheques was concerned, they had totally refused to do so. Similarly, none of the Colleges had appointed requisite number of teachers on regular basis. Referring to the statement given by the Vice-Chancellor at Page 128 of the Appendix that since 'the lower limit is extremely dangerous, respectable amount should be given to the teachers to ensure quality education', he said that the Vice-Chancellor should not have given such a statement. Rather, the Vice-Chancellor should impress upon the Principals to pay salary to the teachers as per UGC, NCTE and P.U. norms.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that DAV Management is giving full salaries to the teachers working in their Colleges. He added that the University should issue clear-cut directions to the Colleges on this issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had asked the Colleges to submit statement of income and expenditure as per their students' strength and prove that they cannot pay salary to the teachers as per UGC/NCTE norms including 80% D.A. by charging a fee of Rs.49,000/-. If they do this, his next question would be could they do it as per norms in 2006 when there was no D.A. If still they say no, his next question would be could they pay salary to the teachers as on 31.12.2005.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, referring to page 132 of the Appendix, said that on the issue of non-payment of salary to the teachers as per NCTE norms, Shri Prabhjit Singh, nominee of the DPI (Colleges), Punjab had stated that at the time of applying for NOC, the Colleges gave affidavit to the Punjab Government that the Society will pay the salary to the teachers and non-teaching staff as amended by the NCTE/UGC/P.U. from time to time and on the basis of this affidavit, the Punjab Government had granted NOC to the concerned College and in the NOC itself they mentioned that the College will comply with Regulations of NCTE/U.G.C./P.U. If running the B.Ed. Course is not viable then why more and more Colleges are being opened in Punjab? Similarly, if the qualified teachers are not available for appointment, why the Colleges are demanding 2nd Unit of students? He said that when the Colleges were giving affidavit to the Punjab Government while taking NOC that the College will pay salary to its teachers/non-teachers as per NCTE/UGC/ PU norms, there is no need for asking the Colleges to supply income and expenditure statement. If the Colleges could not comply with the discrepancies pointed out by certain Inspection Committees, their affiliation/extension of affiliation should be withdrawn by the University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that when the Colleges had given affidavit to the Punjab Government while seeking NOC that they would pay salaries to the teachers as per U.G.C./NCTE/PU norms, there should not be any problem. Instead of balance sheet, they

should demand copy of the affidavit from the Colleges which they had submitted to the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had personally gone to the Chief Secretary, Punjab and apprised him of the need to attend to the issues of affiliated Colleges, to avoid the emergence of a social problem in the State of Punjab. He had told him categorically that while Constituent Colleges have been commenced in those areas of Punjab, where it had been determined that College Education had not reached, but withdrawing support from those places where there are Colleges, as reflected by not appointing requisite number of teachers in the Government Colleges and also not giving 95% grant-in-aid to the aided Colleges for payment of retiral benefits, a contradictory message was permeating. All the discussions would be recorded and Resolution(s) could be passed in the 27th April meeting of the Senate on behalf of Panjab University in 150th year of higher education in Punjab, which would be sent to the Punjab Government.

On a point made by Dr. Tarlok Bandhu, the Vice-Chancellor said that he was seeking their permission that all the papers be circulated to the members of the Senate for the meeting scheduled to be held on 27th April 2013.

Referring to page 139 of the appendix, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that there are 11 proposals made by the Committee. Were they in a position to discuss and answer everything here? According to him, it needed a lot of discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Vice-Chancellor had announced the holding of a special meeting of the Senate relating to the Colleges. What is to be discussed there, is yet to be decided. Hence, it is still under process. He, however, would like to tell them once again as to what is stipulated in the Calendar. As per Regulations, the special meeting of the Senate could only be called by the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor or at least fifteen members of Senate in a joint requisition signed by all such members and, that too, only for the business/issues for which the meeting had been called for. Meaning thereby, that the agenda for such a meeting had to be specific. That requisition of whether Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor or 15 members of the Senate, had to be placed before the Syndicate and it is the Syndicate which will decide the date for that meeting looking into the urgency of the issues which had been raised. Perhaps, the Vice-Chancellor had not been made aware of the procedure for holding the special meeting of the Senate. They were yet to decide as to what are the issues, which are to be discussed in the special meeting of the Senate. He could count 500 issues relating to the Colleges. Tomorrow, they would hold a special meeting of the Senate for discussing the issues relating to the University alone. They could well imagine that such a meeting might not end even for 15 days because the problems are unending. Did they think that these issues could be discussed in the Senate, whereas they are experiencing difficulties in discussing these in the Syndicate? So much so they could not say if the data supplied by the Colleges is right or wrong. He had said in the last meeting also that what is not within their purview, what is the idea of discussing that and the idea which he had gathered is as if it is to be considered by the Syndicate or the Senate as the case may be. In the end, the Committee had recommended that the Colleges may be allowed to appoint at least 4 Assistant Professors instead of required six. On the first reading, it

looked as if these are the recommendations of the Committee, which are to be considered by the Syndicate. Whereas the fact of the matter was that this Committee had been constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in view of the discussion with the Principals of the Colleges on 28th January 2013 to make suggestions to him to enable him to take up the cases of these Colleges with the NCTE and Punjab Government, which in fact, are the regulatory authorities. The Committee had recommended that after a good deal of discussion and deliberation in the light of representation given by the Management of the Colleges to the Vice-Chancellor, these suggestions be taken to the NCTE as well as Punjab Government. Therefore, it is not at all for consideration of the Syndicate. The Committee was also constituted for this purpose only because in view of what is recorded in the meeting of Principals of the Colleges of Education is that he should come out with a proposal, whereby the Vice-Chancellor had been strengthened to take up the matter with the NCTE to get something diluted so that it helps the Colleges. There also it had been mentioned by the Dean, College Development Council and also in the meeting of the Committee, Professor Nandita Singh had very categorically stated that she had discussed the issue with Professor S.P. Malhotra, Senior Consultant, NCTE, who had clarified categorically that the University has no *locus standi*/jurisdiction to dilute the Regulations of the NCTE. If NCTE is the one, which had to take the decision, then probably the spirit was that the Vice-Chancellor using his good offices might be in a better position to explain the practical difficulties being faced by the Colleges and he may be in a position to get some concessions for them and similar concession from the Punjab Government also. Dr. I.S. Sandhu had said that they should get copies of the affidavit which had been submitted by the Colleges with the Punjab Government, but there was no need of that because copies of the NOCs are submitted to the University also when they applied for grant of affiliation and the NOC letter is very much annexed with the application, wherein they had put in all these conditions that they would pay salaries as per UGC/NCTE/P.U. norms, and that also which are to be revised from time to time by the UGC. They did not take into consideration that maybe after 5 years they would not be able to make admissions. Yes, it is just possible that it is not viable to run the Colleges with the present fees, but at the same time if they are helpless, the University is equally helpless that it could not relax the conditions. They could only be good sympathizers, good helpers and tools to approach different agencies to see if something could be done. What the Senate would do? The only thing which they could do is that they should realize that they are bound by the rules and regulations of the UGC, NCTE, Punjab Government, AICTE and Panjab University and they could not go out of them. Then probably there is no idea of discussion unless and until they find some way out. Therefore, first they should decide whether there is any scope for coming out of these things. Whether they waste the time today or in the Senate, the end result is zero. He further stated that the nominee of the D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab, had said in the meeting that if it is not viable to run the Colleges and not possible to get the qualified teachers, why they were applying for the second unit. That meant, knowing fully well as to what are the practical difficulties and there is no viability of running the Colleges, still if they are applying for more units, there has to be something more which is not being mentioned in the balance sheets. In view of this, he felt that the recommendations/ suggestions of the Committee are not, in fact, at all, for consideration by the Syndicate. It is just a document prepared to facilitate the Vice-Chancellor to go through it and see

whether he could use his good position with NCTE vis-à-vis with the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he marked these recommendations/suggestions to the Syndicate because they had decided in the meeting of the Senate that they would have a meeting of the Senate before the end of current academic year in which they would discuss the issues relating to the Colleges so that if something could be done it should be implemented from the next academic year. What is being stated, is being recorded and it would go as background papers to the members of the Senate for the 27th meeting of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though they were ready to help the Colleges, which are crying for financial relaxation, if they are not ready to supply the balance sheets, what could they do?

Professor Naval Kishore said that instead of balance sheets, certain Colleges were supplying a paper on which they mentioned the income from fees and expenditure multiplying with the number of teachers.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is clear breach of faith. When last time, the fees were increased, they were part of the recommendation of the Committee, wherein a clause existed that every year they would supply to the University the income and expenditure certificate duly signed by the Chartered Accountant.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that even if the Colleges of Education supplied their balance sheets and if in the balance sheets they showed deficit, what would they do?

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that even the self-financing, aided and private Colleges were not able to pay retiral benefits to their teachers as the Colleges could not get financial help from the Government for the first quarter.

To this, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua clarified that the Colleges had already got grants of the first three quarters and only the fourth quarter grant is pending.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that there are certain Colleges, including reputed ones, which are running in deficit because of the enhancement of gratuity to the employees, which the Colleges would have to pay after the court orders.

Continuing, Shri Dua said that the grants of only those Colleges had been stopped which had not paid retiral benefits to its teachers.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the grant of fourth quarter is pending because the Colleges had not submitted utilization certificate. He added that there was no doubt that even the Government Colleges were paying a salary of Rs.6000/- to the teachers. But what solution they could have.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Colleges which did not fulfil the conditions of the UGC/NCTE/ Panjab University, including salary as per U.G.C. norms, should not be given new courses.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that certain Colleges were complying with 80% of the conditions, certain 50%, certain 25% and others did not comply any of the condition at all. They should not put all the Colleges in the same category.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that in several meetings of the Senate a demand was being made that a special meeting of the Senate should be held wherein the issues relating to the Colleges should be discussed. If it had been decided by the House that a special meeting of the Senate be held, they should not go into the technicalities. But he would like to say that there were three-four different aspects relating to the problems of the Colleges, e.g., service conditions with the Management qua the employees (suspension, dismissal, termination, etc. – which is governed by the Punjab Security of Service & Employees Act), violation of affiliation conditions. First issue is purely related to Management, employees, DPI, College Tribunal, Secretary Higher Education and the High Court. In the second issue wherein they put certain conditions for affiliation, if the Colleges violate these conditions, they step in. Third issue was where the problems of the Managements were genuine. They want to pay full salaries to the teachers, but they did not have sufficient funds. Hence, they are genuinely facing problems. Certain Managements had made two accounts. One account was which is shown to the public and the University as well. The other was where the income generated through fees, fines, capitation fee, etc. was deposited. Majority of the schools in Chandigarh had opened such accounts. Though they have to see the concern of the employees, teachers and others, the Managements which had opened such accounts should also be taken care of to ensure that they are doing their best to achieve academic excellence. Their main concern should be: (i) what are their obligations; (ii) how to perform these obligations; and (iii) how to ensure implementation of rules and regulations. While enforcing these if they found certain genuine problems, what solution they could suggest? If there was no solution, they should proceed as per law. Now-a-days, the Court trend is also very harsh. The unaided schools of Punjab, Haryana and U.T. Chandigarh were increasing their fees every year. Just three-four days before a judgement had been pronounced by a Division Bench (comprising of Justice A.K. Sikri and Justice Rakesh Jain) of Punjab & Haryana High Court that even if they were not receiving any grant-in-aid and are *prima facie* not under any obligation of the State, still they owe a responsibility towards the public and they could not enhance the fees. Now, for all the three States, they had appointed three High Courts retired Judges, i.e., for Chandigarh – Justice Mongia, for Haryana – Justice Kiran Anand Lal along with an academician and a Chartered Accountant. Any school management which wants to enhance the fee, has to approach them. In nutshell, he suggested that their main concern should be how to implement the rules and regulations of the University, which had the force of law, and while enforcing them if they found genuine difficulties, they would certainly like to solve them. But if the Managements tried to go right and left, they should not have any sympathy with them.

On a point of order, Professor Nandita Singh said that last to last year a B.Ed. Coordination Forum was made. As B.Ed. Coordinator, she had got a notification from the Punjab Government that they could not charge more than Rs.40,000 fee. Some of the self-financing Colleges did not agree to that and they went to the Court saying that they would have their own admission process and

charged fee according to their will. They made their admission at their own level and charged fee as they wanted. They could not do anything about that. She had gone for inspections to certain Colleges of Education and found that none of the Colleges were paying salary to the teachers as per norms. After seeing this, it needed to be looked into as to how much profit such Colleges were making. Were they (i.e., Syndicate/Senate) going to become a party to that profit making?

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he had got an e-mail in Punjabi wherein it had been mentioned that they as member of the Syndicate and Senate always raise the issues related to teachers of the affiliated Colleges. Even the Inspection Committees which inspected the Colleges enquire about the salary and service conditions of the teachers, but none enquire about the service conditions of the non-teaching staff which was worse than the teachers. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to make a request to Minister for Higher Education, Punjab, and the D.P.I.s (Colleges), Punjab and U.T., Chandigarh, to attend the special meeting of the Senate scheduled to be held on 27th April 2013.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that for the last 20 years they had completely reversed their stand. The University Act says that while granting affiliation or extension of affiliation it had to be ensured that a given College had sufficient financial resources for continuance as a College and continuing the courses for which affiliation had been sought. It is the duty of the University and if they find as the Colleges are saying that they did not have financial resources, the affiliation are not to be granted and, if granted, needed to be cancelled. Right in the beginning Section 27 (g) of the Act says that "the financial resources of the College are such as to make due provision for its continued maintenance". Similarly, Regulation 15, Chapter VIII (A) relating to Affiliated Colleges clearly says that the College has to send a statement indicating along with the application for affiliation/extension of affiliation financial resources of the College, including statement of annual income and expenditure. Thereafter, every affiliated College in the month of July or August or in such other month as the Syndicate may, from time to time determine, shall submit annually a report to the Syndicate indicating, *inter alia*, income and expenditure of the previous financial year. This is all to ensure to the watch dog or a regulatory body that no financial crunch is there in a given College, because if there is any financial crunch in the College, the salary of teachers and non-teaching and quality of education would be affected and to ensure that quality of education is not affected. But unfortunately they had started acting otherwise, as if they had to ensure functioning of the College by hook or crook even by paying a salary to the teachers between Rs.6,000/- and Rs.10,000/- p.m.

