

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Saturday, 15<sup>th</sup> March 2014 at 2.00 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. Balbir Chand Josan
4. Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop
5. Dr. Dalip Kumar
6. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
7. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
8. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
9. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
10. Shri Jagpal Singh alias Jaswant Singh
11. Dr. Karamjeet Singh
12. Dr. Preeti Mahajan
13. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
14. Principal Puneet Bedi
15. Shri Sandeep Kumar
16. Dr. S.K. Sharma
17. Professor A.K. Bhandari Registrar ... (Secretary)

Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh and S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

### **Condolence Resolution**

The Vice-Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I would like to inform the House about the sad demise of –

- (i) Professor G.K. Chadha, President, South Asian University, New Delhi, and a distinguished, teaching faculty and former Senate Member of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, passed away on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2014. Professor Chadha was honoured with 'Doctor of Literature' (*honoris causa*), by the Panjab University on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2008. He had earlier also served as Vice-Chancellor of Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. He has many other distinctions to his credit. In his death, we have lost a noted economist, academician and a pillar of support and source of inspiration to all of us.
- (ii) Dr. (Mrs.) Meenu, Assistant Professor of Chemistry at the University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), passed away on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2014. In her death, we have lost a valuable colleague."

**The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor G.K. Chadha and Dr. (Mrs.) Meenu and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.**

**RESOLVED:** That a copy of the above Resolution be sent to the members of the bereaved families.

## Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the honourable members of the Syndicate that:

- (i) Professor M.S. Swaminathan, a renowned Agricultural Scientist and recipient of honour of Padma Vibhushan, was recommended for 'Doctor of Science' (*honoris causa*) by Panjab University Syndicate in November 2011. He could not come to receive this honour at the Panjab University Convocation held in December 2011. His name has recently been recommended for the deliverance of first Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap Memorial Oration in the Department of Botany. Professor M.S. Swaminathan desires to receive the *honoris causa* degree during his forthcoming visit to Panjab University Campus.

It is proposed to host a Special Convocation to confer the above honour on him coinciding with his Oration at the P.U. Campus.

- (ii) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, a member of our present Syndicate, has recently bestowed with 'Outstanding Scientist Award' during an International CoD: 'Excellence and Compliance' organized by elect Bio (UK) at Mumbai on February 24 and 25, 2014, for his significant contributions in the domain of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the 'QbD-enabled research work on novel and nano-structured drug delivery.

- (iii) March 2014 issue of Careers 360, a monthly magazine published by Pathfinder Publishing Private Limited, New Delhi and distinguished by Outlook Publishing (India) Pvt. Limited, New Delhi, has placed the Panjab University, Chandigarh at the 7<sup>th</sup> position in the list of 70 Outstanding Public Institutions in India. Indian Institute of Sciences, Bangalore occupies the first position in this list, followed by I.I.T. Bombay, I.I.T. Kharpur, University of Delhi, I.I.T. Delhi and AIIMS, New Delhi. JNCSAR, Bangalore and TIFR, Mumbai are placed at 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> position. Amongst the other CRIKC institutions, NIPER, Mohali, PGIMER, IISER, Mohali and I.I.T. Ropar, stand placed at 13<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>, 54<sup>th</sup> and 69<sup>th</sup> rank."

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that they must place on record their appreciation for the Vice-Chancellor for his contribution in bringing this rank to the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though it is a matter of pride for them that the University is ranked 7<sup>th</sup> in the list of 70 outstanding Public Institutions in India in the March 2014 issue of Careers 360, a monthly magazine published by Pathfinder Publishing Private Limited, New Delhi, it is a matter of concern that one-time the Panjab University is ranked number one in the country and the other time it came down to number 7. He enquired as to how it has happened.

The Vice-Chancellor said that different magazines make classifications based on different parameters. The important thing is

that the Panjab University is amongst the top ranked Universities/Institutions in the country in a listing which comprises all institutions in India and he looked it as a positive thing. The said listing is not based on institutions entering a competition by making available their data in an explicate manner. It should be viewed with satisfaction that five institutions from in and around Chandigarh are included in the top 10 institutions of India. Besides P.U., the other four institutions comprising the Chandigarh Region Innovation and Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) are National Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences & Research (NIPER), Postgraduate Institute for Medical Education & Research (PGIMER), Indian Institute for Science Education & Research (IISER), Mohali and Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Ropar.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they should look at the parameters of all the agencies and take necessary steps to ensure that the University maintains its ranking or achieve higher ranking while being evaluated by different agencies. They should also seek quarterly reports so that their ranking did not go down.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the Institutions within the University itself should also be honoured so that they could keep on improving.

Principal Gurdip Sharma enquired whether they could include the research work of the College teachers in the total research work of the University. He knew that some of the teachers of the Colleges are doing an excellent research work.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that as per 2013 NAAC accreditation report, Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur, is at number 1 out of 600 Institutions in the country. As it is a matter of pride for them, they should honour Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur.

While giving a clarification, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Executive Council of NAAC declared the result on 22<sup>nd</sup> February and Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur, secured 3.75 marks out of 4, which are maximum in accordance with the list displayed on 22<sup>nd</sup> February. As such, it is a matter of pride for all of them.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to Professor B.S. Bhoop, a member of our present Syndicate, on his having been recently bestowed with ‘Outstanding Scientist Award’ during an International (CoD): ‘Excellence and Compliance’ organized by elect Bio (UK) at Mumbai on February 24 and 25, 2014, for his significant contributions in the domain of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the ‘QbD-enabled research work on novel and nano-structured drug delivery’.
2. the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor’s statement at Serial No. (i), be noted and approved;
3. the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor’s statement at Serial No. (iii), be noted; and

4. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 04.01.2014 and 16.01.2014, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

After the decisions on the Vice-Chancellor's statement were taken, the members started general discussion.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that one day in a year should be fixed for honouring the distinguished teachers of the University. Earlier, he used to organize a function to honour the distinguished teachers on 1<sup>st</sup> October of the year, but somehow the practice had been stopped. He suggested that different Committees should be constituted to identify 4-5 teachers (Faculty-wise), who could be honoured. Similarly, the teachers of the affiliated Colleges should also be honoured.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath to give a concrete proposal.

Principal B.C. Josan said that immediately after the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014 meeting of the Syndicate, he had given a Resolution to the Registrar, but no action had been taken in the matter by the University authorities so far.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that, in fact, on his raising the issue, it was decided by the Syndicate on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014, that the Vice-Chancellor would request the MHRD and the Government of India to approve the amendment of Regulations pertaining to enhancement of the age of superannuation. As far as his information goes, it did not find mention in the proceedings of the Syndicate meeting dated 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014. The Senate approved the resolution enhancing the age of superannuation of University and College teachers from 60 years to 65 years in 2011. He suggested that the said decision should be reiterated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had also to speak on the issue, therefore, this issue should be taken up for consideration during the zero hour discussion.

**The Panjab University Syndicate in its meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014 has reiterated the decision of the Senate framing Regulations enhancing age from 60 years to 65 years of all categories of teaching staff in Panjab University as well as affiliated Colleges, including the Principals, which has been sent to the Government of India for approval. This Resolution be sent to the Government of India.**

**Report of the Committee dated 2.12.2013 with regard to complaint made by the students of the M.A.II (Punjabi)**

2. Considered report dated 02.12.2013 (**Appendix-II**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh on a complaint made by the students of the M.A.II (Punjabi) session 2013-14 of National College for Girls, Chowarrian Wali, District Fazilka.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that the report submitted by the Committee is very comprehensive and in the report it had been mentioned as to what the College is doing at the moment. If they go through the details of the annexures, it would be a matter of great disturbance for all of them that the Principal of the College has

forged the signatures (page 11). After 16<sup>th</sup> September, nothing is there about the arrival and departure of that very Principal. Secondly, it is clearly mentioned by the students that there was no timetable for M.A. (Punjabi). Thirdly, the College had no affiliation from the University for M.A. I (Punjabi), though they had affiliation for M.A. II (Punjabi). The College took a fine of Rs.50/- per day from the students for Monday and Saturday, which is not provided in the University Calendar and Rs.5/- per day for other days of the week. Surprisingly, no action had been taken on this. On all the applications submitted by the College to the University, forged signatures of the Principal are there, which is a matter of great concern for the University. If they wanted to maintain the standard and convey a message for such things, the University must immediately issue a show cause notice to the College to reply within a stipulated time, as the University would not tolerate such things at any level.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Dalip Kumar, Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the University should issue the show cause notice to the College and the laid down procedure should be followed so that an exemplary punishment is awarded to the College.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that process for disaffiliation of this College should be started.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that he fully agreed that action should be taken against this College, but despite his raising the issue of excess fees charged by a College situated in Chandigarh in the Syndicate meetings 5-6 times, no action had been taken by the University. The University just wrote a letter to the College concerned and when no reply was received, only a reminder was issued, whereas in respect of this College (National College for Girls, Chowarrian Wali, District Fazilka), which is a weak College, only on the complaint of the students, a Committee was constituted, which inspected the College and immediately submitted its report. But in the case of a Chandigarh College, in spite of raising the issue by a member of the Syndicate, no Committee had been formed. He enquired why did they not adopt a uniform policy/parameters for all the affiliated Colleges? Why don't they check all the affiliated Colleges? He pleaded that they should adopt a uniform mechanism for all the affiliated Colleges.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he fully agreed with Dr. Dinesh Talwar that they should adopt a uniform policy for all the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that till now, there is no College record, wherein the signatures of the Principal had been forged.

Principal Puneet Bedi pointed out that at pages 9 and 10, somewhere the name is mentioned Amrita Gargi and somewhere it is mentioned Amrita Kashyap.

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to issuance of show cause notice to National College for Girls, Chowarrian Wali, District Fazilka, stated that had they not got a complaint from the students, what would have been the situation? Was it not a fault, brought to the notice of the University by the students, which called for a criminal action against the College? Why criminal/civil proceedings be not initiated against the Colleges in the Court of Law, besides issuing show cause notice.