Professor Naval Kishore said that certain cases of the Colleges for grant of extension of affiliation for the year 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 are pending. They should be also discussed threadbare and decision taken accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that though in the most of the Colleges the inspections had taken place for grant of extension of affiliation, the reports had not been placed before the Syndicate so far. He did not know for what reasons these had not been placed before the Syndicate. Since some of the inspection reports are very

serious, those should have been placed before the Syndicate as most urgent item, but it had not come. It had not happened for the first time, but in the past also even when the inspections had taken place in the months of February/March, they were placed before the Syndicate in the month of May/June/July to ensure that the Colleges make the admissions and, thereafter, in the interest of the students, in spite of the fact that affiliation had not been recommended by the Inspection Committee, they had no alternative but to grant the affiliation. Why some of the items had not been brought to the Syndicate? Secondly, it is the Syndicate which is to consider the inspection report submitted by the Inspection Committees and, thereafter, it is the discretion of the Syndicate whether to accept the recommendations of the Inspection Committees or not, and whatever else the Syndicate wanted to add. Only thereafter, the University is supposed to write to the College for compliance within 10 days. But what had happened that a circular had been issued that the Inspection Committee had to give a copy of its report on the same day to the Principal of the College concerned for compliance irrespective of the fact that whether the Syndicate agreed to the recommendations of the Committee or not. They had come across with the cases in the Syndicate where two Colleges were at par with each other. One Inspection Committee recommended that the College needed to appoint three more teachers, but the other Inspection Committee recommended that the College needed to appoint only one more teacher. The University was approving both the inspection reports because both the Colleges said that whatever the Inspection Committee recommended, they had complied with. They should not go beyond the Calendar. Once the Inspection Committee submitted its report, it becomes the property of the Syndicate and it should be brought to the Syndicate in the first instance. They should not wait for receipt of inspection reports of all the Colleges.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that if they go through the data of the previous years, the Inspection Reports were placed before the Syndicate in July/August. The University could not do anything in this regard. He informed that almost 95% inspections of the affiliated Colleges had already been done and the letters had also been written to the Principals of Colleges for compliance in accordance with the inspection reports. He suggested that the inspection reports along with the compliance reports and letters written to the Colleges might be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. In this way, they would have a sufficient time for the purpose.

Shri Satya Pal Jain suggested that a special meeting of the Syndicate should be convened on 26th April 2013 so that if whatever is needed to be discussed/considered in the meeting of the Senate on 27.04.2013, the same could be placed before the Senate.

Professor Naval Kishore, however, suggested that after the special meeting of the Senate on 27.04.2013, a special Syndicate should be convened wherein all such inspection reports should be discussed and decision taken accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that some people belonging to the Colleges being run by the S.G.P.C. came and met the Vice-Chancellor. After the meeting, a letter had also gone to the effect what they wanted. He suggested that whether it is S.G.P.C. or D.A.V. or S.D. Institutions or any other individual Institutions, the rules/regulations should be made applicable uniformly. Because the

Colleges had started saying that they would not get the inspections conducted. But a letter had already been issued, succumbing to their pressure and contrary to the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate. They said that they wanted inspections only for the courses of their choice. The University had taken a stand that their inspections would be, as were in the cases of other Colleges. How, under what circumstances and under whose orders, the letter had gone?

Professor Nandita Singh said that NCTE had given specific dates by which the process of affiliation should be completed and if it is not done it would be treated as contempt of court.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that 17 Engineering Institutions are at the verge of closure and are on sale in the State of Tamil Nadu. Therefore, they should be very careful and guide their institutions correctly, so that they should not face such kind of situation.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 28.1.2013 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Principals of all the Education Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University and that of the meeting of the Committee dated 6.2.2013 (**Appendix-XI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to devise means and ways as would help in streamlining the education process in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, be forwarded to the Senate for a threadbare discussion.

Academic Calendar for the session 2013-14

22. Considered minutes dated 5.3.2013 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalize the Academic Calendar for the session 2013-14 to be observed by the Teaching Departments, Regional Centres of the Panjab University and the affiliated Colleges (Arts, Science, Commerce & Education).

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that since the proposed Academic Calendar (Appendices 'B', 'D', 'E', 'F' and 'G') for affiliated Colleges of Education running B.Ed./B.Ed. Yoga/B.P.Ed./M.P.Ed. courses and Department of Education (M.P.Ed. courses General, Educational Technology and Guidance & Counselling) for the academic session 2013-2014 was not in accordance with the N.C.T.E. guidelines, the same needed to be modified.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that a Committee comprising Professor Nandita Singh, Principal S.S. Sangha (Dean, Faculty of Education), and Dr. Tarlok Bandhu, be constituted to make necessary alterations in these Academic Calendars. The Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Calendars for the University Teaching Departments, P.U. Regional Centres, affiliated Colleges with postgraduate courses having Semester System, for the academic session 2013-2014, as per Annexure 'A', and Annexure 'C', respectively, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the following Committee be constituted to suggest alternations, keeping in view the N.C.T.E. guidelines, in the proposed Academic Calendars for affiliated Colleges (Arts, Science, Commerce & B.P.Ed. having Annual System), affiliated Colleges of Education running B.Ed./B.Ed. Yoga/B.P.Ed./ M.P.Ed.

courses and Department of Education (M.P.Ed. courses General, Educational Technology and Guidance & Counselling) for the academic session 2013-2014, Annexure 'B', Annexure 'D', Annexure 'E' Annexure 'F' and 'G', respectively:

1. Professor Nandita Singh ... (Chairperson)
2. Principal S.S. Sangha
3. Dr. Tarlok Bandhu
4. Deputy Registrar (Colleges) ... (Convener)

Keeping in view the urgency of the matter, the meeting of the Committee be convened at the earliest. The Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Hereinafter, Item 41 on the agenda was taken up for consideration.

**Appointment of Director
Public Relations-cum-
Editor, PU News, Panjab
University, Chandigarh**

41. Considered minutes dated 11.04.2013 of the Selection Committee (**Appendix-XIII**) for appointment of Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Mr. Vineet Punia be appointed Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the grade of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.6,600/- plus allowances admissible under the University rules, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Ms. Kamalpreet Kaur be placed on the Waiting List.

- NOTE:**
1. A summary bio-data of the selected and waiting listed candidate/s is/are enclosed.
 2. Certified that the selected and wait-listed candidates fulfil the qualifications laid down for the post.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of appointment to Mr. Vineet Punia, who has been appointed Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News, be issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

At this stage, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that in the meeting of the Senate held in December 2012, he and Professor B.S. Bhoop had raised the issue of appointments in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences. In fact, they had objected for declaring a candidate eligible taking into consideration his qualification obtained after the last date of submission of application. Ultimately, the Senate decided to review all those appointments in whose cases the qualifications after last date of submission of application were taken into consideration, through a Committee.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that the appointments referred to by Dua were still under scanning by the Committee and had not been cleared because some of the candidates had approached the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. He had also called Professor B.S. Bhoop, who had come and met him. Professor Bhoop had made only

one request that the candidates who had approached the Court, their cases should not be cleared and those cases be decided by the Court as per law. The Committee had cleared only those cases, where after examination it did not find any weight in the objections. The Committee had also gone through the reply filed by the University in the Court as well as the writ petitions and the lawyers of the University had been asked to give their opinion, because sometimes the courts did not grant stay in writing, rather granted stay orally. As such, all the cases which are pending in the court, had not been cleared by the Committee. In one of the cases, a girl was selected at two places. Though she had submitted the thesis and her viva was conducted, it was said that she was not eligible on that day. Now, some of the members had been suggesting that the Ph.D. should be treated awarded as and when the viva of the candidate is held. They sought the entire record. Professor R.P. Bambah observed that as per existing regulations, the final authority for award of Ph.D. is the Syndicate. How could they say that on the date of viva, Ph.D. is awarded? Fortunately for her, the last date for submission of application was 31st January and on the same day the Syndicate decided to confer degree on her. Hence, the Committee decided to clear her appointment. Neither any representation was made against her nor it was challenged in the court of law. One of the cases was of Library Science where it was said that though the candidate had obtained Ph.D. degree, he had not qualified U.G.C. NET, then they sought clarification and observed that in that case qualification of NET was not required.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he just wanted to point out that an item relating to appointment of Assistant Professor in the Department of Statistics was not approved by the Senate itself and it was the only item which the Senate did not approve and that did not fall within the purview of the Committee. They could check the proceedings of the Senate, it was the only item where the Vice-Chancellor had said that this item is not approved because on the last date of submission of application she was not eligible as her result of Ph.D. was notified subsequently. He did not know how that item was cleared by the Committee. They could see it from the video recordings of the proceedings of the Senate.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that the item was placed before the Committee and the office also said that on the last date of submission of application she was not eligible, but the Committee overruled the office. Now, also certain members, including Professor Shelley Walia, said that the day the viva of the candidate is held, Ph.D. degree should be treated as awarded.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that an I.A.S. was appointed as Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh University and he asked for the record for the last five years whether there was any candidate whose case for award of Ph.D. degree was rejected after the conduct of viva voce and the answer was no. For five years, till he remained the Vice-Chancellor, he simply abolished the viva. If they had to award Ph.D. to everybody, what is the need of viva voce and the notification as well. They knew that the last date for submission of application was 31st January, but how do they know about Kurukshetra University, Bombay University, etc. where there might be different procedure. Which date would they consider the final date? It was in their University that the Syndicate is the authority to finalize the award of degree. Therefore, the Panjab University and every University in India

decided that the date of notification, i.e. declaration of result, under the signatures of competent authority, is the date which they took into consideration. They had decided and could decide for future also, but in the Universities where there is no Syndicate, what would they do? It is a settled law that only the date of notification of result which is the date of passing the examination. That was why the Senate specifically disapproved only that item and the others were referred to the Committee.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he recalled that there was one Department where everybody was conceding that the candidate was not eligible and the said candidate should not have been cleared by anybody without the Senate approval. Even if that candidate was eligible, he/she should not have been cleared.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar enquired whether he/she was that candidate, who was selected at two places?

The Vice-Chancellor said that on the date of the Senate meeting, he was not aware of that the Syndicate had cleared the award of Ph.D. degree to her on that last date of application.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they should not be strict regarding such rules that it had to go to the Syndicate or the Senate. For instance, if a candidate appeared in the viva under his (Shelley Walia) supervision and he on his letter head issued a certificate that the reports were favourable and viva was successful, that should be considered the date of the award of Ph.D. degree. In fact, the day the viva of his wife was conducted, she went to the Faculty Office at Cambridge University to get a copy of the certificate, whereas the final certificate for her Ph.D. was to be awarded at the University Convocation. Had the Syndicate during the last 20 years rejected any award of Ph.D. degree? Then why delay giving the student a document certifying that he/she has successfully completed her viva?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that some of the students had demanded that the Budget should be put on the University Website. Further, some of the employees had got notices from the Income Tax Department regarding non-deposit of their income tax by the University. He handed over the representations in this regard to the Vice-Chancellor on the floor of the House.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that in one of the meetings of the Syndicate they decided to grant increments for Ph.D. degree. But that decision was not being implemented on the plea that it required approval by the Senate. He suggested that, that decision of the Syndicate should be implemented in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

RESOLVED: That the decision taken by the Syndicate dated 16.03.2013 (Para 11) regarding grant of increments to the faculty members on acquiring Ph.D. degree, be implemented in anticipation of approval of Senate.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that answer-books were not reaching the Evaluation Centres and the teachers are sitting idle. It should be ensured that the answer-books are sent to all the Evaluation Centres so that results are declared at the earliest.

At this stage, the meeting was adjourned.

The meeting of the Syndicate, which was adjourned on 15th April 2013, was held on 25th April 2013 at 3.30 p.m. in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh, to take up the remaining Items of the agenda. The following were present:

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|----------------|
| 1. | Professor A.K. Grover
Vice-Chancellor | ... | (in the Chair) |
| 2. | Shri Ashok Goyal | | |
| 3. | Dr. Dinesh Talwar | | |
| 4. | Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon | | |
| 5. | Shri Harpreet Singh Dua | | |
| 6. | Dr. Jagwant Singh | | |
| 7. | Professor Keshav Malhotra | | |
| 8. | Professor Naval Kishore | | |
| 9. | Principal R.S. Jhanji | | |
| 10. | Dr. R.P.S. Josh | | |
| 11. | Shri Satya Pal Jain | | |
| 12. | Professor Shelley Walia | | |
| 13. | Dr. Tarlok Bandhu | | |
| 14. | Professor A.K. Bhandari
Registrar | ... | (Secretary) |

Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Nandita Singh, Dr. Satish Kumar, Smt. Gurpreet Kaur Sapra, Director Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh and Shri Tarsem Dhariwal, D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Vice-Chancellor’s Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, “I feel immense pleasure in informing the distinguished members of the House that the Hon’ble Vice-President of India and Chancellor of Panjab University, Chandigarh, has very kindly consented to be the Chief Guest and to inaugurate Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni National Seminar scheduled to be held on October 24, 2013 at 15.30 hours”.

RESOLVED: That the above information contained in the Vice-Chancellor’s statement, be noted.