He further stated that it called for an action to be initiated against the College besides action under Regulation 11.1. Secondly, in the case of maternity leave to a lady teacher of the College, it had been mentioned at page 20 of the appendix that “..... I have been working here since 1 year as Assistant Professor of Punjabi. I have been on maternity leave for four months from 2<sup>nd</sup> May to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2013. I have rejoined the College from 1<sup>st</sup> September. Now I want to extend my leave from 21<sup>st</sup> October 2013 to 21<sup>st</sup> December 2013”. In this way, she is seeking extension in maternity leave after a gap of 1½ months. In such types of Colleges, they should move in such a manner that at least the College is not able to make admissions for the session 2014-2015. Hence, the College should be given 15 days time to give reply to the show cause notice. The Dean, College Development Council, should be asked to issue show cause notice to the College by 18<sup>th</sup> March 2014 without waiting for the decision of the Syndicate as he himself is present in the meeting.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the report of the Committee dated 02.12.2013 (**Appendix-II**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on a complaint made by the students of the M.A.II (Punjabi) session 2013-14 of National College for Girls, Chowarrian Wali, District Fazilka, be accepted; and
- (2) a show cause notice be issued to National College for Girls, Chowarrian Wali, District Fazilka, listing the irregularities, as to why action be not taken against it under Regulation 11.1 at page of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. The College be given 15 days’ time to reply.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar recorded his dissent with the remarks that on students’ complaint, a Committee constituted, inspected the College and submitted its reports and accordingly action is being taken, but despite the issue of excess fees charged by a College situated at Chandigarh raised by a member of the Syndicate several times for the last 8 months, no action had been taken by the University so far.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that he had also lodged a complaint with the University about 8 months’ back, but no action had been taken by the University on that also.

**Rectification of the decision of the Syndicate dated 24.8.2013 and Senate dated 29.9.2013**

**3. Item 3 on the agenda was read out, viz. -**

**3.** To rectify the following decision of the Syndicate dated 24.8.2013 (Para 18) and Senate dated 29.9.2013 (Para LXIII), respectively with regard to provisional extension of affiliation be granted to GGN Khalsa College, Ludhiana.

<b>Syndicate dated 24.8.2013 (Para 18) and Senate dated 29.9.2013 (Para LXIII)</b>	<b>Rectification</b>
That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to GGN Khalsa College, Ludhiana, for <b>Diploma Add-On course in Journalism</b> , as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2012-13.	That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to GGN Khalsa College, Ludhiana, for <b>Certificate Add-On course in Journalism</b> , as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2012-13.

**RESOLVED:** That the Syndicate decision dated 24.8.2013 (Para 18) that provisional extension of affiliation be granted to GGN Khalsa College, Ludhiana, for **Diploma Add-On course in Journalism**, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2012-13, be rectified as under:

“That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to GGN Khalsa College, Ludhiana, for **Certificate Add-On course in Journalism**, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2012-13.”

**Issue regarding provisional extension of affiliation to JCDAV College, Dasuya for Add-On courses**

**4.** Considered if the provisional extension of affiliation be granted to J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya for the following courses as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Finance for the session 2013-14:

**Diploma Add-On course**

- (i) Travel & Tourism
- (ii) Retail Sales Management

**Advance Diploma Course**

Hardware & Maintenance

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

**RESOLVED:** That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya, for the following courses as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Finance, for the session 2013-14:

**Diploma Add-On course**

- (i) Travel & Tourism
- (ii) Retail Sales Management

**Advance Diploma Course**

Hardware & Maintenance

**Items 5, 6 and 7 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together.**

**Reports of Inspection Committees on their re-visits, as per decision of the Core Committee**

**5.** Considered reports submitted by the Inspection Committees on their re-visit to certain Government/Non-Government Degree Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, constituted on the decision of the Core Committee in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 15.05.2013/ 29.6.2013 (Para 2) for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2013-14.

- NOTE:**
1. The Vice-Chancellor, on the decision of the Core Committee constituted by the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation in the course/s/ subjects as mentioned against each College, subject to the condition that an Inspection Committee shall re-visit the deficient College to see the compliance in totality including the appointment of the required teachers & payment of salary to them as per Panjab University/ UGC/Punjab Government norms.
  2. Accordingly, the respective Inspection Committee re-visited the College for verification of the compliance and submitted the Inspection report in the office.
  3. The recommendations/observations (available in last column of the compendium) made by the Inspection Committees in the reports having re-visited the Colleges is attached in tabulated form.

**6.** Considered reports submitted by the Inspection Committees on their re-visit to certain Government/Non-Government Degree B.Ed. and Physical Education Colleges affiliated to Panjab University constituted on the decision of the Core Committee in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 15.05.2013/ 29.6.2013 (Para 2) for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2013-14.

- NOTE:**
1. The Vice-Chancellor, on the decision of the Core Committee constituted by the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation in the course/s/subjects as mentioned against each College, subject to the condition that an Inspection Committee shall re-visit the deficient College to see the compliance in totality including the appointment of the required teachers & payment of salary to them as per Panjab University/ UGC/Punjab Government norms.
  2. Accordingly, the respective Inspection Committee re-visited the College for verification of the compliance and



submitted the Inspection report in the office.

3. The recommendations/observations (available in last column of the compendium) made by the Inspection Committees in the reports having re-visited the Colleges is attached in tabulated form.

**7.** Considered report submitted by the Inspection Committees on their re-visit to Law Colleges affiliated to Panjab University constituted on the decision of the Core Committee in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 15.5.2013/29.6.2013 (Para 2) for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2013-2014.

- NOTE:**
1. The Vice-Chancellor, on the decision of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate has granted temporary extension of affiliation in the course/s/subjects as mentioned against each College, subject to the condition that an Inspection Committee shall re-visit the deficient College to see the compliance in totality including the appointment of the required teachers and payment of salary to them as per Panjab University/ UGC/Punjab Govt. norms.
  2. Accordingly, the respective inspection committee re-visited the College for verification of the compliance and submitted the inspection report in the office.
  3. The recommendations/observations (available in last column of the compendium) made by the inspection committees in the reports having re-visited the Colleges is attached in tabulated form.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that there were certain Institutions/Colleges to whom they had not granted affiliation/extension of affiliation in the previous year/s. Whenever they submitted application for grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation, their requests are returned by the office itself without being considered by the competent authority. He had brought this matter to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor and, in future, if any College submits an application for grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation for the year 2014-15, the same should be considered and Inspection Committee be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor. Whether the College concerned is granted affiliation/extension of affiliation or not is a separate matter, but the application should not be returned by the office.

Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh said that it had been mentioned that affiliation/extension of affiliation had been granted for the session 2013-14, but for 2014-15 affiliation would not be granted. To this, he suggested that Committees should be sent to the Colleges to verify whether the Colleges concerned had made compliance and those who

had made compliance should be granted affiliation/extension of affiliation for the year 2014-15.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that there were several Colleges, which were granted affiliation for the years 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14, especially in the subjects of BCA and PGDCA. Since only 5% NET qualified teachers in the subject of Computer Science are available, regular teachers to teach these subjects could not be appointed. If the report of the Core Committee is accepted, all these Colleges would have to be closed down or the University would have to send the Committees again wherein the Colleges would say that they had advertised the post/s and the appointment/s would be made. Secondly, there would be another problem that since the University is not giving approval to certain appointments made by the affiliated Colleges, the Colleges would have no alternative but to relieve the teachers as there is no provision for extension of probation beyond two years.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that he had got the figures according to which there are 600 teachers, who have been selected through duly constituted Committees and after giving proper advertisement, i.e., by following proper procedure, but none of them had been granted approval by the University so far. Out of them, services of about 100 teachers had been terminated as they could not extend the probation period beyond two years. Another problem is that certain teachers, who are under probation, are not being allowed to attend Refresher/Orientation Courses by the College Managements on the plea that they are still under probation and their appointments had not been approved by the University. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to solve this problem as well. He further said that he was of the considered opinion that the appointments made by following a prescribed procedure needed to be approved without any ifs and buts. They had just to see whether the proper advertisement was given in two papers, in response to that the Vice-Chancellor constituted the Selection Committee and the Selection Committee selected the eligible person and other laid down procedure was followed while making the selection and nothing else. He had yet to come across a case in 48 years of being a member of the Syndicate and Senate wherein approval was not given. In fact, this matter should have gone to the Vice-Chancellor, who is the competent authority to take the decision. Whenever a College applied for extension of affiliation, including for Add-On course, the University could see as to how many teachers' appointments had been approved. There would be problem in keeping the approvals pending for long. He, therefore, urged that the approvals should be granted by the University to the appointments of teachers at the earliest. Despite assuring him during his meeting with the Vice-Chancellor, no step had been taken. Either a Committee should be constituted or they themselves should take a decision today itself so that the problem is solved once for all.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why the approvals are pending.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that there is a list of 82 Colleges, which had been re-visited by the Inspection Committees. If still there are certain deficiencies, such Colleges should not be allowed to make admissions for the ensuing session, i.e., 2014-15. He, however, just wanted to say that the Committee must be clear whether there is/are

deficiency/deficiencies in the College concerned or not. Since it is a serious matter, they should give due consideration to the Colleges.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that this is a very ticklish issue. If they go through all the reports, they would find that there is no uniformity at all. In one case of a Government College, BBA course had been recommended on the basis of temporary/guest faculty, who are being paid Rs.175/- per hour. In Government Colleges, the teachers are being paid between Rs.10,000/- and Rs.21,000/- per month, whereas in other aided and private Colleges, the University is denying BBA and BCA courses. He, therefore, pleaded that there should be a uniform policy for Government Colleges as well as other affiliated Colleges. As such, they have to examine individual report as in certain cases there is no specific recommendation.