Revised Regulations for change of names

18. Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 31.1.2013 (**Appendix-XIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame new Regulation regarding change of name cases received from the male/female candidates registered with this University and the Committee has recommended the following amendment in Regulation 10 at page 149 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and included some instruction therein:

Existing Regulation for Change of Name	Proposed Regulation for Change of Name
Regulation 10: a person applying for change of his name in the Register shall submit his application. a) In the case of a regular student, through the Head of the Department/Principal of the College last attended by him; b) In the case of a private candidate, through a Gazetted Officer or the Principal of an affiliated college, or an	Regulation 10: a person applying for change of his name in the Register shall submit his application. a) In the case of a regular student, through the Head of the Department/Principal of the College last attended by him; b) In the case of a private candidate, through a Gazetted Officer or the Principal of an affiliated college, or an

Existing Regulation for Change of Name	Proposed Regulation for Change of Name
<p>Officer of the University not below the rank of an Assistant Registrar, or (in the case of a Government employee) through the Head of the Department in which he is employed.</p> <p>The application shall be accompanied by -</p> <p>i) A fee of Rs. 11 (including Re.1 for notification in the Government Gazette); Or A fee of Rs.6 in the case of a woman who changes her name after marriage.</p> <p>ii) An affidavit relating to his present and proposed names duly sworn in the presence of a Magistrate or an Oath Commissioner by his parent or guardian in case he is minor or by himself, in case he is major; and</p> <p>iii) A cutting from a newspaper in which the proposed change of name has been advertised.</p>	<p>Officer of the University not below the rank of an Assistant Registrar, or (in the case of a Government employee) through the Head of the Department in which he is employed.</p> <p>The application shall be accompanied by -</p> <p>i) A fee prescribed by the university (revised from time to time);</p> <p>ii) An affidavit relating to his/her present and proposed names duly sworn in the presence of a Magistrate by his/her parent or guardian in case he/she is minor or by himself or herself, in case he/she is major; and</p> <p>iii) Newspaper (full page) in which the proposed change of name has been advertised. The validity of the advertisement will be up to one year from the date of publication.</p> <p>iv) Matriculation and Higher Secondary Part I and Higher Secondary Part II or Pre-University or Pre-Medical or Pre-Engineering or 10+2 or any other equivalent examination certificates with change of name as requested in the application form.</p> <p>Provided a woman candidate applying for change in sub-caste after her marriage will not be required to fulfill the conditions mentioned at (iii) & (iv) above. However, she will be required to submit the marriage certificate from the competent authority.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">INSTRUCTIONS</p> <p>1. Any alteration in name already recorded in the university office is considered as a change in name.</p> <p>2. Only Matric or Higher Secondary Part I passed in 1965 or thereafter or Higher Secondary Part II Examination passed or registered candidates of this University or with the University of</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">INSTRUCTIONS</p> <p>1. Any alteration in the name already recorded in the University office is considered as a change in name.</p> <p>2. Matriculation and Higher Secondary Part I and Higher Secondary Part II or Pre-University or Pre-Medical or Pre-Engineering or 10+2 or any other equivalent examination (passed from</p>

Existing Regulation for Change of Name	Proposed Regulation for Change of Name
<p>Panjab, Lahore, are allowed to apply for change in their names.</p> <p>3. Change in sub-caste is not permissible unless there is any link between the proposed and the one already shown against his/her name. This rule does not apply to women candidates who change their names due to marriage and advertisement in the newspaper is not necessary.</p> <p>4. The application should be forwarded to this Office through the Head of Institution affiliated/recognized by this University where the applicant is studying or last studied.</p> <p>Note:- In cases where the Institution last attended by a candidate is in Pakistan, the applicant, if employed, should submit his application through the Head of the Department where he is employed.</p> <p>5. A cutting from the newspaper in which the applicant has advertised the change in his/her name be pasted in the space provided for it at page 1. The advertisement will be valid up to six months from the date of publication. Attested copy of the same is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Panjab University) or registered candidates of this University are allowed to apply for change in their names.</p> <p>3. Change in sub-caste is not permissible unless there is any link between the proposed and the one already shown against his/her name. This rule does not apply to women candidates who change their sub-caste due to marriage and in their case, advertisement in the newspaper and matriculation and Higher Secondary Part I and Higher Secondary Part II or Pre-University or Pre- Medical or Pre-Engineering or 10+2 or any other equivalent examination certificates are not necessary. However, the women candidate is required to produce the marriage certificate from the competent authority.</p> <p>4. The application should be forwarded to this Office through the Head of Institution affiliated/ recognized by this University where the applicant is studying or last studied.</p> <p>5. Newspaper (full page) in which the applicant has advertised the change in his/her name be attached. The advertisement will be valid up to one year from the date of publication. Attested copy of the same will not be accepted.</p> <p>6. The prescribed fee can be paid either in cash at the University Counter in the Main Office or through Bank Draft in favour of Registrar, Panjab University preferably drawn on State Bank of India, Panjab University, Chandigarh or any scheduled bank of Chandigarh or through Crossed Indian Postal Orders drawn in favour of Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh.</p>

Existing Regulation for Change of Name	Proposed Regulation for Change of Name
	7. If the change in name is permitted, the name in the university records as well as in the duplicate copies of the certificates/degrees, if obtained will be shown in 'New Name' alias/nee 'Old Name'.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is a system in the University for changing the name. In fact, the name with which someone is generally known is alias. Whenever somebody got the name changed, his/her changed name is always written. But they write the changed name of the person alias along with the old name, which did not make any sense. He, therefore, suggested that, in future, only the changed name of the person should be mentioned as is being done by the Passport Department. Similarly, in the case of female, after her marriage, nee sub-caste acquired after the marriage is added to her original name.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that Shri Ashok Goyal is right, but in judicial matters it might create problem as there might be case/s pending against the person in his/her old name. Shri Ashok Goyal said that till the matter is sorted out, in the University records for the purpose of issuance of certificate, etc. it should be taken care of. The communications made to him, in future, should be addressed as **Shri Ashok Goyal** and not Shri Ashok Goyal alias Ashok Kumar.

Continuing, he stated that, in fact, the Committee had done a wonderful job. Referring to proposed Regulation 10(b), he stated that it is written that the application should be routed through the last Educational Institution; rather it should be Educational Institution or the Institution where the person concerned is employed. Therefore, it should be added; otherwise, they had to submit an affidavit that they are not involved in any criminal activity and not remained in jail during the gap period. But here the IAS and serving IPS also gave an affidavit that he/she (the applicant) is not involved in any criminal activity and his/her application countersigned by his/her employer is not sufficient. Those who are employed somewhere, there is definitely a gap of 20-30 years and they are asked to give an affidavit attested by the Judicial Magistrate that they are not involved in any criminal activity. He suggested that these kinds of things should be taken care of.

Shri Satya Pal Jain suggested that a column should be incorporated in the application form that he/she was/is not involved in any criminal activity/case.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the candidates, who took admissions in the Department of Laws (Evening Shift) and have gap during their passing the last examination and admission in the Department of Laws, are required to give affidavit that they are not involved in any criminal activity. Even those candidates were asked to give the affidavit, who are employed and had more than 20 years of service to their credit. He suggested that instead of affidavit, they should be asked to submit a certificate from their respective employers.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that no other University is taking such an affidavit from the students. This should not be the ground for denying education. He, therefore, suggested that they should dispense with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the problems/issues pointed out by him should be got examined and brought before the Syndicate in its next meeting, so that in the next academic session they did not face such a situation.

This was agreed to.

Procedure & Qualification for the posts of Group-IV, III, II & I category of the Laboratory & Technical cadre

19. Considered the recommendations dated 8.3.2013 (**Appendix-XIV-A**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the entire procedure for filling up the vacant posts of the Jr. Tech. G-IV of various departments of the Panjab University, and

RESOLVED: That the qualification for the posts of Group-IV, III, II & I categories of the Laboratory & Technical cadre, be amended as under:

Laboratory & Technical Cadre (Group I to IV)	Existing Qualification approved by the Syndicate	Proposed Qualification
Group-IV	<p><u>Qualification approved by the Syndicate at its meeting held on 04/11/2012</u></p> <p>Graduation in Science OR 10+2 with 3 years Diploma in relevant subject/trade.</p>	<p><u>Essential Qualification</u> Graduation with relevant subject/trade Or 10+2 in relevant stream or any other examination equivalent to 10+2, and 3 years' Diploma in the relevant subject/trade.</p> <p><u>Note :</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevant qualification and other details (i.e. desirable qualification etc., if any) will depend upon the job requirements which will be decided by the Academic/ Administrative Committee of the concerned department. 2. The posts of Jr. Tech. G-IV, will be advertised department wise in the newspaper. 3. The proficiency theory and/ or practical test will be conducted by the concerned department. 4. The criteria of the selection will be as per the guidelines, approved by the Vice-Chancellor.

Laboratory & Technical Cadre (Group I to IV)	Existing Qualification approved by the Syndicate	Proposed Qualification
<p>Group-III</p>	<p>Existing Qualification as approved by the Syndicate (Para 6.B, dated 21/03/1992), / Senate (Para II, dated 29/03/1992), if the post is to be filled in by open selection .</p> <p>B.Sc. OR Diploma (3-Years) from recognised institution with 3 Years experience; OR Diploma (2 – Years) / Certificate (2-Years) from recognised institution with 5 Years experience; OR Diploma (1 Year)/ Certificate (1 Year) from recognised institution with 7 Years experience.</p> <p>Note:-</p> <p>The required experience is to be in the line of speciality suiting job requirement.</p> <p>Before interview practical test be conducted to assess the proficiency of the candidates for required job.</p>	<p><u>Qualification for Open selection post</u></p> <p>Graduation with relevant subject/trade with 3 years' experience.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>10+2 in relevant stream or any other examination equivalent to 10+2, and 3 years' Diploma in the relevant subject/trade from recognised Institution and 3 years' experience after Diploma/ Certificate course.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>2 years' relevant Diploma/ Certificate Course from the recognised Institution after 10+2 with 4 years' experience after Diploma/Certificate course.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>1 year relevant Diploma/ Certificate Course from the recognised Institution after 10+2 with 6 years' experience after Diploma/Certificate course.</p> <p>➤ Relevant qualification and other details (i.e. desirable qualification etc., if any) will depend upon the job requirements which will be decided by the Academic/ Administrative Committee of the concerned departments.</p> <p>Note:-</p> <p>The required experience is to be in the line of speciality suiting job requirement.</p> <p>Before interview practical test be conducted by the concerned department, to assess the proficiency of the candidates for required job.</p>
<p>Group-II</p>	<p>Existing Qualification as approved by the Syndicate (Para 6.B, dated 21/03/1992),/Senate (Para II, dated 29/03/1992).</p> <p>B.Sc. with 3 year's experience OR Diploma (3 Years) from</p>	<p><u>Qualification for Open selection post</u></p> <p>Graduation with relevant subject/trade with 6 years' experience.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>10+2 in relevant stream or any other examination equivalent to 10+2, and 3 years' Diploma in the relevant</p>

Laboratory & Technical Cadre (Group I to IV)	Existing Qualification approved by the Syndicate	Proposed Qualification
	<p>recognised institution with 5 Years experience; OR Diploma (2 Years)/ Certificate (2-Years) from recognised institution with 7 years experience.</p> <p>Note:- The required experience is to be in the line of speciality suiting job requirement.</p> <p>Before interview, practical test be conducted to assess the proficiency of the candidate for the required job.</p>	<p>subject/trade from recognised Institution and 6 years' experience after Diploma/ Certificate course. Or 2 years' relevant Diploma/Certificate Course from the recognised Institution after 10+2 with 8 years experience after Diploma/Certificate course.</p> <p>➤ Relevant qualification and other details (i.e. desirable qualification etc., if any) will depend upon the job requirements which will be decided by the Academic/ Administrative Committee of the concerned departments.</p> <p>Note:- The required experience is to be in the line of speciality suiting job requirement.</p> <p>Before interview practical test be conducted by the concerned department, to assess the proficiency of the candidates for required job.</p>
<p>Group-I</p>	<p>Existing Qualification as approved by the Syndicate (Para 6.B, dated 21/03/1992),/Senate (Para II, dated 29/03/1992).</p> <p>For Science Department M.Sc. at least 2nd class in relevant subject with 3 years experience; OR B. Pharma or B.Sc. (Med. Tech.); with 4 years experience OR B.Sc. with 5 years experience OR Diploma (3-Year) from reputed institution with 7 years experience.</p> <p>Note:- The required experience is to be in the line of speciality suiting job requirement.</p>	<p>Qualification for Open selection post</p> <p>Post Graduation in relevant subject with 55% marks with 5 years experience. Or B.Pharma/B.Tech./B.E./B.Sc. (Medical Technology) in relevant subject/trade with 6 years experience. Or B.Sc. in relevant subject/ trade with 8 years experience.</p> <p>➤ Relevant qualification and other details (i.e. desirable qualification etc., if any) will depend upon the job requirements which will be decided by the Academic/ Administrative Committee of the concerned departments.</p> <p>Note:- The required experience is to be in the line of speciality suiting job requirement.</p>

Laboratory & Technical Cadre (Group I to IV)	Existing Qualification approved by the Syndicate	Proposed Qualification
	<p><u>For other than Science /Technical Departments</u> M.A. (2nd class) in the relevant subject with 3 years experience</p>	

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the procedure for filling in the posts of Laboratory & Technical Cadre falling under categories of Group-III, II & I to be filled in 100% through promotion from amongst the internal candidates working in the department and recommended that the Clause 2.4 of the procedure approved by the Syndicate at its meeting held on 23.01.1998 (Paragraph 13), be amended as under:

Existing Clause 2.4	Proposed Clause 2.4
<p>2.4 A five member Screening Committee shall consist of the Chairman, two/three senior most faculty members, faculty member next to the Chairman and a member as Vice-Chancellor's Nominee. The Committee shall screen the applications in accordance with the prescribed qualifications, experience and job requirement together with the ACR dossiers of the candidates for the preceding three years and send the recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor. In this case, no interview/practical test will be given.</p>	<p>2.4 A five member Screening Committee shall consist of the Chairman, two/three senior most faculty members, faculty member next to the Chairman and a member as Vice-Chancellor's Nominee. The Committee shall screen the applications in accordance with the prescribed qualifications, experience and job requirement together with the ACR dossiers of the candidates for the preceding eight years out of which five should be Good or above and send the recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor. In this case, no interview/practical test will be given.</p>

- NOTE:**
1. The above said proposed qualifications and amendment may be allowed to be implemented with effect from the date of approval by the competent authority, i.e., Syndicate/Senate.
 2. The criteria for recruitment to the post of Junior Tech. G-IV as mentioned in Part C of the proceeding has already been approved by the then Vice-Chancellor and was circulated vide No. 15284-384/Estt. dated 14.7.2010, would remain the same.

Arising out of the above, Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that Pre-Screening Committees for promotions under Career Advancement Scheme of the U.G.C. had been formed. Since the senior-most persons have been ignored while forming these Committees, there was a lot of heart-burning amongst them.

The Vice-Chancellor accepted the point of Professor Keshav Malhotra and said that he would look into structure/memberships of the Committees.

Proposal of Shri Ajoy Sharma, former Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, regarding alternative system of internal assessment

20. Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 4.3.2013 (**Appendix-XV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into feed-back received from the Colleges on letter received from Shri Ajoy Sharma, Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh for suggesting alternative system of Internal Assessment:

1. The House Test being conducted in December as at present should continue as such based up to the subjective type questions with 50% marks. The style of question paper be the same as the final examination.
2. The House Test being conducted in September be replaced with the objective type questions based examination with 20% marks. This test be completed within the class-room time table within a period as specified by the College/ Department/Class-teach. The teacher may get the answers checked after thorough discussion of each question with the students. This will serve multiple functions and useful to the students and the teacher.
3. Pedagogic activities such as Lectures, workshops, seminars, project work, field trips, case studies, role-play, quiz, Power Point Presentation, Community out-reach activities etc. for the holistic development of the students be conducted any time convenient to the teachers but the assessment award must reach the University by the stipulated schedule.

To ensure much required transparency, the students must submit the report and the assessment award for this should be out of 30% marks.

50%	December Test on the format of final exam.	As per University schedule
30%	Pedagogic activities	Any time during the teaching-schedule
20%	September House Test Objective Type	Before the supplementary examination.

After discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the above-said proposal of Shri Ajoy Sharma, former Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, suggesting alternative system of Internal Assessment, along with discussion and decision of the Syndicate dated 08.09.2012/06.10.2012, be referred to the Boards of Studies, Faculties and Academic Council for consideration and recommendations.

Fact Finding Committee Report

21. Considered Report of Fact Finding Committee (**Appendix-XVI**) under the Chairpersonship of Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, Department of Sociology to conduct an on the spot Enquiry in the light of a complaint dated 16.1.2013 received from Ms. Anu Verma, Assistant Professor in English, G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur.

NOTE: The Report placed below is an exhaustive and clear report. The report clearly indicates that Shri Balwinder Singh has been indulging with

acts of harassment and discrimination towards his women Colleagues. There is also a strong probability of connivance between the accused and college authorities. He is also in the habit of indulging in misconduct during the examination work. Therefore, under the circumstances:

1. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the concurrence of the Syndicate has approved that Shri Balwinder Singh be debarred from all examination duties/work, so that he is not appointed for April, 2013 examinations.
2. The report be allowed to be placed before the Syndicate for approval and for approval of further action; namely
 - (i) Sending a copy of this report to D.P.I., Punjab requesting appropriate action against the erring teacher, Mr. Balwinder Singh;
 - (ii) Issuing show cause notice to the Management and Principal of G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya.
 - (iii) Inquiry into the circumstances in which the contractual and term appointment were terminated.
 - (iv) Inquiry into payment of salaries to contractual staff.
 - (v) Any other action, Syndicate deem fit.

The members placed on record their appreciations for the Committee headed by Professor Rajesh Gill for preparing an exhaustive and excellent report.

After threadbare discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the Report of Fact Finding Committee, to conduct an on the spot enquiry in the light of a complaint dated 16.01.2013, received from Ms. Anu Verma, Assistant Professor in English, G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur, be accepted;
- (2) a show cause notice be issued to Management and Principal G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur, to explain as to why action be not initiated against the College, under Regulation 11.1 at

page 160 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007;
and

- (3) the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in debarring Shri Balwinder Singh, Government College, Tanda Urmar, for all kinds of University work, for future, be ratified and information about this be sent to Director, Higher Education, Punjab.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur, be **not** made examination centre for University examinations and a centre for its students be created at J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya.

On an information given by Professor Naval Kishore that the Court in December 2012 had stayed the orders of the University regarding payment of Basic Pay + Dearness Allowance by the Self-Financing Colleges, the members said that it was an ex-parte decision **and unanimously suggested that the University should engage a good Lawyer, who be asked to contest the case properly.**

This was agreed to.

Item 22 on the agenda was taken up for consideration after Item 17.

**Recommendations of the
Committee dated
4.3.2013 regarding
introduction of Education
Programme under
National Vocational
Education Qualification
Framework from 2013-14**

23. Considered minutes dated 4.3.2013 and 14.3.2013 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss/finalize about the introduction of Education Programme under National Vocational Education Qualification Framework (NVEQF), Ministry of Human Resource Development, (M.H.R.D.), Government of India (New Delhi) in the Government College from the session 2013-14.

- NOTE:** 1. D.O. No.5-1/2012/DL dated 11.10.2012 (**Appendix-XVII**) received from Anant Kumar Singh, Joint Secretary (CU&L), Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India.
2. Letter No.15/15/2012-5C.Cell/93 dated 31.1.2013 received from Special Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Government of Punjab is enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired are these Community Colleges independent or within the existing Colleges? In fact, it had been clearly mentioned in the minutes of the Committee that since it is an issue which demands discussion on the policy which is to be framed, this type of programme of the Government of India is a new one and not in tune with Panjab University Regulations till that time, only National Competency Certificate (NCC4) be considered for adoption by the pilot College under this community programme. It had also been mentioned in the minutes at page 217 that 'Arising out of discussion,

attention got focused on item No.(xiv), (xv) and (xvi) text of which is reproduced below:

- “(xiv) These colleges should have full functional autonomy in respect of designing curriculum, its transaction, evaluation, declaration of result, etc. and its Board of Management should also include representatives of affiliating University, Agriculture University, relevant Industries, including Business, Service, Agriculture and Allied Sectors their Associations/Professional Guilds by whatever names they are known, Local Bodies and State Government. Once the Community Colleges become fully functional, they should be able to stand on their own but until then, there is a need for support from the Central/State Governments and the Regulatory Authorities.
- (xv) In order to facilitate this hand holding the States/UTs should constitute a broad based State Level Steering Committee (SLSC) under the chairpersonship of the Chief Secretary and having representation from all stakeholders, viz. the Universities/Colleges, State Departments of Agriculture, Industry, Labour, Finance, Higher/Technical Education and other course related Departments, Association of Industries, business and service sectors, State Directorate/Board/Council of Technical Education, etc., to co-ordinate between various departments/agencies to facilitate the activities of the college to get them completed in time.
- (xvi) The Central Government should also constitute a National Level Monitoring Committee (NLMC) having representation from all stakeholders to supervise and monitor implementation of the scheme.”

All the members, who were present in the first meeting, were present in the second meeting except Deputy Registrar (Colleges). The Committee in its first meeting recommended that:

- (i) the introduction of the vocational courses, as detailed overleaf be accepted, in principle, as per MHRD guidelines, from the session 2013-2014;
- (ii) the Chairman/Director of the concerned Departments, i.e., UBS, UIHMT and Public Health be sent the syllabus of courses for consideration and approval of the Board;
- (iii) Deputy Registrar (General) be requested to send to the Assistant Registrar (AOC), the Regulations as are applicable to such courses; and
- (iv) A.R. (AOC) must send the relevant documents within two days, to the Chairperson/Director of the concerned Departments, and

Meaning thereby, that the courses should be introduced from the session 2013-2014, but the same Committee in its second meeting made the observations that attention got focused on the above-quoted items. As per observation (xiv), it is a concept of independent Community Colleges, but the proposal which had come to the Syndicate, that too, after the two meetings of the Committee, is as if they were to consider this concept of Community Colleges in the

existing Government Colleges. The U.T. Administration requested for starting this programme in Government Postgraduate College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, in the month of February 2013, whereas the last date for applying for any course was 01.10.2012. Further, the letter of Government of India, which had been written to the respective Governments was way back in August 2012 and they had crossed all the dates. The Committee in its first meeting considered the case of Postgraduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, as a Community College and, however, he was happy that the Committee in its second meeting realized its mistake. Though the Government of India did not provide, the U.T. Administration at its own decided that these courses be divided amongst the five Government Colleges and had sent an affiliation fee of Rs.10,000/- @ Rs.2,000/- per College. According to him, such kind of proposal should have been rejected straightaway and returned to them instead of placing the same before the Committee. But he could understand the reason since the request had come from a very important organization, i.e., Chandigarh Administration, where the University is also afraid of enforcing its Regulations.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that though the MHRD had allowed one Community College in Chandigarh, i.e., Postgraduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, surprisingly the Chandigarh Administration at its own level included four other Colleges in it. He enquired whether the aided Colleges lag behind the Government Colleges as far as infrastructure and other things were concerned. Secondly, the composition of the Committee was such that the people from the Government Colleges had been made members and none had been included in the Committee from the aided Colleges. Thirdly, Shri Anant Kumar Singh, Joint Secretary (CU&L), Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India, vide letter dated 11.10.2012 had sought the compliance report by September 2012, which was surprising.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that already there were a lot of complexities in the Panjab University as they were not able to take care of its existing affiliated Colleges. Besides, the Government had given them the Constituent Colleges. Now, another concept of Community Colleges had come. They should also think over as to where they ought to fix some limit. In the instant case, some persons sat together and recommended community education and the Committee met without the approval of the Syndicate and Senate. The Committee had recommended acceptance of Community Colleges, in principle, which was neither approved by the Syndicate nor the Senate. The Committee recommended that the syllabus should be prepared. Fortunately, he was member of the Board of Studies for Hospitality and he requested the other members of the Board not to do any exercise as it had not been approved by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is a new thing and the Central Government had set aside a huge amount for establishment of 200 Community Colleges on pilot basis. They could take a stand that they did not want to participate in it, but the U.T. Administration would take offence to it. He, however, informed the members that as per their wish, he had requested all the Ex-Officio members of the Senate to attend the meeting of the Senate scheduled for 27th April 2013.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that as said by Professor Keshav Malhotra and others this concern is not right in the University system. The MHRD had proposed this task of Vocational Education and Skill Development Task primarily for Polytechnics and Engineering Colleges. Though the MHRD had allowed one Community College in Chandigarh, i.e., Postgraduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh. The decisions notified by the MHRD, are constitutionally binding, but everything had come so late. If they say that they could not do it in Government College, that would be far beyond their competence. But as per their system, it is too late. Therefore, they should suggest them to introduce this concept from the next academic session or that it should be assigned to Chandigarh Polytechnics College, Sector 26, Chandigarh.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that basically it is community education, but the Committee had been constituted to finalize the introduction of Education Programme under National Vocational Education Qualification Framework (NVEQF) and the words 'Vocational Education' are missing. It is vocational education and is necessarily to be covered by the State Technical Education Board. The Committee in its meeting held on 14.03.2013 had unanimously felt that since it is an issue which demands discussion on the policy which is to be framed, since this type of programme of the Government of India is a new one and not in tune with Panjab University regulations till that time, it was recommended that only National Competency Certificate (NCC4) be considered for adoption by the pilot colleges under this community programme. In fact, NCC4 is Advance Diploma. Wherefrom the University had the expertise to conduct the NCC4 is also not explained by the Committee? The representative of the U.T. Administration was there in the Committee and the Committee had recommended that for the time being it is not possible. There were two letters one addressed to Punjab Government and another addressed to U.T. Administration. Interestingly, there is no request from the Punjab Government wherein they had so many affiliated Colleges. Mr. Anant Kumar Singh, in his letter dated 11.10.2012 had stated that if no response is received till 30.10.2012, it would be construed that the State is not interested in the scheme and the Colleges allotted to the said State would be given to other States/UTs showing keen interest in the Scheme. Therefore, it is optional for the State because the spirit of the letter clearly showed that they had to open independent Community College. The U.T., Chandigarh, had come out with a novel idea that Postgraduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, should be allowed as a Community College. Why not the Chandigarh Polytechnic be allowed to function as a Community College? The MHRD had asked them for identification, registration and Skill Knowledge Providers for enabling flexible skill programmes community colleges/polytechnics could allow learners after assessing their prior learning to acquire credits through modular courses and certification. It is to be done through Schools, Boards, AICTE and the University is not in the picture. The Punjab Government had written that as a pilot project they had to establish four Community Colleges, two in the Degree Colleges and two in the Polytechnic Colleges. But not even a single College had been opened so far. Moreover, the private Colleges had not been taken into consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the U.T. Administration's point of view was that since the University had resources available, it would provide some software input in the form of syllabus, etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they should take the Syndicate and Senate seriously because they are feeling completely isolated and ignored as some policy decisions, which are only within the purview of the Syndicate and Senate, are being taken by the University Administration, circulated and implemented without the knowledge of these bodies. Even the Dean, College Development Council had said that after doing the whole exercise, they had brought the matter in the notice of the Syndicate. Did they lack faith in the Dean, College Development Council or Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor? Why they did not directly say that they did not bother about the Syndicate? One such circular had been issued and had also been given to the Press and put on the University Website regarding Professor Emeritus, Fellows of various academies, duties and functions of re-employed teachers, despite the fact that the Syndicate had taken the decision that no re-employed teacher should be appointed member of any Committee. In fact, it was left to the respective Department to utilize the services of experienced faculty members, if they feel necessary. But the University had issued a circular for appointing the re-employed teachers on various Committees. The circular issued was totally in contrast to the Calendar of the University and the Syndicate decision. If any question is asked, they are not able to explain except that the Dean, College Development Council had said that the Syndicate would be informed about the decision as *fait accompli*. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to ensure that such a message should not go in future that the Syndicate and the Senate are just regulatory bodies and are not to consider any academic issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how many times, the Syndicate had generated the proposal which related directly to the academics. Here they just validate the decisions, which are taken by the lower bodies.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate is supposed to do this as they had got Board of Studies, Faculties, Academic Council. These bodies took academic decisions, which came to the Syndicate for approval. If the Syndicate started doing this, objection would be, what for these academic bodies were there?

The Vice-Chancellor said that in this particular case, the Government of India, in its wisdom, has sought to provide a new scheme for employment opportunities to younger generations. Under this scheme, some decisions have been made and in compliance we have to do something. All this is on experimental basis. The proposal had come from the U.T. Administration and one course of action should have been that approval of the Syndicate should have been sought before the constitution of a Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the meeting of the Committee was convened on 14th March 2013, which is too late.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the process had been set in motion. However, if it had been initiated because of compulsions, the members of the Syndicate should have been informed through e-mail.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that neither the Panjab University is prepared for the purpose nor it had expertise in it. Therefore, the Chandigarh Administration should be requested to open the Community College in Chandigarh Polytechnic College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whenever it is mandatory to have concurrence of the Syndicate for a policy decision, the concurrence of the Syndicate would be sought through e-mail or by calling an emergent meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the provision for calling an emergent meeting of the Syndicate already existed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they had serious reservations and apprehensions about this item, the Chandigarh Administration would be requested that it would be better to open the Community Colleges in Chandigarh Polytechnic College.

This was agreed to.