Principal B.C. Josan suggested that a Committee comprising Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, Principal Gurdip Sharma, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Dr. Dalip Kumar and Professor Naval Kishore should be constituted to examine the issue and make recommendation/s.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that they had to see how many permanent positions had been filled up in the Government Colleges on regular basis. There could not be different parameters for Government Colleges and different parameters for aided and private Colleges affiliated to the University. Payment of minimum salary to the teachers should be got decided once for all as payment of Rs.175/- per hour to the teachers is not acceptable to them at all. If they look at the chart, they would appreciate the work done by the Core Committee as they had done a wonderful job. The first Committee had pointed out the deficiencies, the second Committee re-visited the Colleges to verify the compliance and third Committee also visited the Colleges and recommended that these Colleges should not be granted extension of affiliation for 2014-15. Since deficiencies are there, they have to send Inspection Committees again with set parameters/clear-cut instructions to the Conveners so that they could evaluate the Colleges on set parameters and make recommendations uniformly. Those Colleges, which found to have made compliance, should be considered for grant of extension of affiliation for 2014-15.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that on the one hand they are giving approval to the appointed teachers with a salary of Rs.21,600/- per month in the Colleges of Education and on the other hand, they are not giving approval to the similarly placed teachers of Degree Colleges. He pleaded that all types of Colleges should be dealt with equally.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that certain Colleges had received a letter from the University that if they paid D.A. @ 80%, only then the approval to the appointment of teachers would be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they should compromise to some reasonable extent as far as quantum of salary is concerned. If that could be done by the Syndicate, let's take a decision. If the affiliated Colleges did not pay the minimum salary fixed by the Syndicate/University, approval to the appointed teachers should not be granted and next time affiliation should also not be granted. But before doing that, they had to see that certain Colleges had gone to the Court and got stay, which is probably ex-parte stay. Principal Hardiljit

Singh Gosal had also said that they should contest the case sincerely and see that the stay is got vacated. If the stay is likely to continue, other Colleges should be forced to go to the Court. Hence, they should contest the case in the Court and if the Court fixed the minimum amount of the salary, the University would not feel guilty. If it is not in their hands to reduce the salary, while deciding what could be done, they should not take a decision consciously to violate the regulations. Perhaps, the stay was granted more than one year ago and the Dean, College Development Council, had told that the reply had gone from his office, but he did not know whether the same had been filed in the Court or not.

Principal Gurdip Sharma pleaded that till the stay is vacated, the Colleges should be allowed to appoint 50% teachers on temporary basis/Guest faculty basis. Even if they made best efforts, 100% teachers could not be appointed on regular basis. In University itself 50% faculty is on either temporary basis or guest faculty basis. As such, they had to relax this condition.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the minimum compromise could be that the Colleges must pay salary to the teacher equivalent to the salary of a person appointed as guest faculty. However, there must be some fraction of the faculty, which needed to be on full salary.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that just some time before they had decided to issue a show cause notice to a College under Regulation 11.1 at page 160 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and, now, they are thinking of making a compromise. He emphasized that they should have a uniform policy for all the affiliated Colleges.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this is the 6<sup>th</sup> year in which he is seeing that despite there being deficiencies in the Colleges, they are allowing them again and again. They did not come with a time bound performance. Usually, the Inspection Committees of the University visited the Colleges when the Colleges had already made admissions for the new academic session. Therefore, they should make clear-cut criteria for grant of affiliation, i.e., minimum number of teachers to be appointed both on regular and temporary basis, purchase of books, equipments, software, etc. and the Colleges should be asked to make compliance within the stipulated period. They have to send the Inspection Committees in a time bound manner so that when the next admissions are made, they had reports with them. If they did not do this, it would merely be an academic exercise. He also suggested that the dates for the revisits by the Inspection Committees should also be fixed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to share the background in which the Core Committee was appointed and the decision of the Core Committee that admissions for the session 2014-15 would not be allowed, if the shortcomings are not removed. In fact, this was also done as a compromise. The Inspection Committee visited the Colleges and recommended that affiliation be not granted. The Core Committee also wanted to take the decision and then a conscious decision was taken by the Syndicate that let's not be harsh to those Colleges, which are habitual offenders as they did not know, this time the University is going to put their foot down and would not allow this time. Let's give them time as a matter of concession and compromise in spite of the fact that they knew that they are habitual offenders and will not remove the deficiencies pointed out by the Committees. But

from the next year, i.e., 2014-15, the Colleges should not expect that this concession would be given to them. The Committees would re-visit the Colleges to verify the compliance of deficiencies pointed out by the earlier Committees and if it is found that the deficiencies have not been removed, the Colleges concerned would not be allowed admissions for the session 2014-15. Therefore, it was in this background, it had been written that affiliation to these Colleges for the year 2014-15 would not be granted. Now, it looked as if, perhaps, now they must have removed the deficiencies. As suggested by some of the members, instead of sticking to it, those Colleges which had made compliance should be got verified from the Committees constituted for grant of extension of affiliation for the year 2014-15, but at least this much leverage the Inspection Committees should have that if the College fulfilled the conditions/made compliance even before commencement of admissions of 2014-15, it should be granted extension of affiliation for 2014-15 and those, which did not comply even by then, they should not be allowed to make admissions for the next academic session 2014-15. That was why he was saying up to what extent they could give concession. Officially or unofficially, at least they should know to what extent they are empowered to give concession. If they had the power, let's give that concession. Even if a College is deficient by 100%, should they grant affiliation to it or not. His only submission is that let's not befool themselves and others. Instead, let's take a decision forgetting what the UGC/Punjab Government/Punjab University regulations say. They would stick to the parameters, which might be laid down by the Syndicate officially or unofficially so that the Inspection Committees knew what they are supposed to do and on what basis, they have to make recommendations from the year 2014-15 onwards. Let's send Committees with instructions in advance about the detailed performance to all the Colleges, which had applied for grant of extension of affiliation, so that the objections are not raised later on that uniformity has not been taken care of. As far as U.G.C. Regulations are concerned, only 10% of the faculty could be appointed on temporary/*ad hoc* basis. Let us know the name of one College, which had appointed 90% of the faculty on regular basis. As such, they are already making compromises because basically their intentions are not to close-down the Colleges. He, therefore, suggested that a decision in this regard should be taken at the earliest.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that Committees should be sent to verify compliance by the Colleges and the Colleges which found to have removed the deficiencies, should be granted affiliation for the session 2014-15 and others not. He added that earlier Inspection Committees used to visit the Colleges by the month of March, but this time, perhaps the Inspection Committee are yet to be constituted. Those Colleges which had applied afresh, separate Inspection Committees needed to be constituted in their case. However, affiliation to them should be granted only if they are found to have met the deficiencies pointed out by the Inspection Committees on verification; otherwise, not.

Professor Preeti Majahan said that she was of the view that some sort of relaxation should be given as far as appointment of teachers in the subject of Computer Science is concerned.

It was clarified that Inspections Committees would be sent to the Colleges as per the set *pro forma*, which had already been in use.

If they framed new guidelines for grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation, it would take too much time, which might delay the whole process. Therefore, the Inspection Committees should be allowed to be sent in accordance with the existing guidelines. As far as approval of appointment of teachers of the Colleges is concerned, there is no link between the approval to the appointed teachers in the Colleges and grant of affiliation to the Colleges. At present, there were about 500 cases of approval of teachers pending in the University. The University had already given approval to about 170 cases. Some of the Colleges are violating U.G.C./NCTE Guidelines and most of the approvals to the appointed teachers are pending due to non-payment of salary as per UGC/NCTE/Punjab Government norms. Though the Colleges advertise posts as per UGC pay-scales, the teachers were not being paid salaries as per the advertised scales.

Principal B.C. Josan suggested that since the pay-scale is mentioned in the appointment letter, the University should give approval to the appointment.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that he had a letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> September 2013 from the University in response to his query as to what is the total number of cases pending in the University for approval and reason/s for non-grant of approval. In the reply, it had been written that 500 cases of approval to the appointments of teachers are pending in the University and the reason given is that salary is not being paid to the teachers as per UGC/NCTE/Punjab Government norms. The case of Self-Financing Colleges is pending in the Punjab & Haryana High Court for non-payment of Dearness Allowance (DA). There are also certain complaints regarding selection of Assistant Professors without submission of API Score card. He enquired as to how these last two reasons are relevant, especially when the selections had been made through the duly constituted Selection Committees. When the template was not supplied in time, how could they expect the selection to be made in accordance with the API Score card? This should be checked.

It was further clarified that they had segregated both the complaints.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that as had been clarified, the selections had been made through the duly constituted Selection Committees and the pay-scale had been mentioned in the appointment letter, it is mandatory for the College to pay salaries to the teachers as per UGC norms. The proceedings of the Selection Committees had been signed by the President of the Management of the College or his nominee, the Principal of the concerned College and the subject expert. Therefore, it is mandatory for the College to give full salary to the appointed teachers. Some of the Colleges gave salaries to the teachers as per UGC norms, but some others not. He was of the view that it should be made mandatory that Colleges should pay salaries to the teachers as had been mentioned in their appointment letters.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that approval to the appointment of teachers should not be linked with the grant of affiliation.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in a way, this could be linked with grant of affiliation also because at the time of grant of affiliation this could be verified whether full salary is being paid to the teachers. In

fact, their apprehension was that if they give approval to the appointment of teachers, the Colleges would not pay them full salaries. He, therefore, suggested that all the affiliated Colleges should be asked to submit copy of Form-16 or salary statements of the teachers working in the respective College to the University office by 31.03.2014. Could they not grant approval to the appointments of teachers with the proviso that the approval is granted subject to the condition that the College concerned would submit the above-said documents by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014; otherwise, the approval would be treated as automatically withdrawn.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the Court did not accept the provision of automatic withdrawal/cancellation. He, therefore, suggested that the issue should be resolved through a small Committee of Syndics, which should be authorized to take decision on behalf of the Syndicate.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this task should be done in a time bound manner and must be completed before the commencement of the ensuing academic session.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the whole process of grant of affiliation to the Colleges would be got examined by a small Committee, which shall also find a way out for appointment of temporary/guest faculty in more ratio than 90:10 (Regular: temporary/guest faculty) so that higher education could flourish and they would also save the Colleges from closing down.