Inspection Report

24. Considered if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to A.S. College, Khanna, for Diploma Add-on-course in (i) Travel & Tourism (ii) Biotechnology and (iii) Industrial Chemistry as per UGC guidelines under UGC/ Self-Financing course, for the session 2013-2014.

NOTE: Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that it needed to be sent to the Board of Studies because these are self-financing Add-On courses and if they look at the syllabi of these courses, they had proposed 160 lectures each on Industrial Chemistry and Bio-Technology, which they normally allocate for main/core B.Sc. subject. The students, who were supposed to do this Add-On course, they were already burdened with four core subjects. In fact, the entire syllabi of B.Sc. (Industrial Chemistry) and (Biotechnology) had been prescribed for these Add-On courses. He, therefore, suggested that the syllabi prepared by the College/s should be referred to the concerned Board of Studies.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they had already made two recommendations. In fact, both Biotechnology and Industrial Chemistry courses were of 24 credits and though they had been reduced to 12 credits through the Board of Studies, the syllabus was same.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to A.S. College, Khanna for Diploma Add-On course in (i) Travel & Tourism (ii) Biotechnology and (iii) Industrial Chemistry for the session 2013-2014 as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Financing course.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the syllabi for Add-On courses in Industrial Chemistry and Biotechnology be referred back to the concerned Board of Studies.

Inspection Report

25. Considered if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Guru Nanak National College, Doraha, Ludhiana for Advance Diploma Add-On course in (i) Nursery Teacher Training and (ii) Animation &

Graphics as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Financing course, for the session 2013-2014.

NOTE: Inspection Report and office note are enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).

RESOLVED: That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Guru Nanak National College, Doraha, Ludhiana, for Advance Diploma Add-On course in (i) Nursery Teacher Training; and (ii) Animation & Graphics for the session 2013-2014, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing course.

Inspection Report

26. Considered if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to P.G. Govt. College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh for Diploma Add-on-course in (i) Disaster Management (ii) Entrepreneurship (iii) Web Designing & Graphics (iv) Animation & Graphics and (v) Mass Communication & Video Production as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Financing course, for the session 2013-2014.

NOTE: Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).

RESOLVED: That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to P.G. Govt. College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh, for Diploma Add-On course in (i) Disaster Management; (ii) Entrepreneurship; (iii) Web Designing & Graphics; (iv) Animation & Graphics; and (v) Mass Communication & Video Production, for the session 2013-2014 as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing course.

Issue regarding grant of 25% tuition fee concession to the wards of retired teachers of affiliated Colleges

27. Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 29.11.2012 (**Appendix-XXI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance with the decision of the Syndicate dated 29.4.2012 (**Appendix-XXI**) that 25% tuition fee concession be extended to the wards of the retired teachers of affiliated colleges at par with the in-service teachers of such affiliated Colleges in respect of self-financing courses in the University and its Regional Centres.

NOTE: The expenditure on account of concession allowed to the students shall be borne out of the College Development Council Fund. This concession shall be affected with effect from the session 2012-2013.

RESOLVED: That 25% tuition fee concession be extended to the wards of the retired teachers of affiliated Colleges at par with the in-service teachers of such affiliated Colleges in respect of self-financing courses in the University and its Regional Centres.

Inspection Report

28. Considered if temporary extension of affiliation for M.Phil in Psychiatry Social work and M.Phil. in Clinical Psychology be given to Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh for the session 2011-12 with the condition that the College will follow other instructions of the RCI/UGC/UT administration Chandigarh/Panjab University.

NOTE: 1. In view of the compliance communicated and the recommendation of the Committee, temporary/extension of

affiliation for 2011-12 may be considered. The college has not admitted students for 2012-13. The extension of affiliation to the course, when requested would only be considered on compliance of 100% conditions.

2. Dr. Krishan Gauba has opined that the case pertains to granting of affiliation for the M.Phil. course in Clinical Psychology and M.Phil Psychiatry social work to the batch admitted in 2011-12. The college has already complied with the deficiency pointed out by the RCI team and further the Inspection Team appointed by P.U. has also recommended for granting the affiliation for this batch. GMCH has not admitted any further batch thereafter and has sought guidance & direction from RCI in this aspect, in view of this and based upon the recommendations of the Inspection Team of P.U., it is desired that the affiliation for the batch admitted in 2011-12, may kindly be granted keeping in view the interest of the students admitted.
3. Inspection Committee Report of Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh is enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu pointed out that though temporary extension of affiliation for M.Phil. in Psychiatry Social Work and Clinical Psychology sought by Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, was meant for the session 2011-2012, the report of the Inspection Committee was coming to the Syndicate in April 2013, i.e., two years late, when the affiliations/extension of affiliations were being granted for the session 2013-2014. Moreover, no compliance report had been attached. Now, they had no alternative except to grant extension of affiliation.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that whatever had been pointed out by Dr. Tarlok Bandhu is right. The Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, had made admissions during the session 2011-12, but had not complied with the conditions of the RCI. However, during the session 2012-2013, the College did not make any admission. Though the relevant papers should have been attached with the item, the same had not been attached. He informed that the Committee had recommended that the College should be warned not to repeat the mistake in future.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that it had been written in the Note 2 that the College had already complied with the deficiency pointed out by the RCI team and the Inspection Team appointed by the Panjab University had also recommended for grant of affiliation for this batch. The College had not admitted any further batch.

Professor Naval Kishore said that he did not know how this note had been incorporated. In fact, there was no compliance by the College. Of course, the Committee had recommended that the College

is trying to comply and it seemed that they are helping, which could not be considered compliance.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that in Note (1) it had been mentioned that in view of the compliance communicated and the recommendation of the Committee, temporary extension of affiliation for 2011-12 may be considered.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that it is *fait accompli* and nothing else. Therefore, the extension of affiliation should be granted for the session 2011-2012.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that on the basis of the notes, they were granting temporary extension of affiliation. But if these notes are to be corrected, temporary extension of affiliation could not be granted. He, therefore, suggested that the item should be brought back to the Syndicate in its meeting proposed to be held on 15.05.2013 after making necessary corrections. Since the affiliation was for 2011-12, it would not make any difference if the item is brought back on 15.05.2013.

Professor Naval Kishore said that since it is matter of only one year (2011-2012) and they had not made any admission thereafter. The temporary extension of affiliation should be granted, but a letter should be issued to the College that such things should not be repeated in future.

Professor Shelley Walia said that why did they not follow 100% compliance as a precedence?

RESOLVED: That temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, for M.Phil. in Psychiatry Social Work and M.Phil. in Clinical Psychology for the session 2011-12, with the condition that the College will follow other instructions of the RCI/UGC/UT administration Chandigarh/Panjab University. However, the College be warned not to repeat such mistake in future.

Inspection Report

29. Considered if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City for Master of Science in Cosmetology & Health Care - 2nd Year (under Innovative Programme by UGC - Teaching & Research in Interdisciplinary and Emerging Areas for the session 2013-14).

NOTE: The Inspection Committee Report of Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City and Office note are enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

RESOLVED: That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City for Master of Science in Cosmetology & Health Care-2nd Year (under Innovative Programme by UGC - Teaching & Research in Interdisciplinary and Emerging Areas for the session 2013-14).

Inspection Report

30. Considered if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Malwa College, Bondli, Samrala for Advance Diploma Add-on-course

in Web-Designing & Multimedia as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-financing for the session 2013-14.

NOTE: The Inspection Committee Report of Malwa College, Bondli, Samrala and Office note are enclosed (**Appendix-XXIV**).

RESOLVED: That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Malwa College, Bondli, Samrala, for Advance Diploma Add-On course in Web-Designing & Multimedia for the session 2013-14, as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-financing.

Deferred Item

31. Considered if affiliation to G.M.T. College of Education Jalandhar By-pass Chowk G.T. Road, Ludhiana for the session 2012-13 be not allowed till the condition imposed by the Inspection Committee are complied with. Further the admission in B.Ed. Course (200 seats) for the session 2013-14 be also not allowed.

NOTE: 1. The office vide No.Misc.A-8/1659 dated 13.2.2013 requested to the Principal that the faculty should be appointed on regular basis in compliance of the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee immediately and authentic proof to this effect i.e. proceeding of the Selection Committee, appointment and joining report be sent with the clear understanding that the affiliation for the session shall not be allowed till the condition imposed by the Inspection Committee are not complied with. Further the admission in B.Ed. course (200 seats) for the session 2013-14 shall not be allowed, but till date no reply has been received from the college.

The Dean College Development Council observed that the reported facts call for adjudication by the Syndicate.

2. An office note enclosed.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that the affiliation to G.M.T. College of Education, Ludhiana, for the session 2013-14 was yet to be granted. However, so far as compliance was concerned, the College had not fulfilled the conditions even today. But since the students had appeared in the examination, affiliation for the year 2012-13 should be granted. He added that for the next session almost all the inspections had been completed and reports received. All the reports would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting and if this College still did not fulfil the conditions, affiliation for the year 2013-14 should not be granted.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the item says that affiliation to G.M.T. College of Education, Ludhiana, for the session 2012-13 be not granted, but the Inspection Committee (page 275 of the appendix) had recommended that extension of affiliation for 2012-13 be granted.

On a point of order, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the report under consideration was for the year 2013-14. The University had written a letter in February 2013 to the College that the affiliation for the session 2012-13 shall not be allowed till the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee are not complied with and had further written that the admissions to B.Ed. (200 seats) for the session 2013-14 shall also not be allowed. Now, the students had been admitted and appeared in the University examination, could they stop declaration of their results.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that since they had already written to the College that the affiliation for the session 2012-13 shall not be allowed till the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee are complied with, how could they grant affiliation now?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this was a College in which they had to take a decision neither to the liking of the Syndicate nor in terms of the Regulations of the University just because there had been delay and the examination had already been conducted. Whether a College, which had put them in such a situation, should be allowed to go scot free? He wondered why a College, which did not fulfil the conditions imposed for the year 2012-13, had been inspected for the year 2013-14. As told by the Dean, College Development Council, that they had written a letter to the College that the College must comply with the conditions by the stipulated date, but what to talk of the compliance, the College had not even bothered to respond. Irrespective of the report of the Inspection Committee for the year 2013-14, they should take action against the College in terms of Section 27 of the Panjab University Act issuing them notice for disaffiliation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all such Colleges should be treated at par.

Professor Naval Kishore referred to page 275 of the appendix, wherein the Inspection Committee had recommended extension of affiliation to this College for the year 2012-13.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that on the basis of this inspection report, a letter had been issued to the College, which he had already referred to.

The Vice-Chancellor said that similar situation was prevailing in many Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though there were many Colleges which were not fulfilling the conditions, since the case of this College had come to the Syndicate for consideration, they should take a conscious policy decision, so that the same could be implemented in all such Colleges uniformly.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council to prepare a list of Colleges, which did not fulfil the conditions of the N.C.T.E./Punjab Government and the Panjab University so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate for appropriate decision.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred.

At this stage, when certain members suggested that the next meeting of the Syndicate should be fixed for 19th May 2013, the Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting of the Syndicate could not be fixed on 19th May 2013 as the postponed Convocation of Department of Laws had been fixed for 19th May 2013.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he was surprised that a Convocation is being conducted at the level of a Faculty. Who had taken the decision to conduct such a Convocation? Tomorrow, other Faculties of the University, including Faculty of Arts, wherein more than 153 Colleges are affiliated, would start conducting Convocation at their own level. Nobody had considered the implications of such a Convocation. Despite there being no decision by the Syndicate, how they were conducting a separate Convocation for the Faculty of Law. They had just received a phone call that the Convocation fixed for the Faculty of Law on 28.04.2013 had been postponed, but they neither received any information from the University about the said Convocation nor any card. However, could they afford to have such a Convocation where affiliated Colleges are also being invited. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to consult the decision of the Syndicate in this context.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

Action to be taken against the Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh

32. Considered the action to be taken against the Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh, for not appointing 100% faculty and compliance of other conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee (**Appendix-XXV**).

NOTE: No compliance from the College had been received despite a number of reminders/communication, the office has sent.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that the University had received a letter from Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital dated 20.02.2013, which is misleading. If they go through the earlier decisions of the Syndicate which had been conveyed to the College and the contents of this letter, the College had kept the University in dark. The College had written that the office of the undersigned received a letter dated 27.10.2012 in which the college has been asked to have 100% faculty as well as adoption of service rules to its employees. The issue regarding the requirement of faculty as per allotment of seats is still pending with the concerned ministry. It is completely wrong because the Ministry had already decided that for 100 seats, 23 faculty members are required. The College had also written that the management had promoted some faculty members and the case was sent to the University for its approval, which is also completely wrong because the Syndicate vide its decision dated 29.02.2012 had already rejected these promotions because the promotions were not carried through the properly constituted Selection Committee/s and the decision of the Syndicate was conveyed to the College through a letter and e-mail as well. The College had claimed that the management had also conducted interviews for four posts (i.e. one post of Associate Professor and three posts of Assistant Professors) and proceedings followed vide reminder no.HMC/138 dated 01.02.2013. It is again

wrong claim of the College because the promotion of one of the teachers from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor had also been rejected by the University as the teacher concerned was not eligible. And for one of the posts, no candidate appeared for the interview and the other two posts were filled on contractual basis. The above quoted decisions had already been conveyed to the College. Presently, the College had 12 regular faculty members and in accordance with the new guidelines, 12 more faculty members are required to be appointed. The College had given advertisement in one newspaper, i.e., Hindustan Times on 13.04.2013 for filling up of 10 faculty positions, whereas as per the mandate of the University, the advertisement is required to be given in two newspapers. On 18.04.2013, the College gave advertisement in another newspaper, but neither specific qualifications nor pay-scale had been mentioned in it. Since 2005, the College had advertised the posts for five times and the post/s had been filled once. Firstly, the interviews were held in 2006 when Professor S.K. Kulkarni was the nominee of the Vice-Chancellor in the Selection Committee and he strongly wrote that the College is trying to make appointments in an arbitrary manner and till date, the result of those selections had not been declared. On the intervention of the University, the College advertised 17 posts in 2007, but interviews were never conducted. Thereafter, in 2008 four posts were advertised (one Professor and three Lecturers) and they filled up the same. In February 2011, the College advertised 11 posts, but the management wrote to the University not to send the panel. In December 2011, four posts were advertised (one on regular and three on contractual basis). For one post no candidate appeared in the interview. The University had already given reply to them that since the selected candidate is not eligible, his/her appointment could not be approved. The College was doing all this despite the best efforts of the University. Inspection Committees are inspecting the College, posts were being advertised, interviews are not being held and if at all interviews were held, results are not being declared. Since 2005, only four appointments had been made – one through promotion and three Demonstrators were appointed as Lecturers. It had been mentioned in the letter written by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) to the Principal, Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital on 12.02.2013 that the compliance of the conditions imposed should be sent within seven days, but nothing had been received so far. According to him, the College should be stringently punished for not complying with the conditions of the University since 2005.