**RESOLVED:** That the Inspection Committees be constituted to visit the Colleges and in cases of those Colleges, which have complied with deficiencies pointed out by the Inspection Committees/Core Committee for the session 2013-14, shall also be inspected for extension of affiliation for the session 2014-15 now, and the cases of Colleges, where the deficiencies continue even after having been afforded the opportunity and chance to fulfill the same for the session 2014-15, shall be considered as per the reports of the Committees. Also a small Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the whole process of grant of affiliation to the Colleges as also to find a way out for appointment of teachers on temporary/guest faculty basis in more ratio than 90 : 10 (Regular : temporary/Guest faculty, which is prescribed by the UGC) so that higher education could flourish.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That approval to the appointments of all pending cases of teachers in the affiliated Colleges be granted with the proviso that the approval is given subject to the condition that the College concerned would submit Form 16 or salary statement of the teachers by some date, say, 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 and, if not supplied within the stipulated date, the approval would be treated automatically withdrawn.

**Recommendation of the Undergraduate Board of Studies in Physical Education**

**8.** Considered the following recommendation of the Undergraduate Board of Studies in Physical Education dated 19.12.2013 (**Appendix-IV**) in respect of the grant of temporary affiliation to MGKM Shahi Sports College of Physical Education, Jhakroudi - Samrala (Ludhiana) for B.Sc. course Physical Education, Health Education and Sports:

“that this course is obsolete and without any employability and there is no need to modify the syllabus for the same. This course does not come under the ambit of the NCTE which is a statutory body for giving approval to teacher education courses of affiliating Universities/Institutions for employment. The regulations of B.Sc. Course (Physical Education, Health Education and Sports) existing at page 304 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007 be deleted with the permission of the competent authority”.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 15.12.2012 (Para 32) has resolved that the request of the College for grant of affiliation for B.Sc. three year course in Physical Education, Health Education and Sports, be examined.
  2. The Undergraduate Board of Studies in Physical Education at its meeting held on 16.7.2013 and 3.9.2013 considered the rules, outlines of tests, syllabi and courses of reading B.Sc. Course (Physical Education, Health Education and Sports) and decided that there is , no need to modify the Syllabus and recommended that this course is obsolete and without any employability.
  3. An office note was enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

Initiating discussion, Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the item relates to revision of the syllabus of B.Sc. Physical Education, Health Education and Sports Course, which MGKM Shahi Sports College of Physical Education, Jhakroudi – Samrala, wanted to run. According to him, now-a-days this course could not be run. Therefore, he suggested that B.P.E. course, a non-professional course, which is parallel to the above said course, should be allowed and the B.P.E. Course is also being run in certain Colleges in the State of Punjab, including Bhago Majra College. The fee for the said course is also much less in comparison to other professional courses. He, therefore, suggested that the Board of Studies should be requested to prepare the syllabus of B.P.E. (Non-Professional) 3-year course, which could be taken up/preferred by the students belonging to the village instead of B.Sc. Physical Education, Health Education and Sports. The Board of Studies could also obtain the Syllabus of B.P.E. course from the Colleges, where it is being run.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that MGKM Shahi Sports Colleges of Physical Education seeking B.Sc. Physical Education and Sports course. That was why the Vice-Chancellor had constituted a Committee in 2013, which also visited the college and recommended that the Board of Studies in Physical Education may be asked to revise the Syllabus/Curriculum of this course keeping in view the present



scenario. How the Board could say that this course has no job potential. Secondly, they had never revised any curriculum keeping in view the job potential. As far as this course is concerned, if they go through the Admission Guidelines of the University for the academic session 2013-14., they would find it is very clearly mentioned that students with this background are also eligible for admission to M.P.Ed. course. He, therefore, suggested that the Board of Studies in Physical Education should be asked to revise the curriculum of this course.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that in the 1980's this B.Sc. course was run by Gurusar Sadhar College as an innovative course. The College ran this course till grant was received from the UGC and, thereafter, discontinued it. In the Panjab University, except that College nowhere else this course was ever run. The College, from where the demand has come, on the website of the College, the Secretary of the Management, who himself is a Lecturer, is also officiating as the Principal of the College. He is getting the examination of the students conducted by Nagpur University. If they check the College returns, they would find that 70% of the students without Physical Education subject were admitted there. Earlier, B.P.Ed. 4-Year course was run by Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, SGGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur and at his College. Ultimately, the B.P.Ed., 4-Year Course was running at Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, with the approval of NCTE and four students of his College had to shift to Govt. College, Chandigarh. Only those students, who had done B.P.Ed. 4-Year course, are straightaway eligible for admission to M.P.Ed. course. He added that if they go through the last years students return of this College, they would find that 50% of students, who had been given admission, are ineligible.

On a point of order, Professor Karamjeet Singh said that what is important is that he is going by the stream; B.P.E. (3-year) students are eligible for admission to M.P. Ed. only after doing 1-Year B.P.Ed. course after graduation, whereas, B.Sc. candidates with Physical Education, Health Education and Sports are not eligible to join M.P. Ed. course. Instead of deleting from the Calendar; it has been suspended. In nutshell, he suggested that B.P.E. 3-Year (Non-Professional) course should be allowed in place of B.Sc. Physical Education, Health Education & Sports.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, reading from admission Guidelines for the academic session 2013-14 (Page-11), stated that a person, who possessed 50% marks in B.P.Ed. or B.Sc. Physical Education, Health Education & Sports, is eligible for admission to M.P.Ed. Course. Now, the issue before them is whether to revise the curriculum of this B.Sc. Physical Education, Health Education & Sports course or not. His view is that they should revise the curriculum of this course irrespective of the fact whether the students are eligible for admission to M.P.Ed. Course or not, as is being done in the case of other courses.

Shri Jagpal Singh said that the main problem is that the Syllabus is to be framed, for which the Board of Studies in Physical Education had been requested twice. The same very course is being run at Delhi University and Kurukshetra University. Why could not it be run in Colleges affiliated to Panjab University? He therefore, suggested that the Board of Studies in Physical Education should be directed by the Syndicate again to frame the Syllabus of this course.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since there are certain apprehensions in the minds of the members, let them remove those apprehensions first and thereafter, take a unanimous decision to revise the Syllabus of B.Sc. Physical Education, Health Education & Sports course, which could only be done by the Board of Studies in Physical Education & Sports course, and none else. He thought that the moment they framed the Syllabus for this course, they would be considering grant of affiliation to MGKM Shahi Sports College of Physical Education, Jhakroudi. Therefore, the apprehensions, which are there in the minds of the Hon'ble members should be removed first that it is guaranteed that the College would be granted affiliation only if it fulfilled all the requisite conditions. Secondly, on the one hand, it is a 3-Year course and on the other hand the students who possessed this degree are not eligible to M.P.Ed. course. How could it be possible, especially when the B.P.Ed. 4-Year course students are eligible for admission to M.P.Ed. course. Therefore, they have to see the conditions of NCTE as well.

After some further discussion, it was-

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) affiliated to MGKM Shahi Sports College of Physical Education, Jhakroudi - Samrala (Ludhiana) for B.Sc. course Physical Education, Health Education and Sports, be **not** granted:
- (ii) the Board of Studies in Physical Education, be asked to frame the syllabus of B.P.E. 3-Year (Non-Professional) course. The Board could also study the latest syllabus of three-year courses of other neighbouring Universities.

**Appointment of Professor Anil Monga as Dean Alumni Relation**

9. Considered if Professor Anil Monga, Department of Public Administration, recommended by the Vice-Chancellor to the Syndicate, may be appointed as Dean Alumni Relation w.e.f. 01.03.2014 in place of Professor Neelam Grover, USOL as per Regulation 1, page 109 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 1, page 109 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 which reads as under:

“The Senate on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate may appoint a Dean of Alumni Relations, such appointment may be made for a year to year but the maximum period for which a person may hold this office shall not exceed five (consecutive) years”.

2. The term of Professor Neelam Grover, USOL as Dean Alumni Relation will expire on 28.02.2014 on her superannuation.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that as per the list attached, several Professors are senior to Professor Anil Monga. Before appointment of Professor Neelam Grover as Dean Alumni Relation, Professor B.S. Bhoop was the Dean Alumni Relation. Why could he be not appointed again as Dean Alumni Relation, especially when earlier senior Professors used to be appointed as Deans?

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they are not having such position where they took seniority as factor for appointment as Deans. There are many cases wherein the junior persons had been appointed as Dean. Recently, they had appointed Dr. Navdeep Goyal as Dean Student Welfare. He, therefore, proposed that Professor Anil Monga is quite proper and the proposal for his appointment as Dean Alumni Relation should be approved.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Professor Anil Monga, Department of Public Administration, be appointed as Dean Alumni Relation w.e.f. 01.03.2014 in place of Professor Neelam Grover, USOL, as per Regulation 1, page 109 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**Issue regarding adoption of Punjab Government letter dated 5.8.2013 regarding API score for making appointments/promotions in the Colleges**

**10.** Considered letter dated 5.8.2013 (**Appendix-VI**) received from the Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Govt. of Punjab with regard to maintain the standard of Higher Education in Universities, Govt. Aided Private Colleges situated in Punjab State, the UGC notification dated 30.6.2010 and 14.6.2013 regarding API Score for making the appointment and promotion of Principal/ Professor/Associate Professor/Assistant Professor be adopted with the following changes:

1. The tenure of the appointment of Principal in Private Colleges will be 10 years instead of 5 years.
2. For the selection of the Principal and Assistant Professor covered under (grant-in aid) scheme, the DPI (Colleges) Punjab or his nominee be appointed on the selection Committee.

**NOTE:** 1. The Senate dated 20.1.2013 (Para LXXXV) had resolved that the decision of the Syndicate dated 29.8.2011 (Para 38) and Senate dated 20.12.2011 (Para XIV) regarding appointment of Principals and Assistant Professors in the affiliated College in terms of UGC Regulations 2010, be rectified as under:

“Guidelines regarding composition of Selection Committee for the Selection of Principals and Assistant Professors etc. as contained in the UGC guidelines in question be implemented in letter and spirit only after these are adopted by the Punjab Government.”

2. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 4.1.2014/16.1.2014 (Para 29) had decided that the item be deferred.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that they should adopt this letter of Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Government of Punjab, with regard to API Score with capping.

Referring to the aforesaid letter of the Punjab Government, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that he had a decision of the University Grants Commission meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014.

How could they treat it (the tenure of the appointment of Principal in private Colleges will be 10 years instead of 5 years) the decision of the UGC, especially when it is not in the form of written document. Could it be implemented?

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that Punjab Government letter is there, which is attached as an annexure. What else they wanted?

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that this letter of the Government should be adopted; otherwise, the Director Higher Education's (DHE's) nominees are saying that if they did not accept this letter, the Government would not give approval and then wherefrom the salary would come.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, reading the item, said that this letter is from the Punjab Government and not the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if they go through the item, they would find that the item is only to consider the letter which they had received from Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Government of Punjab. They had to see whether they had any discretion to say yes or not. If they did not have the discretion, they had to adopt it. If they say that it is being adopted, whether they had to adopt those qualifications of API score and other things. An impression is being given as if this would be applicable only in the Punjab Government Colleges. Even when the item was deferred in the earlier meeting, at that time also, the Vice-Chancellor had given the impression that the item would be considered when the representatives of both the Punjab Government and Chandigarh Administration are present in the meeting. He would like to draw their attention towards the most important thing that the Senate had already adopted it. The only thing which was kept pending was constitution of Selection Committees and as far as other part is concerned that already stood adopted by the Senate in its meeting dated 20<sup>th</sup> January 2013. Note 1 say that the Senate dated 20.1.2013 (Para LXXXV) had resolved that the decision of the Syndicate dated 29.8.2011 (Para 38) and Senate dated 20.12.2011 (Para XIV) regarding appointment of Principals and Assistant Professors in the affiliated College in terms of UGC Regulations 2010, be rectified as under:

“Guidelines regarding composition of Selection Committee for the Selection of Principals and Assistant Professors etc. as contained in the UGC guidelines in question be implemented in letter and spirit only after these are adopted by the Punjab Government.”

As such, this had already been adopted. As far as second part is concerned, the Punjab Government had recommended that the tenure

of the appointment of Principal in private Colleges would be 10 years instead of 5 years. The UGC had also decided to extend the tenure of Principals from 5 years to 10 years, but probably they did not have documents. But it is based on some document that the Punjab Government had taken a decision to extend the tenure of Principals from 5 years to 10 years, which is mentioned in the letter under consideration.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he was sorry to say that he had the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate held in the months of January and February 2014. When the item was considered in the earlier meeting of the Syndicate, he had suggested that the item should be brought back after getting information from both Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, as to how they are extending the tenure of Principals of the Colleges, which is not available. The Panjab University would also be facing similar problem because of non-availability of qualified/eligible Principals. Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University had already taken care of this problem and it is only needed that a provision be made to re-employ Principals up to the age of 65 years, in case of non-availability of qualified/eligible Principals. There is already a decision taken in 2006 that in case of Education Colleges where the Principals are not available, they could re-appoint the retiring/retired Principal up to the age of 65 years on year-to-year basis. He, therefore, pleaded that information on the issue be sought/collected from Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, and an item be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting, so that the issue could be formalized. He added that the Government also did not have any objection to this and they are allowing Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, to do so.

It was told that a Committee is already there to look/examine as to how Principals in P.U. Constituent Colleges could be appointed on contract basis. **The issue raised by Shri Ashok Goyal regarding re-employment of Principals up to the age of 65 years on year-to-year basis would also be placed before the said Committee for consideration and Shri Ashok Goyal would be included in that Committee.**

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath remarked that the Punjab Government could not give any direction to the Panjab University and under Section 72 of the Punjab Reorganization Act, 1966, only the Government of India could issue direction to the Panjab University.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that this letter of the Punjab Government should be adopted, but at the same time, the notifications of the UGC under which various benefits had been given to the teachers both University and the College, including enhancement in age of superannuation from 60 years to 65 years, should also be adopted.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that he would request the Punjab Government to adopt the UGC decision with regard to enhancement in the age of superannuation of University and College teachers from 60 years to 65 years.**

Principal B.C. Josan said that the UGC framed Regulation in 2007, when the recommendations of the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission regarding revision of pay-scales w.e.f. 01.01.2006 had come, that payment of 80% of the arrears or part of the salary would be given by the Central

Government and the remaining 20% would be borne by the State Government. This composite scheme had been implemented in five States, including the State of Punjab. Since the Punjab Government had taken the entire money from the Central Government, they are bound to pay the arrears to the teachers.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that he would write to Punjab Government, Central Government and also to the Ministry of Human Resource & Development, Government of India, on the issue.**

**RESOLVED:** That letter dated 5.8.2013 (**Appendix-VI**) received from the Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Government of Punjab with regard to maintain the standard of Higher Education in Universities, Government Aided Private Colleges situated in Punjab State, the UGC notification dated 30.6.2010 and 14.6.2013 regarding API Score for making the appointment and promotion of Principal/Professor/Associate Professor/Assistant Professor be adopted with the following changes:

1. The tenure of the appointment of Principal in Private Colleges will be 10 years instead of 5 years.
2. For the selection of the Principal and Assistant Professor covered under (grant-in aid) scheme, the DPI (Colleges) Punjab or his nominee be appointed on the selection Committee.

**Execution of MoU between Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA)**

**11.** Considered if Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-VII**) be executed between Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA), New Delhi and Department of Defence & National Security Studies (DDNSS), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**NOTE:** The minutes of the meeting dated 20.8.2013 with regard to Research Promotion Cell, for examining and vetting of all the MoU's (pending or new) is enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he appreciated the signing of MoU between Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA), New Delhi and Department of Defence & National Security Studies (DDNSS), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that about two-three years ago a MoU was signed/executed between the Panjab University and British Brook University. He enquired as to what progress had been made on that front.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that what had been said is quite right. Therefore, he suggested that there should be a provision of academic audit of all the MoUs and the same would give a new dimension. This would definitely result into enhancement in terms of academics, students exchange and research activities.

It was clarified that, earlier, there used to be no record of MoUs. But now all the MoUs are given to Research Promotion Cell (RPC) for examining, before they are brought to the Syndicate and that the RPC is maintaining a proper record.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they had created the post of Dean Research. He suggested that other Deans, i.e., Deans, Faculty of Science, Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Business Management & Commerce, Law, Languages, Education, Engineering & Technology, Faculty of Design & Fine Arts, etc. should be attached with Dean Research in order to have better coordination amongst them as far as research activities in the University are concerned.

It was said that Research Promotion Cell is already there for the purpose.

**RESOLVED:** That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-VII**), be executed between Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA), New Delhi and Department of Defence & National Security Studies (DDNSS), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**Request of Divisional Engineer (Horticulture) for sanctioning funds for developing Dusshera Ground**

**12.** Considered the request of Divisional Engineer (Horticulture) P.U. Construction Office to sanction –

- (1) (i) Rs.8,08,000/- (**cost estimates/analysis of rates – Appendix-VIII**) out of the Budget Head “Development fund” alongwith permission to invite tender/quotation for Developing of Dusshera Ground into Cricket ground, Sector-14.
- (ii) to engage one Head Mali and 10 Malies for five months through outsourcing by contractual agency out of the non plan budget.
- (2) (i) Rs.6,21,180 (**cost estimates-Appendix-VIII**) out of the Budget Head “Development fund” for providing and fixing Barbed wire fencing around the Dusshera Ground Sector-14, P.U., Chandigarh
- (ii) Permission to invite tenders/quotations for the subject work.

**RESOLVED:** That the above request of Divisional Engineer (Horticulture), P.U. Construction Office, be acceded to.

**Assignment of Fellow to the Faculties**

**13.** Considered and

**RESOLVED:** That the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name in anticipation of the approval of the Senate:

Professor A.K. Bhandari Dean University Instructions Panjab University, Chandigarh	1. Languages 2. Medical Sciences 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
--	---

**Amendment in Rules**

**14.** Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following amendment in the CIIPP Rule as approved by the joint

meeting of Advisory Committee of IPR cell and CIIPP core committee dated 26.8.2013(**Appendix-IX**):

<b>Existing Rule</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<p>As per rule 9: The distribution of consultancy amount received will be as under:</p> <p>9.1. In case of Advisory Consultancy, 50% of the amount received for item 5.1 (cost of consultants' time, including intellectual fee) will be paid to the consultant(s) and 50% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>9.2 Similarly, in case of service consultancy, 50% of the amount received for item 5.1 above will be paid to the consultant(s) involved and 50% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>As per rule 10.1</p> <p>Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Development Fund and 50% will be available to the Department concerned for the purchase of equipment and/or material or for any academic activity and promotion of industry participation.</p>	<p>As per rule 9: The distribution of consultancy amount received will be as under:</p> <p>9.1. In case of Advisory Consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 (cost of consultants' time, including intellectual fee) will be paid to the consultant(s) and 30% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>9.2 Similarly, in case of service consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 above will be paid to the consultant(s) involved and 30% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>As per rule 10.1</p> <p>Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Development Fund and 50% will be available to the concerned department for the purchase of equipment/ material/ repair of the existing equipment/ maintenance of laboratory infrastructure or for any academic activity/industry participation activity, upon request by the department.</p>

Professor B.S. Bhoop said that, in fact, it is a welcome and laudable step. There were so many Scientists and faculty members, who were getting consultancy offers, but due to only a meagre amount going into their kitties, they were showing reluctance and were shirking this job. Hence, they were demanding increase in their share for providing consultancy services and he was happy that their demand had now been heard and fulfilled.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that reference had been made to Rule 10.1 at pages 62-64 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2005, but since the Calendar had been reprinted in the year 2009, the pages of the Calendar wherein Rule 10.1 mentioned had been changed, i.e., Rule 10.1 at page 65 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009. He suggested that necessary corrections should be made. He further said that as per Item out of total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Development Fund and the remaining 50% will be available to the concerned Department, but as per Calendar, it is Corpus Fund



'Foundation for Higher Education & Research' and not Development Fund. He suggested that necessary corrections should be made.