Professor Naval Kishore said that in the last meeting the Principal, Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, had submitted a letter seeking time up to 15th May 2013 and had assured that they would appoint 10 regular faculty members.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the letter of the College dated 20.02.2013 is completely misleading as the University had already rejected their case. Hence, no cognizance should be taken of the said letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the item which is placed before the Syndicate is to consider action to be taken against the Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, for not appointing 100% faculty and compliance of other conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee and the report which was considered was for the session 2011-2012 and the shortfall was 23 faculty members. Until 23 faculty members are appointed by the College, affiliation for

2011-12 could not be granted. Thereafter, when the Committee inspected the College on 13th January 2012, they recommended that the affiliation should be suspended. Meaning thereby, no affiliation to the College w.e.f. 2011-12. The College had been written by the University on 27.10.2012 that in case the College failed to appoint 23 faculty members up to November 2012, the College shall not be considered for grant of temporary affiliation for the session 2013-2014 and about 2012-13 nobody knows. Thereafter, after three and half months a reminder goes again stressing the same thing that affiliation for 2013-14 would not be granted, but nothing is mentioned about 2011-12 and 2012-13. See the smartness of the College that it automatically got affiliation for 2011-12 and 2012-13 without inspection and without fulfilling any of the conditions. Since it was a Medical College, it became a more serious issue. If the College could manage affiliation like this, he wondered whether they could take action against any of the Colleges. If at all any time is to be given to the College, the time should be given up to 15th May 2013, that too, for fulfilling the conditions for affiliation for the sessions 2011-12 and 2012-13 and not for the session 2013-14.

Professor Naval Kishore said that the Central Council for Homoeopathy had given amnesty for all the Homoeopathic Colleges throughout India for one year. That was why their cases were considered. It had been mentioned therein that the amnesty as referred to therein, neither overrides the regulations of the regulatory body nor supersedes the affiliation rules of the affiliation University; rather it mandates the compliance thereof in toto.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the letter of the CCH vide which they had given amnesty should be shown to them. In fact, the same should have been annexed with the item.

On a clarification given by Professor Naval Kishore, Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the reports of the Inspection Committees for grant of affiliation for the years 2011-12 and 2012-13 had not been placed before the Syndicate. He stressed that these reports should be brought to the Syndicate. Even if the College fulfilled the conditions up to 15th May 2013, the affiliation could not be granted retrospectively. He had also read in the newspapers that fearing action from the Panjab University, the Homoeopathic College, Chandigarh, had advertised faculty positions.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that it had been policy of the College that they only advertised the posts, but never tried to fill up those posts seriously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the College had not complied with the conditions and if they did not comply with the conditions, action should be taken against the College under Section 27 of Panjab University Act and Regulation 11.1 at page 160 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if anyone goes against the Educational College, they had made a permanent feature of filing a Caveat.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that Caveat could only be filed against an Institution/organization or an individual and not in general and its life is only one month.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That that extension of affiliation to Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh, be **not** granted.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That notice for disaffiliation be given to Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh, under Section 27 of the Panjab University Act and Regulation 11.1 at page 160 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and it be ensured that a caveat is filed in the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the following Item 33 on the agenda was withdrawn and information in this respect was given to the members in the papers circulated to the members in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 15.04.2013:

Withdrawn Item

33. To consider if the appropriate action is to be taken against S.C.D. Government College, Ludhiana for not appointing a regular faculty for the courses for which the temporary extension of affiliation was granted by the Syndicate meeting dated 4.8.2012 (Para 40(xxxiii)).

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 4.8.2012 (Para 40(xxxiii)) has granted temporary extension of affiliation for certain courses with the condition that the College will appoint regular faculty members within the current academic session 2012-2013 and documentary evidence regarding purchase of twenty Computers which is essential for these courses.
 2. The Principal, S.C.D. Government College vide letter dated 29.11.2012 has taken up the case for appointment of regular faculty with the D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab but the DPI Office vide letter dated 13.9.2012 addressed to Govt. College, Ludhiana has stated that Government has banned to appoint the regular teacher in Government Colleges.
 3. The D.R. (Colleges) has opined that there are no two sets of guidelines/ norms to deal with the same issue in Government /non-Government affiliated Colleges to maintain uniformity/parity.
 4. An office note enclosed.

Issue regarding admission of excess students in various courses by S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur

34. Considered issue of admitting in various courses students in excess than the approved intake by the S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur (Hoshiarpur), during the academic sessions 2010-11, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

- NOTE:** 1. The College admitted excess number of students than the approved intake during the **session** 2011-12 (**Appendix-XXVI**).

The University imposed a fine of Rs.1 lac for violation with the stipulated that the college admit the students the courses for the session 2011-12 by reducing the number of students admitted the excess than the approved intake the 2011-12 again the College admitted more number of students than approved intake during 2011-12 (**Appendix-XXVI**) and 2012-13 also (**Appendix-XXVI**).

2. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

Dr. R.P.S. Josh remarked that what the University was doing during the last four years. Why the case was not placed before the Syndicate earlier?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the fine, which had been imposed, was for the session 2011-12 and along with the fine, condition was imposed vide letter dated 22nd December 2011 that 'as per orders of the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor your College has to admit less number of students for the session 2012-2013 in the following classes to equal number of students admitted more than the sanctioned strength for the session 2010-2011. Meaning thereby, instead of taking fee charged from the students from the College, the University asked the College to admit less number of students next year. But instead of admitting less number of students, it has admitted excess students during the session 2012-13 as well. Now, the issue which is to be considered is, as far as 2011-12 is concerned, they had imposed the fine with the stipulation that next year 2012-13, the number of excess students admitted, should be minus from the actual intake for the admission of 2012-13. Though the fine had been remitted to the University, the condition had not been followed. What is the penalty for the second offence? Now, the fine could not be less than which was imposed earlier. But the Principal of the College, in spite of the orders of the Vice-Chancellor that the names of the students who had been admitted in excess, should be struck off the rolls, had replied vide letter dated 22nd February 2011 that due to clerical mistake and oversight of admission Committee the students in excess had been admitted. He had further intimated that it was quite impossible to strike off the names of the students from the College rolls because it might spoil their career and had requested to confirm the admissions of the so admitted students on mercy ground and also to avoid the litigation. The Principal had assured that such type of mistakes would not be repeated in future. In the light of this letter of the Principal, the decision to strike off the names of the students was withdrawn and the penalty of Rs.1 lac along with the above said condition was imposed on the College. But the College had again committed the same mistake. Could they consider it two punishments for one offence; rather it is case of a person who had committed an offence was warned and also fined and also cautioned to follow the Regulations/Rules of the University? But knowingly, he again committed the same offence. Hence, it seemed he had become a habitual offender and not to punish a habitual offender, would not be proper. He, therefore, suggested that

a fine of Rs.2 lac plus the fee charged from the excess admitted students should be imposed on the College.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that firstly they had to identify the subjects in which excess admissions than the permitted limit had been made and, thereafter, the number of such students. Secondly, as per the N.C.T.E. norms, the University on 28.02.2011 increased the number of seats for B.P.Ed. from 50 seats to 100 seats and M.P.Ed. from 30 seats to 40 seats. Presently, there was no excess admission in the B.P.Ed. and M.P.Ed. courses. Similarly, for B.Com. the College had two units. In M.Sc. (Physics), the number of students admitted are 17, which is less than the intake of seats. Before calculating the amount of fine, all this should be verified.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if any mistake is committed willfully, it is not a mistake. The Principal himself is writing that unless and until the competent body took the decision, the decision could not come into force. It says that the NCTE in its notification No.F-51-1/2009-NCTE (N&S) dated 31.08.2009 had already enhanced the intake seats from 30 to 40 for M.P.Ed. and also B.P.Ed. (Annual) from 50 seats to 100 seats. The Board of Studies of Physical Education had also accepted this notification in its meeting held on 24.07.2012, in which the undersigned was also present. According to the above mentioned NCTE orders, this institution admitted 82 students in the B.P.Ed. (Annual) against the sanctioned 100 seats. The question was if the Board of Studies had accepted the enhancement in the number of seats, could the College admit students accordingly, especially when the Inspection Committee had inspected the College only for 50 seats keeping in view the infrastructure available with the College. Now, the argument that he had admitted 82 students in the B.P.Ed. (Annual) against the sanctioned 100 seats, is not sustainable.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the Syndicate had already approved the enhancement of seats and the same could be verified from the minutes of the Syndicate dated 28.02.2011 (Para 19) wherein they had approved the latest recommendations of the NCTE.

Shri Ashok Goyal argued that if he inspects a College where the classroom could accommodate only 20 seats, would he recommend 100 seats or 20 seats? He pointed out that the Inspection Committee had recommended extension of affiliation for B.P.Ed. with 50 seats. If the Inspection Committee had recommended specifically 50 seats, how could they grant 100 seats? Therefore, the proposed fine should be approved.

Dr. Jagwant Singh suggested that the excess number of seats should be re-calculated and verified with the University record and there should not be any error. It should also be verified whether the University had given approval for enhancement of seats.

RESOLVED: That a fine of Rs.2 lac plus the fee charged from the excess admitted students, be imposed on the College. The excess number of seats (course-wise) be calculated and verified by Professor Keshav Malhotra.

Withdrawn Item

35. Considered recommendation of the Selection Committee dated 24.1.2013 for appointment of Mrs. Avninder Kaur, Assistant Professor in Clothing & Textile against UGC sponsored Innovative Programme MFDM in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +Rs.6000/- A.G.P. at a

starting pay of Rs.21600/- Plus allowances w.e.f the date of her joining at Master Tara Singh Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana.

NOTE: Payment voucher and Bank statement related to salary paid to Mrs. Avninder Kaur and office note enclosed.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that only two candidates (Mrs. Avninder Kaur and Mrs. Prerna) appeared in the interview. The Selection Committee recommended appointment of Mrs. Avninder Kaur and also placed her on the Waiting List along with Mrs. Prerna.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar, while going through the office note, said that he did not know why and who had suggested that the case be placed before the Syndicate for approval. He also read out the following noting made by the Dean, College Development Council:

A bare reading of the proceedings of the Selection Committee Flag-C; page-3 at mark 'B' reveals that the D.A. and other allowances which is an integral part of the salary has not been referred to therein, which calls for necessary corrective measure from the Chairperson of the Selection Committee/Vice-Chancellor's nominee, when after the recommendations of the College Development Council Office at mark 'A' on previous page would be met. Accordingly the issue be referred to the concerned and the Principal of the College and be asked to furnish the salary proof as per UGC/University pay-scales inclusive of D.A. & other allowances by way of Bank transfer/salary register/other mode of payment bearing the signature of the appointed candidate. But nothing in this respect had been attached.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the appointment is in the subject of Fashion Designing & Management and the appointee might be belonging to some inter-disciplinary subject and might not be fulfilling the requisite qualifications.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item should be treated as withdrawn.

This was agreed to.

Withdrawn Item

36. Considered if the minor punishment of withholding of one increment with cumulative effect be imposed upon Shri Hussan Lal, Senior Assistant, Election Cell on account of change of centre of the students of LL.B. 6th semester of Law from Chandigarh to Muktsar.

NOTE: An office note and reply of Shri Hussan Lal enclosed.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that they could not understand whether the item was coming for the first time or it had come for review.

It was clarified that the report of the Committee had been placed before the Syndicate and the same had already been accepted by the Committee. The Committee had suggested that 3-5 increments of Shri Hussan Lal be stopped with cumulative effect and his three increments were withheld. Thereafter, a representation from Shri Hussan Lal was received stating that his case should be considered

sympathetically and the order of major punishment of withholding three increments with cumulative effect be withdrawn.

The members suggested that a comprehensive office note be prepared and placed before the Syndicate along with the item.

This was agreed to.

Re-employment of Shri Dwarka Nath, P.A. (retiring on 30.04.2013)

37. Considered if Shri Dwarka Nath, P.A., (retiring on 30.4.2013 after attaining the age of superannuation) be re-employed for a period of six months w.e.f. 2.5.2013 in the General Branch after giving one day break on 1.5.2013 purely on contractual basis at the emoluments last salary drawn minus pension per month from the Budget Head "General Administration-Sub Head-Hiring Services/ Outsourcing Contractual/ Casual or Seasonal Workers", to enable the new incumbents to learn the techniques of preparing the minutes of various University bodies (which is of technical nature) in view of his vast experience of preparing the agenda/minutes of the meetings of the Academic Council/Syndicate/Senate etc.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in fact, Shri Dwarka Nath is so intelligent that when he became the member of the Senate and Syndicate for the first time and expressed his viewpoints in the meetings, he was quick to grasp the basic idea of his speech and elaborated the same in the proceedings in such a way that nothing remained untouched. He was devoted to the work of the University in such a manner that he was always involved in the work, even if it was not assigned to him. He always worked with great efficiency. He, therefore, suggested that the services rendered by him should be appreciated.

Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Tarlok Bandhu suggested that Shri Dwarka Nath should be re-employed for one year at a stretch.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that re-employment is good and 3-4 items were there in the items for ratification. Re-employment is being given to certain employees on the non-teaching side, invariably for one or two years. He suggested that instead of adopting the pick and choose policy, the rules should be framed for granting re-employment to the non-teaching employees for 1, 2 or 3 years, so that all the non-teaching employees superannuating at the age of 60 years are given re-employment. He was supported by Principal R.S. Jhanji.

RESOLVED: That Shri Dwarka Nath, P.A., (retiring on 30.4.2013 after attaining the age of superannuation) be re-employed for a period of one year w.e.f. 2.5.2013 in the General Branch after giving one day break on 1.5.2013 purely on contractual basis at the emoluments last salary drawn minus pension per month from the Budget Head "General Administration-Sub Head-Hiring Services/ Outsourcing Contractual/ Casual or Seasonal Workers", to enable the new incumbents to learn the techniques of preparing the minutes of various University bodies (which is of technical nature) in view of his vast experience of preparing the agenda/minutes of the meetings of the Academic Council/Syndicate/Senate etc.