**It was assured that necessary corrections would be made.**

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that it had been mentioned at page 81 of the Appendix that the reason for low number of patents filing is due to lack of sufficient funds. It had also been mentioned that a sum of at least Rs.40,000/- to Rs.50,000/- is required for patent filing in India and Rs.1.50 lac to Rs.1.75 lac for filing patent in PCT countries. He, suggested that since sufficient funds are not available with the CIIPP, the ratio of share between the Consultant and the University should be reduced to 60:40 instead of 70:30.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That, as approved by the joint meeting of Advisory Committee of IPR cell and CIIPP Core Committee dated 26.8.2013 (**Appendix-IX**), the CIIPP Rules, be amended as under:

Existing Rule	Proposed Amendment
<p>As per Rule 9: The distribution of consultancy amount received will be as under:</p> <p>9.1. In case of Advisory Consultancy, 50% of the amount received for item 5.1 (cost of consultants' time, including intellectual fee) will be paid to the consultant(s) and 50% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>9.2 Similarly, in case of service consultancy, 50% of the amount received for item 5.1 above will be paid to the consultant(s) involved and 50% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>As per rule 10.1</p> <p>Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Development Fund and 50% will be available to the Department concerned for the purchase of equipment and/or material or for any academic activity and promotion of industry participation.</p>	<p>As per Rule 9: The distribution of consultancy amount received will be as under:</p> <p>9.1. In case of Advisory Consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 (cost of consultants' time, including intellectual fee) will be paid to the consultant(s) and 30% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>9.2 Similarly, in case of service consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 above will be paid to the consultant(s) involved and 30% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>As per rule 10.1</p> <p>Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Corpus Fund 'Foundation for Higher Education &amp; Research' and 50% will be available to the concerned Department for the purchase of equipment/ material/repair of the existing equipment/maintenance of laboratory infrastructure or for any academic activity/ industry participation activity, upon request by the Department.</p>

**Change of nomenclature of Department of Commerce, USOL**

**15.** Considered if, the nomenclature of the Department of Commerce, USOL, be changed to Department of Commerce and Management Studies.

**NOTE:** (i) The present and future Dean, Faculty of Business Management and Commerce have opined as under:

“In the light of the courses being offered by the Department of Commerce, USOL, the nomenclature of the Department can be changed to Department of Commerce and Management Studies”.

(ii) The Department of Commerce (USOL) in its faculty meeting held on 23.09.2013 proposed the change in the nomenclature from the “Department of Commerce” to “**Department of Management Studies**” and the Chairperson, USOL has also recommended the said proposal.

(iii) An office note enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

After some discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the nomenclature of the Department of Commerce, University School of Open Learning (USOL), be changed to Department of Commerce and Management Studies, USOL.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 10.02.2014 regarding allocation of Rs.25 lacs out of Amalgamated Fund for installation of A.C. Plant in the Shooting Range Building**

**16.** Considered the following recommendation of the Committee dated 10.02.2014 (**Appendix-XI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that:

- (i) the Rs.25 lacs (balance Rs.24,73,192/-) be reallocated for installation of A.C. Plant for Rs.18.55 lacs and remaining balance for purchase of shooting articles and equipments to be fixed in the Shooting Range Building out of Amalgamated Fund for the session 2013-14.
- (ii) the electricity bill for this building shall be paid out of the Sports Fund.

**NOTE:** That Rs.25.00 lac was sanctioned for the purchase of Multi-Gym Machines out of Amalgamated Fund for the session 2013-14 but the amount could not be utilized and now it was requested that this amount i.e. Rs.25.00 lac be re-appropriated for installation of A.C. Plant and purchase of shooting equipments to be fixed in the Shooting Range Building.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Amalgamated Fund is being spent for creating infrastructure in the hostels, and other sports activities in the University, which could not be done because these facilities are to be used by a select group of students. In fact, the Amalgamated Fund

could be used for the facilities which are to be used by all the students and not by the selected group students. Amalgamated Fund is contributed equally by all the students and the same could be spent for the welfare of all the students. For such activities, i.e., Shooting Range Building, Sports Fund is there.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the Rs.25 lacs (balance Rs.24,73,192/-) be reallocated for installation of A.C. Plant for Rs.18.55 lacs and remaining balance for purchase of shooting articles and equipments to be fixed in the Shooting Range Building out of Amalgamated Fund for the session 2013-14; and
- (2) the electricity bill for this building shall be paid out of the Sports Fund.

**NOTE:** That Rs.25.00 lac was sanctioned for the purchase of Multi-Gym Machines out of Amalgamated Fund for the session 2013-14 but the amount could not be utilized and now it was requested that this amount i.e. Rs.25.00 lac be re-appropriated for installation of A.C. Plant and purchase of shooting equipments to be fixed in the Shooting Range Building.

**Writing off articles of Biotechnology Department**

**17** Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 2.12.2013 (**Appendix-XII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the following articles costing above Rs.1 lac in the Department of Biotechnology be written off from the record as these are not in working order for the last two to three years and are irreparable:

Sr. No.	Name of the Instrument	Date of Purchase	Total cost of the Article
1.	Orbital Shaker	21.06.1997	114357.00
2.	Microplate reader-Biorad Model-550	21.12.1996	187631.00
3.	Pharmacia-Gel Electrophoresis system & Pharmacia Protein Gel Electrophoresis and Electro focusing	27.02.1996	472077.00
4.	Genephora Electrophoresis system	04.09.1999	186855.00

**NOTE:** As per P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2009 at page 450-51, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

1.	Vice-Chancellor	Up to Rs.1 lac per item
2.	Syndicate	Up to Rs. 5 lac per item
3.	Senate	Without any limit for any item

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that there are a lot of costly equipments amounting to crores of rupees, which are lying unused in various Departments and the same are being written off and given to 'Kabaries' at throw away prices. A large number of Departments are

asking for funds from the 'Depreciation Fund' for purchase of new equipments/instruments. He suggested that there is shortage of funds, the University should write to each and every Department asking them to request the Company while purchasing the new equipment/instrument to extend the scheme of buy-back to them, under which the Companies offered at least 30-40% discount. In this way, a lot of money of the University would be saved.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor S.K. Sharma, Professor B.S. Bhoop said that a circular should be sent by the office of the Vice-Chancellor to all the Teaching Departments of the University. He also suggested that before writing off the instrument/equipment, they should see the possibility of having buy-back arrangement.

**This was agreed to.**

**RESOLVED:** That the following articles costing above Rs.1 lac of the Department of Biotechnology, be written off from the record as these are not in working order for the last two to three years and are irreparable:

Sr. No.	Name of the Instrument	Date of Purchase	Total cost of the Article
1.	Orbital Shaker	21.06.1997	1,14,357.00
2.	Microplate reader-Biorad Model-550	21.12.1996	1,87,631.00
3.	Pharmacia-Gel Electrophoresis system & Pharmacia Protein Gel Electrophoresis and Electro focusing	27.02.1996	4,72,077.00
4.	Genephora Electrophoresis system	04.09.1999	1,86,855.00

**Recommendation of the Pension Committee dated 21.11.2013**

**18.** Considered the following recommendation of the Pension Committee dated 21.11.2013 (Item 4) (**Appendix-XIII**) with regard to service rendered by Shri Sukhdev Singh, Caretaker (Retd.) from the department of P.U. Campus Sports in Amalgamated Fund Account w.e.f. 26.10.1960 to 31.3.1978 be treated as qualifying service for pension purpose:

“the employee under question has worked on full time basis and his service was followed by regular employment, therefore, the service rendered by him from 26.10.1960 to 31.3.1978 from the Department of P.U. Campus Sports out of the Amalgamated Fund is eligible for counting towards qualify service for pension”.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate at its meeting held on 29.2.2012 (Para 61) has resolved that the matter be referred to the Pension Committee for consideration.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if there were other similar cases, the same should be dealt with in accordance with the decision taken in this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, the problem arose because the salary to the appointed person was given from the Amalgamated Fund and due to this, the question arose – whether the person concerned is eligible for the Pension or not. Were they running some parallel system of employment in the University? Somewhere the

employees are being paid from the Sports Funds and somewhere from other Funds, e.g., hostel funds and the same should not matter as all are the employees of the University. One fine morning it came to their notice that a person, who has been serving in this University for the last 30 years and is paid salary out of some fund, namely Amalgamated Fund, Hostel Fund, Sports Fund, etc., is retiring from the University service, but his/her name did not exist in the record of the Establishment Branch. Whether such a person is eligible for retiral benefits, including Pension? His proposal in this regard is that recruitment, including temporary/daily-wage basis, in all the Departments of the University, whether it is Sports Department or Hostels or any other such a Department, should be made centrally, i.e., through the Establishment Branch of the University, and by following proper/prescribed procedure in vogue, so that at least they should know as to what is the total strength of the University employees. As such, all kinds of recruitments (regular, temporary, *ad hoc*, daily-wage, contract basis, etc.), which had been made without involving Administrative Block, i.e., Establishment Branch should be discontinued and brought into the University master-roll, irrespective of the fund/budget head for which their salaries are being paid/are to be paid.

**This was agreed to.**

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Sukhdev Singh, Caretaker (Retd.), who retired from the Department of P.U. Campus Sports, had worked on full-time basis and his service was followed by regular employment, therefore, the service rendered by him from 26.10.1960 to 31.3.1978 in the Department of P.U. Campus Sports out of the Amalgamated Fund, be counting towards qualify service for pension.

**Issue regarding Provisional Extension of affiliation to S.D. College, Hoshiarpur**

**19.** Considered if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to S.D. College, Hoshiarpur for Certificate and Diploma Add-on-Course in Computer Based Accounting as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-finance for the session 2013-14.

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

Professor S.K. Sharma said that certain conditions had been mentioned in the Inspection Report, i.e., purchase of latest version of all the software, purchase of 5 computers, renewal of licenses of software and purchase of latest text books in accordance with the syllabus. But nowhere it had been mentioned that these conditions have been met. He, therefore, suggested that extension of affiliation to S.D. College, Hoshiarpur, for Certificate and Diploma Add-on-Course in Computer Based Accounting should be granted subject to fulfilment of these conditions, which should be got verified by sending a Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to S.D. College, Hoshiarpur, for Certificate and Diploma Add-On course in Computer Based Accounting, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-finance, for the session 2013-14, subject to verification of compliance.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 25.2.2014 constituted to adjudicate representation of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College, Sector 46, Chandigarh**

**20.** Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.2.2014 (**Appendix-XV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor as per decision of the Syndicate dated 04.01.2014/16.1.2014 (Para 54) to adjudicate the representation of the Principal, Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Dabur Dhanwantry Hospital, Sector 46-B, Chandigarh, vis-à-vis the facts on record of the Panjab University and to make recommendations in commensuration and in accordance with the orders of the Hon'ble High Court and Government of India.

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is pained to observe that the item which was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> January 2014 was –

“To consider the following recommendation of the Committee dated 11.12.2013 (**Appendix-XV**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that:

- (i) the result of the students of 2010-11 batch of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh, be declared provisionally forthwith. This will be subject to the outcome of any litigation/dispute/ approval pending either with the Government of India or in any Court of Law.
- (ii) for other matters connected with this College the appropriate bodies including Syndicate/ Senate may take any appropriate decision as it may deem fit.”

Whereas now the item placed before the Syndicate is totally different, i.e., “To consider the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.2.2014 (**Appendix-XV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor as per decision of the Syndicate dated 04.01.2014/16.1.2014 (Para 54) to adjudicate the representation of the Principal, Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Dabur Dhanwantry Hospital, Sector 46-B, Chandigarh, vis-à-vis the facts on record of the Panjab University and to make recommendations in commensuration and in accordance with the orders of the Hon'ble High Court and Government of India.” What were the documents before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> January 2014, neither any mention had been made nor a reference given. In fact, the consideration of the item was deferred on the suggestion of the Vice-Chancellor, who, at that time, had said that since the relevant papers were given at the last moment and the members would not be able to apply their minds, the consideration of the item should be deferred. Ultimately, it was decided that these papers be got examined by a Committee and the Vice-Chancellor had specifically said that Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, would be included in the Committee, but Professor Naval Kishore had not been appointed as member of the Committee, whose recommendations were under consideration. Though the Controller of Examinations was not a member, he had been invited to the meeting of the Committee as a Special Invitee. In fact, the Vice-Chancellor at that time (Syndicate meeting dated 4<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> January 2014), had said that a Committee, comprising Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, 1-2 representative/s of the U.T. Administration, Professor D.V.S. Jain, Dr. Krishan Gauba, Professor Naval Kishore, some members of the present Syndicate and maybe 1 or 2 persons more. All the documents should be made available to the Committee so that they could bring up something for the consideration

of the Syndicate. But in this Committee, there is only one member of the Syndicate and Dean, College Development Council and the Registrar are not there. No mention of the earlier Committee, which was headed by Shri Satya Pal Jain, had been made. In fact, the Satya Pal Jain Committee had recommended that the result of the students of 2010-11 batch of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh, be declared provisionally forthwith. This will be subject to the outcome of any litigation/dispute/ approval pending either with the Government of India or in any Court of Law. But the present Committee had made recommendations which are not commensurate with the decision of the Senate, Government of India and the Court as well. The two lines recommendation which had been given by the Committee was not even the subject matter for the consideration of the Syndicate earlier. In fact, the Committee had made following recommendations:

- “1. The admission of the students for the session 2013-14 would be subject to the legal opinion.
2. In future, the University may take appropriate steps well in advance before the admissions in the College so that the subsequent admissions are done as per norms of the University/CCIM under Act, 1970.
3. The batches admitted in previous years, whose admission forms have been accepted by the University on the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, would be allowed to sit in the examination and the result may be declared provisionally. This will be subject to the outcome of any litigation/dispute/approval pending with the Government of India or in any Court of Law.”

This Committee had probably one angle in mind, i.e., to help the students and not the overall scenario relating to judgements of the Court, documents of Government of India and other agencies. He would have been happy, had they given some background of all the related issues. He was sorry to point out that the Controller of Examinations is the only person, who knew the whole background of the case, i.e., about all the orders of the Court, and had thus been invited as Special Invitee to the meeting of the Committee, and the same had been made a part of the proceedings. Though the Syndicate members expect to be guided by the Committee, the minutes of the Committee had not been prepared in a proper manner. If they had to go through all the related documents and other things themselves, then they could have done this job themselves instead of constituting the Committee? He would like to point out that the Court had already passed the buck on to the Government of India. It is on the judgement of the High Court that the issue is to be decided by the Government of India in respect of years 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12 and he thought for 2012-13 also. As far as the first recommendation for the year 2013-14 is concerned, that issue is already closed because that writ has been finally dismissed or disposed off with some directions. 2013-14 had already closed down the doors for this College and even if the University wanted, they could not do anything. The earlier recommendations (original recommendations made by Satya Pal Jain Committee), which were placed before the Syndicate were “that the result of the students of 2010-11 batch of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh, be declared provisionally forthwith, subject to the outcome of any litigation/dispute/approval

pending either with the Government of India or in any Court of Law". As per that order, the High Court had directed the University to go in for fresh inspection and that inspection report was supposed to be sent to the Government of India for adjudication. Till the time of the last meeting, the Government of India had not passed any order in spite of the order of the Court. So Satya Pal Jain Committee also took a view that subject to any outcome of the orders to be passed by the Government of India, let us declare the results of the students of 2010-11 batch provisionally. Because there were protests and only to ease and smoothen the situation, they recommended declaration of results of the students of 2010-11 batch provisionally and the same is yet to be approved by the Syndicate. He was sure that it must be in the knowledge of the Vice-Chancellor and other authorities that in terms of the orders of the Court, the Government of India had passed the orders now. What were the conditions which were laid down by the Government of India and which were debated in the Court of Law also were **subject to continuation of affiliation by the University?** The University had not granted affiliation to Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Chandigarh, for 4-5 years continuously and every year they were getting permission to admit the students from the Court and, that too, subject to final outcome of the case. If the petition had been dismissed finally, the students have to bear the loss and if the petition succeeded, the admissions of the students are to be regularized. Now, he would like to read only a couple of lines that the Committee seems to have taken the decision on humanitarian grounds, but the Court of Law says (page 68 of the order of Justice Ranjit Singh) that "the challenge raised in the CWP No.8697 of 2009 and CWP No.17592 is not made out the merit. In CWP 8697, the prayer was against the University where it had found certain deficiencies in the faculty of the College. Subsequently, the College had survived on the basis of interim protection grant by this Court. If the petitioner College still has not make up the deficiencies in regard to faculty, it cannot be permitted to continue with the class even if the course has advanced for all these years. I am conscious of the fact that the students, who had been admitted in the year 2008-09, would now be on the verge of completing the course or may have completed the course, but equally important is for the Court to see that the deficiencies which were noticed in the faculty and other deficiencies which were found in the College & Hospital are removed, so as to ensure that the Colleges produces the good doctors in the field. The challenge in CWP No.17592 of 2010 was to the denial of permission to admit students for session 2010-11. On the basis of recommendation made by CCIM though there may be a contrary recommendation made by the Panjab University. Plea is that such recommendation of the University would be rendered redundant. I am not prepared to accept this position as a purely correct position as has been canvassed before me. Considering the fact that the students admitted in the year 2009-10 or 2010-11 have continued with the study for considerable period, I am not inclined to cancel such admission at this stage as ultimately it would prejudice the students and students alone and may not result in much harm or prejudice to the college as such, but such permission has to be on the basis of satisfaction which the University must now make in regard to the faculty engaged by the college. It may need a mention here that the college had been granted a provisional permission to admit the students subject to the condition that it would fulfil the deficiencies in the faculty engaged by the college. Let, fresh inspection be conducted by the Panjab University especially in regard to the faculty engaged by the college and in regard to the other deficiencies as noticed and submit a fresh report before the Union of



India so far as challenge in these two writ petitions are concerned. On the basis of this report, the Union of India would be at liberty to pass a fresh order in accordance with law. The Union of India can then consider the report and consider the case of the petitioner college for all the said years with some sympathy considering that the career of students is linked with it. If any adverse order is still passed and if the petitioner college still feels aggrieved against the same, it may take any appropriate action in accordance with law. These two Civil Writ Petition Nos.8697 of 2009 and 17592 of 2010 are accordingly disposed of in the above terms. Civil Writ Petition No.16219 of 2012 is, however, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs". From this, it is clear that the ball was only in the court of Government of India and they could not have done anything in view of the strong observation of the Court. They could only pray and pray, hoping against hope that the Government of India would consider their case positively and sympathetically and, maybe, the fate of the students would be saved. He also had sympathy with the students, but had no sympathy with the management of the College, which in fact, is playing fraud with the society as a whole, the parents of the students and the students whose career is at stake. Instead of penalizing those people who are responsible for such a blunder, they all are penalizing the University, which in fact, is established to maintain excellence in academics, especially in the field of professional courses. A document, which he told the Vice-Chancellor on that day, he could not read the whole of it because it was handed over to him on the same day, clearly says that for 2010 and 2011, the University never granted the affiliation to the College and on the basis of that an order was already passed on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2013 wherein it is very clearly mentioned that an order had been passed by the Government of India after the order which had been passed by the Court which was conveyed to the Principal of the College vide letter dated 11.03.2014, i.e., only four days back. After mentioning both the writ petitions, the order says that "The Department had received a letter No. MISC/A-6/20552 dated 20.12.2013 from the Panjab University, Chandigarh, along with inspection report of the above said college for necessary action in compliance of the Hon'ble Court's Order. Therefore, an opportunity of hearing was given to the college under provisions of first proviso of sub-section 5 of section 13A of IMCC Act, 1970 to substantiate the claim of having valid affiliation from the University concerned vide hearing notice of even no. dated 20.01.2014 for presenting their case along with all relevant documents before the designated Hearing Committee on 31.01.2014 at 10.30 A.M. The Court had ordered that they should consider the case for all the years starting from 2008. After considering their representation, they had given the relief only for one year and not for 2008-09, 2009-10, 2011-12 and 2012-13. The relief is "The representative of the College had appeared before the designated hearing Committee in the Department of AYUSH on 31.01.2014 and produced relevant documents in respect of affiliation from the University concerned for the academic session 2010-11. They also made mention of the observations of hearing Committee based on submission made by the college along with the relevant documents during the hearing indicate that the affiliation of the college to the Panjab University was continued for the session 2010-11. They had not been entertaining them only on one ground that they had not granted them affiliation. It is only on the basis of interim orders, the students were admitted by the college. He did not know which documents they were able to produce before the AYUSH, Government of India, Ministry of Health, which said that the Panjab University had granted them affiliation for the year 2010-11. Why he is referring to