Award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy

38. Considered reports of examiners of certain candidates on the theses, including viva-voce reports, for the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

RESOLVED: That the degree of Doctor of Philosophy be awarded to the following candidates in the Faculty and subject noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
1.	Ms. Bhawna Jain H.No. 16, Sector-1 Jail Land Ambala City-134003	Pharmaceutical Sciences	"FORMULATION DEVELOPMENT OF PHOSPHOLIPID STRUCTURED CARRIER SYSTEMS OF METHOXSALEN AND FINASTERIDE FOR SKIN DISEASES"
2.	Ms. Lalita Sharma H.No. 358, Sector-40 A Chandigarh.	Science / Microbiology	"PATHOPHYSIOLOGY OF PLACENTA OF PLASMODIUM BERGHEI INFECTED MICE AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY"
3.	Ms. Manie Bansal Dept. of Physics, P.U., Chandigarh	Science / Physics	"STUDY OF FUSION REACTIONS USING DEFORMED AND ORIENTED NUCLEI"
4.	Mr. Rajbir V.P.O. Garnauthi District Rohtak Haryana.	Arts	"KALIDASIYA LAGHUTRAYI MEIN CHITRIT STRIPATRON KA MANOVAIGYANIKADHYAYANA"
5.	Mr. Ajit Kishore H.No. 5758 A Sector-38 (West) Chandigarh.	Business Management & Commerce	ADOPTION AND DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN INDIAN PUBLIC SECTOR BANKS
6.	Mr. Ajay Kumar #24 MS Enclave Dhakoli Near Railway crossing Zirakpur, Mohali.	Education / Education	A STUDY OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION STRATEGIES ADOPTED BY PRINCIPALS IN RELATION TO THEIR EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
7.	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Vill. & P.O. Charara Tehsil. Bangana Distt. Una (H.P.)	Arts/ Defence and National Security Studies	AN EXPLORATION INTO U.S. MILITARY AID AND ARMS TRANSFERS IN THE POST 9/11 WORLD, THREAT TO GLOBAL PEACE AND SECURITY
8.	Ms. Gagan Chaudhary H.No. 2191 Super Enclave Sector-49C Chandigarh	Business Management & Commerce	CRM PRACTICES AND THEIR IMPACT ON PATIENT SATISFACTION AND LOYALTY: A STUDY OF SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR HOSPITALS IN PUNJAB AND CHANDIGARH
9.	Ms. Monica Chauhan R/o Dhangvi P.O. Kokunalla Tehsil Kotkhai District Shimla-171202	Sociology	CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF LADAKH: A STUDY OF CHANGE AND CONTINUITY IN LEH DISTRICT
10	Ms. Archana Sharma Deptt. of Physics P.U. Chandigarh.	Science/Physics	"STUDY OF W → μV CHANNEL AND MUON TRIGGERS FOR CMS EXPERIMENT AT LHC".

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
11.	Mr. Anurag Asija Maharishi Dayanand College of Education Abohar.	Education/ Education	SWAMI DAYANAND'S EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT AND ETHICS AND THEIR RELEVANCE IN PRESENT EDUCATIONAL SCENARIO
12.	Ms. Sunita Arya H.No.. H.M. 40, Phase-4, Mohali	Education/ Education	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COMPUTER SELF-EFFICACY, COMPUTER ANXIETY AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS COMPUTER USAGE AMONG PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN RELATION TO LOCUS OF CONTROL
13.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur H.No. 543 Giani Zail Singh Nagar Ropar	Languages/ Punjabi	PUNJABI KALI-KAV DA LOKDHARAK ADHIYAN
14.	Mr. B. Komow Boys Hostel No. 5 Room No. 14, Block – I, P.U., Chandigarh	Arts/Public Administration	ADMINISTRATION OF PRIMARY EDUCATION IN TRIBAL AREAS: A CASE STUDY OF SENAPATI DISTRICT, MANIPUR

Agenda Items 39 and 40 being Ratification and Information Items, these be read under Items 42 and 43.

Routine and formal matters

42. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xviii)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved re-employment of Dr. R.K. Wanchoo, Professor (Retd.) Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., on contract basis w.e.f. 02.04.2013 up to attaining the age of 65 years i.e. 10.03.2018 with one day break on 01.04.2013, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:**
1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year of re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III will be applicable.
 2. The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation of the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he /she shall not be

allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment under Rule 4.1, at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. V.K. Rattan, Professor (Retd), University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., on contract basis w.e.f. 02.04.2013 up to attaining the age of 65 years i.e. 25.03.2018 with one day's break on 01.04.2013, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:**
1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year of re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Cal. Vol.III will be applicable.
 2. The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he /she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment under Rule 4.1, at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Manjit Singh, Professor (Retd), Department of Sociology, P.U., Chandigarh, on contract basis w.e.f. 04.03.2013 up to attaining the age of 65 years i.e. 16.02.2018 with one day's break on 01.03.2013 (02.03.2013 & 03.03.2013 being holidays), as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments

equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:**
1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year of re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Cal. Vol.III will be applicable.
 2. The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment under Rule 4.1, at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved re-employment of Dr. N.K. Sehgal, Professor in Commerce (Retd.), Deptt. of Evening Studies on contract basis up to 01.02.2018 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date he joins as such after one day break as usual, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58)/ 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:**
1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year of re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Cal. Vol.III will be applicable.

2. The re-employment teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he /she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment under Rule 4.1, at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in pursuance of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Shri Ramesh Pal, Tutor-cum-Curator (Public Administration) (Designated as Teacher), USOL, (whose term of re-employment for the third year expired on 15.02.2013) further w.e.f. 19.02.2013 (after giving one day break on 18.02.2013 (Monday); 16.02.2013 & 17.02.2013 being Saturday & Sunday), for one year (i.e. for the fourth year) on the terms and conditions as approved by the Syndicate Para 78 (xviii) dated 29.06.2010.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate meeting dated 29.06.2010 (Para 78 (xviii) has approved that the re-employment are with the condition that they will take classes regularly in other related departments also on need basis. The re-employment on contract basis would be on fixed emoluments to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent allowance. Payment on this account will be made against the post of Tutor-cum-Curators in the University School of Open Learning Vacated by him on his retirement.

2. An Office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXVII)**.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Medical Officers (Full time), BGJ Institute of Health, PU for further period of six months w.e.f. the dates as noted against each, on the previous terms & conditions:-

Sr.	Name of Doctor	Date of expiry	Date of	Due date of
-----	----------------	----------------	---------	-------------

No.		of previous term	break	extension
1	Dr. R.V. Suri	2.1.2013	3.1.2013	4.1.2013 to 3.7.2013
2	Dr. R.K. Jindal	2.1.2013	3.1.2013	4.1.2013 to 3.7.2013

- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of selection committee dated 20.02.2013 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of the followings as Part-time Doctors in the BGJ Institute of Health, PU on fixed salary of Rs.12000/- p.m., initially for the period of six months w.e.f. 2.3.2013 to 29.8.2013 with one day break on 1.3.2013 and to be extended giving one day break after every six months for a maximum period of up to two years on the same terms & conditions as notified by the CMO vide his Notice dated 8.1.2013 (**Appendix-**):

Sr. No.	Name of the Doctors	Designation
1.	Dr. Vikramjeet Singh	Part-time Radiologist
2.	Dr. (Mrs.) Virpal Kaur	Part-time Gynecologist

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Mrs. Shruti Sahdev, Medical Officer (Homoeopathic), SSGPURC, Bajwara, (Hoshiarpur) for further period of three months w.e.f. 14.3.2013 to 10.6.2013 with one day break on 13.3.2013 or till the post is filled in afresh, whichever is earlier on the previous terms & conditions.

- (ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of following:-

- i. Mr. Om Parkash, Programmer (on contract), Computer Centre, PU for further period of three months w.e.f. 2.3.2013 to 29.5.2013 with one day break on 1.3.2013 or till the post is filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier on the previous terms & conditions.
- ii. Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Programmer (on contract), Computer Centre, PU w.e.f. 27.2.2013 to 31.3.2013 with one day break on 26.2.2013 with the condition that he will provide necessary support to the admission work for CET, PUTHAT & L.L.B. entrance test-2013 & also perform other jobs assigned by the Director, Computer Centre.

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Leave Cases Committee and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has granted Study Leave to Ms. Nidhi Gautam Prabhakar, Assistant Professor, UIAMS, for one year w.e.f. 14.1.2013, under Regulation 11 (I) at pages 140-143 of P.U.

Cal. Vol. 1, 2007, to complete her Ph.D. research work, by granting permission for conversion of Earned leave w.e.f. 14.1.2013 to 13.2.2013 (already sanctioned and availed by her for pursuing her Ph.D. Research work) into Study Leave.

- NOTE:**
1. Ms. Nidhi Gautam Prabhakar is required to execute an Indemnity Bond on a non-judicial stamped paper of Rs.15/- before proceeding on leave.
 2. She is also required to send reports of progress in her studies/Research period. These reports shall reach the Registrar within one month of the expiry of every six months of the Study Leave failing which the payment of salary may be deferred till the receipt of such reports. The other terms and condition will be applicable under the above said regulation.

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. (Ms.) Pallavi Mishra, Assistant Professor in History (Temp.) at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. 01.03.2013 (A.N.) under Rule 16.2 at page 83, P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2009.

- NOTE:**
1. Rule 16.2 page 83 P.U. Calendar, Vol. III 2009, reads as under:

“the service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived off at the discretion of appropriate authority”.

2. Dr. Pallavi Mishra has deposited one month salary, i.e., Rs. 40355/- through cheque bearing No. 506763 dated 28.02.2013 which was deposited in the account of University vide P.U. receipt No. 59761 dated 11.03.2013.
3. An Office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXIX)**.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following as Programmers (on contract basis) in the pay scale of Rs.15600-

39100+ GP-5400 Plus DA for a period of 89 days only w.e.f the date they join in the Computer Unit.

1. Mr. Neeraj Pathania
2. Mr. Gurdeep Singh
3. Mr. Mohinder Singh Negi
4. Mr. Anmol Joshi

NOTE: 1. They be relieved from their duties after completion of 89 days.

2. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXX)**.

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Shri Paramjit Kumar, (Supdt. Budget Section) on contractual basis for a period of 6 months in the Accounts branch (Budget Section) w.e.f. 02.04.2013 with one day break on 01.04.2013 @ half of the salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100, out of the Budget Head "General Administration – Sub Head-Hiring Services / Outsourcing Contractual / Casual or Seasonal Worker".

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Shri Ashok Kumar, (Supdt., Retd. on 28.2.2013) on contractual basis upto the end of current academic term i.e., May 31, 2013, w.e.f. the date he joins/joined his duty, as OSD, in the UIAMS @ half of the salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100, out of the Budget Head "General Administration-Sub Head-Hiring Services / Outsourcing Contractual / Casual or Seasonal Worker".

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Shri Kahan Singh, Sr. Assistant R&S Branch (Store Section) on contractual basis for a period of 6 months in the Store Section w.e.f. 02.04.2013 with one day break on 01.04.2013 @ half of the salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100, out of the Budget Head "General Administration – Sub Head-Hiring Services/Outsourcing Contractual/Casual or Seasonal Worker".

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate and grant of NOC from Punjab Govt. has granted temporary extension of the affiliation for B.A.-III (English, Punjabi, Hindi, Computer Science, History, Political Science, Physical Education, Economics & Mathematics), and (ii) B.Com.-I (One Unit) to Guru Gobind Singh Degree College, Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib for the session 2012-2013, with the conditions that the college shall:-

- (i) Follow the other instructions/guidelines of the UGC/Punjab Govt./PU Chandigarh.
- (ii) Appoint the required number of teachers on regular basis.
- (iii) Pay Salary to the appointed teachers strictly as per UGC pay scale 2006/University norms and send to the University within 15 days the proof of salary such as certified copy of bank statement/salary register.

- Note:**
1. In the event of non-compliance, the admission to 1st year of the courses shall not be allowed for the next coming session i.e. session 2013-2014.
 2. Inspection Report enclosed **(Appendix-XXXI)**.

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation for M.Ed. Course (35 seats) to Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial College of Education, Dhudike, Tehsil & District Moga for the session 2011-12, with the condition that the College will follow the other instructions/ guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./NCTE/UGC.

NOTE: An Inspection Report and office note are enclosed **(Appendix-XXXII)**.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the students of various Departments for the session 2012-13 as recommended by the Academic Committee/Board of Control of the respective departments as per enclosed list **(Appendix-XXXIII)**.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it had never happened in the history of the University, which was happening now. There is a clear-cut rule in the University Calendar that after superannuation, the re-employed teachers would not hold any administrative charge of any Department and he/she will not be member of any of the Governing body of the University, but what they were seeing during the last 2-3 months was that in violation of the rules of their own and without approval from anybody, the people are still continuing in their positions after their superannuation. Though Professor Manjit Singh (Sub-Item R-(iii)) had been re-employed as Professor of Sociology, he is still continuing as Director of Centre for Ambedkar Studies, the charge he was holding before his retirement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is being looked into.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the person had retired on 28th February 2013 and even on 25th April 2013 (after two months), they were saying that the matter would be looked into. In fact, on 1st March 2013, he had no business to continue. As far as his

memory goes, the Syndicate in 2010 decided that the charge of Centre for Ambedkar Studies be immediately handed over to Dr. Bhajan Kaur. Only 15 days before, they had come to know that Dr. Manjit Singh continued to be the Director of that Centre and is still continuing and Dr. Bhajan Kaur was never handed over the charge. A person, who had defied the instructions of the Syndicate for three years, is being re-employed and had also been allowed to continue as Director of a Centre.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know whether there was a decision of the Syndicate on the issue. It had just come to his notice now and the matter would be looked into. He added that just two days ago they had a meeting in which Dr. Bhajan Kaur, Professor Manjit Singh, Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Madhu Raka participated. He was hopeful that the matter would be resolved in a few days. If it was automatic, the procedure should have been in place.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was automatic that the person should not have been allowed to continue even one day after his retirement.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in fact, Professor Manjit Singh is also exercising the financial and administrative powers.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if it was so, it was a serious matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal proposed that the charge of Centre for Ambedkar Studies be immediately handed over to Professor Rajesh Gill.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was the prerogative of the Vice-Chancellor and he would pass necessary orders.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the Vice-Chancellor had not used his prerogative, the Syndicate had taken note of it and decided that the charge of Centre for Ambedkar Studies be immediately handed over to Professor Rajesh Gill.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there was a case, which was being reported in the media, about Cost Accounting paper of B.Com. Part II, wherein the paper had not been set as per pattern. There was another media report that in a particular case, the same paper had been distributed which was given to the students last year. The statement of Controller of Examinations was appearing in the newspapers that the strictest possible action would be taken against the persons concerned. He reminded that Professor Manjit Singh had done similar thing, wherein the same question paper was distributed next year and the Syndicate had taken decision that strictest action be taken against him, but nothing had been done. That meant, every Regulation, Rule, norms, etc. had been violated for one man. He stated that the Vice-Chancellor received an office note in the month of March 2013 when the salary bill of those, who were working in that Centre, was to be signed. A note was sent to the Vice-Chancellor by Professor Manjit Singh stating that since the undersigned had already retired on 28th February 2013, he did not enjoy the financial powers anymore and since the salary bill of the employees working in the centre are to be signed, appropriate orders may please be passed, who

had got the powers to get the bill signed, wherein the Vice-Chancellor mentioned the name of Professor Rajesh Gill, only for the purpose of signing the salary bill. That meant, the Vice-Chancellor knew that Professor Manjit Singh had retired and he could not continue as Centre Director. Professor Rajesh Gill signed the salary bills with the condition that she will not discharge the duties of Centre Director of Centre for Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy unless the charge was handed over to her. Subsequently, the orders were passed and she was given the temporary charge, but in spite of the orders of the Vice-Chancellor which were passed in March itself, Professor Manjit Singh did not obey the orders and he was still continuing there. So much so he had told Professor Rajesh Gill that this Centre is not the place for her and the charge of this centre would go to Dr. Bhajan Kaur and Professor Rajesh Gill should go to some other place.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he needs to understand the history of this Centre and what is its status. Therefore, he had decided that he along with Professor Madhu Raka would go to the Centre and see the files and understand the issues relating to the Centres for Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy and that of Ambedkar Studies which had been started in *ad hoc* ways. It would take a little while to comprehend. Hence, they are seized of the matter. They should permit him to comprehend and take corrective measures.

Professor Keshav Malhotra informed that when Professor Shelley Walia went to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, even though his retirement was stayed by the Apex Court, he relinquished the charge of Director, Academic Staff College.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it would set a wrong precedent if a person, who had already retired, is allowed to continue as Director of a Centre.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that an enquiry should be conducted as to how Professor Manjit Singh continued as Director, after his retirement, which he was not supposed to. Secondly, the charge of Centre be given to Professor Rajesh Gill.

On the point of information, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that if a Tutor-cum-Curator is designated as Lecturer/ Assistant Professor, he is given re-employment, but if he/she is not designated as Lecturer/Assistant Professor, he/she is not given re-employment. Is he right?

The Vice-Chancellor replied in affirmative.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xii), Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that these four persons had been re-employed, but the others have been shunted out. Perhaps, here the new persons had been appointed and still some of these persons had been allowed to continue. Why the other persons were not re-appointed, whether their services were not required?

It was clarified that a request had come from the Controller of Examinations stating that the services of these persons were required to train the new appointees.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xvi), Dr. Dinesh Talwar pointed out that though the Inspection Committee comprising ten persons, the inspection report had been signed by only one person, i.e., Dr. Kuldip Singh and they were giving extension of affiliation to the College. In the inspection report at page 346, it had been mentioned that the number of teachers in the College (list with qualifications, date & nature of appointment, teaching workload, etc. to be supplied by the College is to be enclosed) is enclosed, but no paper in this regard had been appended with the item.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was a serious and sensitive issue because they had to look into to which College they were talking about. This showed, how casually they deal with such cases. He did not know whether there was a subject of Commerce in B.A. Part-I. They had written that number of teachers for teaching new subject already appointed. Moreover, the inspection report is dated 19.05.2012, which had come to the Syndicate in April 2013, that too, under the signature of one person. Further, the Inspection Committee had recommended that the proposed extension of affiliation in B.A. III, B.Com. I be granted only if the College fulfilled the following conditions and submit the proof of having fulfilled the requirement:

1. Requirement of books by May 30, 2012
2. Post of permanent Principal is duly advertised.

Besides, the name of Dr. I.D. Gaur had been wrongly spelt in the Inspection Report.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in Item 42 R-(i) to R-(xviii) on the agenda, be ratified.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (i) an enquiry be conducted as to how Professor Manjit Singh continued as Director, after his retirement, which he was not supposed to; and
- (ii) the charge of Centre for Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy, be given to Professor Rajesh Gill.

Routine and formal matters

43. The following information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(iv)** on the agenda was read out and noted, i.e. –

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor has passed order that the honorarium to the teachers engaged as Guest Faculty for conducting practical classes be paid @ Rs.1000/- per practical of 2/3 hours and if the practical is for four hours or more in a given day, let the honorarium be doubled, i.e. Rs.2000/- for the whole session.

NOTE: 1. The minutes of the Committee dated 8.2.2013 constituted by the

Vice-Chancellor regarding rationalization of honorarium to the teachers engaged as Guest Faculty enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIX**).

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

(ii) The National Council of Teacher Education of Jaipur vide order dated 9.2.2013 (**Appendix-XXXV**) has again withdrawn the recognition already granted to G.G.S. College of Education Dabwali Road, Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, for 100 seats in B.Ed. course.

NOTE: A comprehensive note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXV**).

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. Tapas Mukhopadhyay, Professor, Department of National Centre for Human Genome Study & Research	22.10.2002	28.2.2013	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations
2.	Dr. Manjit Singh Professor Department of Sociology	16.06.1997	28.02.2013	
3.	Dr. N.K. Sehgal Professor in Commerce Department of Evening Studies	27.11.1974	28.02.2013	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Mrs. Krishna Kumari Deputy Registrar Examination Branch	11.10.1971	30.04.2013	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Dwarka Nath PA to Deputy Registrar (General) General Branch	28.12.1974	30.04.2013	
3.	Shri Subhash Kumar Gupta Superintendent (P.R.) General Branch	23.8.1976	30.04.2013	
4.	Shri Karam Chand Junior Technician (Carpenter) Construction Office	02.04.1993	30.04.2013	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations
5.	Shri Shital Singh Security Guard Construction Office	14.01.1983	28.02.2013	
6.	Shri Anand Junior Technician (White washer) Construction Office	02.04.1993	31.03.2013	
7.	Shri Des Raj Security Guard Construction Office	02.09.1985	31.03.2013	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16)

After decisions on the agenda items were taken, the members started general discussion.

(1) Dr. R.P.S. Josh said that a couple of Assistant Professors, who were earlier working in the affiliated Government Colleges situated in the Union Territory of Chandigarh, had been appointed in the University on regular basis. They had joined the University after tendering their resignation. He pleaded that the matter should be taken up with the Chandigarh Administration requesting the Administration to allow the teachers concerned to retain their lien. He further said that a decision had already been taken that the remuneration for evaluation of answerbooks of undergraduate and postgraduate classes be increased by 10% every year. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to enhance the remuneration of evaluation of answer books accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposal for enhancement in rates of remuneration of answerbooks of undergraduate and postgraduate classes would be looked into.

- (2) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that it had been highlighted in the Hindustan Times newspaper that a student, who had failed in her BBA Part I examination conducted by Panjab University last year (April 2012), had been given admission at Guru Nanak Girls College, Model Town, Ludhiana, in BBA Part II during the academic session 2012-13. In fact, the said student had been given admission on the basis of a Detailed-Marks-Certificate issued by Punjabi University, Patiala. The candidate had also submitted a Migration Certificate and the University had issued her new PUPIN Number. He further said that in gross violation of the University rules/regulations, representative/s of the teachers are not appointed on the Governing Body of the University. Further, all the teachers were being given consolidated salary. Secondly, the College is giving only 8 casual leaves and sometimes less than 8. It also did not give maternity leave to the women teachers. Every teacher had to give the PRO's duty on rotation. He suggested that a Committee of Syndics should be appointed to enquire into the whole issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there has to be some strict guidelines to deal with such cases. As far as payment of consolidated salary was concerned, there has to be some proof.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that since there were specific complaints against this College and being the regulatory authority, they had to do something.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want a teacher to be humiliated by the managements at all. At the same time, so many frivolous things appeared in the newspapers. But how many enquiry Committees they had to appoint. They have to frame some policy. As far as payment of less salary was concerned, they should create a proper data base.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that if something is brought to their notice and they did not take any action, what does it amount to? People of the College would feel that the matter was raised in the Syndicate and Senate, but nothing had been done. At least for sending a message and lesson to others that the University meant business, they must take some action against the College concerned. He, therefore, pleaded that a Committee should be formed and sent to the College.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that, normally, they conducted periodical inspections after a period of four years, but if there is complaint against any College, that must be attended to.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the University started enquiries on the basis of information only, there were 85 Senators, including 15 Syndics, how many enquiries, in addition to inspections, would the University conduct. How much strain the University system would sustain?

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that in this case, they had got a complaint from the teachers of the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that honestly he did not know the complaint. He had to verify and talk to the teachers, who are signatories. Hence, they had to give him some time for the purpose.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that since 1948 a teacher organization is working, which has a very excellent track record. Whenever, the General Secretary of that Association/Organization makes a formal complaint, that must be looked into because he/she does not make the complaint without verifying the facts.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issues like that the College/s is/are not giving full salaries and they themselves had said that approximately 100 Colleges are not paying full salaries, they could not initiate action against a particular College.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that probably the issue had been confused. It was one of the allegations which Shri Harpreet Singh Dua had made that the College is not making full payment of salary to the teachers, but the Vice-Chancellor is right that this problem is being experienced in almost every College and one College could not be isolated for getting enquiry conducted or initiating action. But here in the instant case, it is an ancillary issue that payment of full salary is not being made to the teachers and the issue had been reported in the newspapers based on the facts, that too, by the General Secretary of that College Management, they still say that they had to verify. If the Secretary, who is a responsible person, had written a letter to the University with his signature and had also addressed the Press, and he had exposed the mischief of the College wherein unfortunately the University had also become a party to the fraud played by the College that failed student of the Panjab University examination had been given admission to next higher class on the basis of a certificate of Punjabi University, Patiala in the same year and same batch. In view of this mischief of the College highlighted by the newspaper, the Syndicate must take a call and constitute a Committee to look into the whole issue. He further stated that there was another issue wherein allegation had been made not only against the College, but against the University also that how the University could issue the second PUPIN number to the same candidate. Could there be girl with the same name, same father name, same date of birth? Let they introspect themselves and accept the fact that the lapse is also on the part of the University as everything had been computerized. Although it had been reported, the R&S Branch is still sitting on it. That meant, the allegation has been levelled that Panjab University is also a party to it, despite the fact that there is no truth in it. He, therefore, suggested that a Committee should be constituted to look into the allegations against the College vis-à-vis against the University, only with a view to send a message that Panjab University would not remain a silent spectator. If such things found to be correct, *prima facie*, all the allegations against that College, including financial

irregularities, should also be probed by the same Committee. The Committee must comprise at least one member of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee including experienced members of the Senate would be constituted and all the related complaints would be given to it.

- (3) Dr. Dinesh Talwar suggested that the strength of students for appointment of an invigilator should be brought down from 40 students to 22-25 students as an invigilator could not carefully examine such a large number of students.

It was clarified that the invigilator is appointed against the 40 students or above or as per the room capacity notwithstanding anything stated above.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that if they wanted affective invigilation, the strength of students should be reduced to 20 or 25. Secondly, it was going on since 1958 that when 40 to 50 students sit in a room, how could they expect that invigilator would be able to stop the students from cheating. Therefore, the strength of students needed to be brought down.

- (4) Dr. Dinesh Talwar pleaded that the date-sheet should not be stretched to 15th June, which most unfortunately resulted into denial of vacations to the teachers.

- (5) Dr. Dinesh Talwar suggested that the examination of University School of Open Learning students should be made in the University Campus itself. In fact, the examination centre of the University School of Open Learning students are made in the affiliated Colleges and the teachers of the Colleges had to give duty for the purpose. They should get it verified from the record, the University teachers, either from the University Teaching Departments or University School of Open Learning, never give examination duties.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dinesh Talwar to make a concrete proposal, so that next year something could be done.

- (6) Professor Keshav Malhotra pleaded that the Committee for enhancement of NRI fees and filling up of NRI seats should be constituted at the earliest.

- (7) Shri Ashok Goyal stated that some of the members of the Syndicate and Senate are feeling discriminated against, especially when the Selection Committees and Inspection Committees are constituted. He proposed that as the system was running earlier, the proposal for making Selection and Inspection Committee should be mooted from the office of the Dean, College Development Council, as the said system was working very well. Of course, it is discretion of the Vice-Chancellor, but the Dean, College Development Council, could take the file and get the Selection/Inspection Committee appointed so that nobody had reason/s to feel discriminated

against. So much so as Professor Keshav Malhotra could vouch, he could also say that some senior persons have been ignored though he did not know the reasons. At the same time, some junior persons had been accommodated at the cost of seniors. He added that in Selection Committees for appointment of Principal, the Principal of a particular approach are being appointed on the Selection Committees. He suggested that the Dean, College Development Council should be asked to place a proposal in this regard before the Vice-Chancellor.

- (8) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Cost Accounting Paper of B.Com. II near about of 50 marks paper was out of context and the students made a written complaint in this regard to the University. The Board of Studies in its recommendation had suggested grant of 20 grace marks. He, however, was of the view that since the pass marks were 28, grant of 20 grace marks would be on the higher side and such high grace marks had never earlier been granted. He, therefore, suggested that the examination of above said paper should be conducted again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if 28 were the pass marks, how could 20 grace marks be awarded?

Dr. R.P.S. Josh said that it had already been decided to conduct the examination of the said paper again.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the University had sought an independent opinion from him and he had suggested that the said examination be conducted again.

After some further discussion, it was suggested that the examination of Cost Accounting Paper of B.Com. II, be conducted again.

(A.K. Bhandari)
Registrar

Confirmed

(**Arun Kumar Grover**)
VICE-CHANCELLOR