this is because the last para is “Therefore, in supersession to the Department’s order No.R-17011/14/2009-EP dated 20.12.2010, it has been decided by the Central Government to grant permission to Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Dabur Dhanwantry Hospital, Sector 46-B, Chandigarh, Punjab for BAMS (UG) course with 50 seats under Section 13C/A of the IMCC Act, 1970 for the academic session 2010-11 in compliance to Court’s Order dated 17.07.2013 of Hon’ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh in L.P.A. No.2156/2012(O&M). As far as other years are concerned, the issue is closed. As far as the year 2010-11 is concerned, they know for sure that they had not granted any affiliation to this College. What fraud the College had played by producing the documents for getting the affiliation from the AYUSH, needed to be seen. He read out an extract from the letter dated 20.10.2010 of AYUSH, which reads as “Whereas, after careful consideration of the written as well as oral submissions made by the College during the hearing and the recommendation of the CCIM, the Central Government in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Department of AYUSH, New Delhi had concluded that the college under reference did not fulfil even the basic eligibility criteria approved for the academic session 2011-12 as the college does not fulfil the eligibility of genuine functional Ayurvedic Hospital and the College could not produce sufficient supporting documents for establishing that there is a genuinely functional hospital”. The University had also written to AYUSH to stop the College from making the admission for the session 2010-11 because the University had refused to grant affiliation to the College. Not only the University had declined them affiliation, but had taken up the matter with the AYUSH also that they should not allow the College to make admissions. But now after they have shown one particular document which says that the Panjab University has granted them affiliation, the AYUSH had to supersede its own orders. As such, his suggestion in this regard is that the University had no alternative but to obey the orders of the Court and the Court had already given them the liberty that in case any adverse orders passed by the Government of India, they could approach the Court. But as far as 2010-11 is concerned, the University should write to AYUSH to send the copies of the documents, which have been presented to them, indicating that the Panjab University has granted affiliation to them for 2010-11. Secondly, through the Vice-Chancellor, he would like to ask the Controller of Examinations specifically as to how he could give such recommendations because he knew all the judgements of the Court. He (Controller of Examinations) very well knew that the University had not granted affiliation to this College for the last 4-5 years. If this is how they function, probably, they would lose faith in each other.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that the Committee, under recommendation 3, had recommended that the batches admitted in previous years, whose admission forms have been accepted by the University on the directions of the Hon’ble High Court, would be allowed to sit in the examination and the result may be declared provisionally. What is the background behind this recommendation? Were there any direction from the Hon’ble High Court for the previous years of admission and whose admissions have been accepted by the University on the direction of the Court?

The Vice-Chancellor said that, perhaps, the Committee had taken a liberal view to help the students.

It was clarified that the Controller of Examinations was invited by one of the members to the meeting when the same was on. He (Controller of Examinations) was not aware of the agenda. He was specifically asked whether the examination forms of the students of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Chandigarh had been accepted or not and he had told that it is in the light of the recommendation of Satya Pal Jain Committee that the results were declared provisionally. Now, if the Committee recommended something and the same is approved by the Syndicate or some direction is given by the Vice-Chancellor, he would proceed in the matter accordingly. This was only his partial participation and he did not know the final outcome of the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that then the name of Controller of Examinations should be deleted from the proceedings of the Committee meeting dated 25.2.2014.

It was told that the Controller of Examinations had already given in writing that his presence should be deleted from the minutes of the Committee dated 25.2.2014.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the issue is more serious. What was the idea of mentioning the presence of Controller of Examinations as Special Invitee? Was it to add credibility to the report of the Committee? With all due respect to the members of the Committee, probably, it is not fair on their part.

The Vice-Chancellor said that U.T. representative (Shri Sandeep Hans, Director Higher Education) was in the Committee, but he could not attend. Earlier, there were two Committees and he tried to appoint all the stakeholders on the Committee. It is in that spirit that he put Professor D.V.S. Jain as Chairman of the Committee, who had earlier inspected the College also. Similarly, Dr. Krishan Gauba, who was Chairman of the other Committee and was also Dean of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, was appointed other member. One member from the Syndicate (Principal B.C. Josan) and one from the Senate (Professor Ronki Ram) and Director, Ayurvedic (Punjab State) were appointed other members. He did speak to Shri Sandeep Hans and told him that since the land had been given to the College by the U.T. Administration, they should play a pro-active role and the non-compliance by the College should not be taken lightly. At the end of the day, now the ball was put in the Government of India court and the Government of India had given ruling of certain kind. Though he had not seen the latest papers, Professor Naval Kishore had. It had been mentioned in the orders of the Government of India that the University has recommended to stop admissions in the College for the year 2010-11 and the affiliation of the concerned University is a pre-requisite for making an application. On the one hand, the University is recommending to AYUSH that they should stop the College to make admissions and on the other hand, a Committee headed by Satya Pal Jain recommended declaration of results provisionally. Now, he was sure that the letter to which he was referring to must have been received by the University a couple of days before. In fact, he had expected that the said letter would be placed before the Syndicate because that is the latest situation and the members are made aware about the same. In the orders, it is clear that it is only for the year 2010-11. At that time in 2010, the College had said that the Panjab University had refused affiliation and they were asked to stop the admissions and now they had submitted certain papers regarding

grant of affiliation, which had forced them to revise their own decision. He thought that it called for an urgent action on the part of the University to ask them as to what papers they had supplied to the AYUSH. Either somebody had given some papers to them on behalf of the University or they have used some forged documents.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor D.V.S. Jain Committee also would not have gone through these documents.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Professor D.V.S. Jain, Dr. Krishan Gauba and Professor Ashish Jain, are three members, who had inspected the College not once, but twice and both the times they had recommended that affiliation be not granted to the College. The fourth member, i.e., Director, Ayurvedic (Punjab State), who had been included in the Committee, but his wife is an employee of the College. Nobody brought it to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor, but the moment it came to his (Shri Goyal) notice, he immediately brought it to their notice. That gentleman also requested him to come to attend the meeting and he also told that his wife is an employee of the College, but in spite of all this, nowhere it had been mentioned that his wife is an employee of the College. At this stage, their hands are tied and they are left with no other alternative, but to consider this order of the Government of India and, that too, after satisfying that under what circumstances, the College is able to convey to the Government that they had been granted affiliation by the University for the year 2010-11. However, for all other years, the issue is closed because Satya Pal Jain Committee had recommended that the result of the students of 2010-11 batch of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh, be declared provisionally forthwith and the same would be subject to the outcome of any litigation/ dispute/ approval pending either with the Government of India or in any Court of Law and the last line of the recommendations of this Committee also says that this would be subject to the outcome of any litigation/ dispute/approval pending with the Government of India or in any Court of Law. As such, the issue is closed now.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee could not be put at fault because it had taken a humanitarian ground to help the students.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the Committee had taken a liberal view only to help the students.

Referring to the remarks that the Committee had made recommendations keeping in view the career of the students, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the College did not get any relief from the Court for the year 2013-14. They had clearly told that affiliation could not be granted to it, but the College went to the extent of stating in the Court that they would get affiliation from another University in the State of Punjab, which they themselves knew that it could not be done because it is situated in the territorial jurisdiction of the Panjab University. In the year 2013-14 also, the College had made admissions, but not through the University Counselling System, but charging money which is known to everybody. Whosoever dared to point out anything against them, they levelled allegations against him/her. Earlier, serious allegations were levelled against him (Shri Goyal) as well as Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath in the Court of Law by way of an affidavit, but nobody had bothered to file the case and argue for them. The Vice-Chancellor might be aware that when he was

appointed a member of the Committee headed by Shri Satya Pal Jain and information given to him, he immediately sent a message to the Vice-Chancellor that it would not be possible for him to attend the meeting as certain allegations were levelled against him, but that had also not been mentioned in the minutes of the Committee. If they took a decision in regard to this College, they would start raising fingers against the Vice-Chancellor and other members of the Syndicate as well, but that did not at least deter him from speaking the truth. In the light of all this, it had been found that the College had used some fraudulent papers convincing the AYUSH/Government of India that they had been granted affiliation by the University, criminal proceedings should be started/ initiated against the College.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor S.K. Sharma stated that action must be taken against the College for using fraudulent documents.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that whatever decision/s they had taken, that was on the basis of the documents supplied by the College to the fact that the University had not recommended them affiliation, but AYUSH had ignored the recommendations of the University and had allowed the College. Anyhow they were not bothered about them, but they were concerned only about the career of the students, who had been admitted by the College under the orders of the Court and they should not let the students suffer. In the light of that, they made the recommendation that the students, who have been admitted and roll numbers issued to them by the University, should not be stopped.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the recommendation of the Committee was that the results of the students be declared provisionally subject to the final outcome of the case in the Court of Law and Government of India.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that he was a member of the Inspection Committee to this College twice. He was made party in the Court by the College and the Counsel of the College, Mr. Amar Vivek, levelled charges against him which were abused. When he had gone to inspect the College as a member of the Inspection Committee, the College had tried to bribe him. Similar allegations were levelled against him in the Court and the Judges of the High Court had admonished them and told them that they must apologize and withdraw the allegations. In fact, the Judges had remarked that they did not know the amount of respect they had got for this man. The University had been writing against the College, but the CCIM supported the College to get approval from the Government of India. As such, the University could not do anything against the College. Ultimately, the judgement of Mr. Justice Ranjit Singh put stop on their all actions. Rightly or wrongly, the College was able to get orders from the Court to admit the students and they (members of the Syndicate and Senate) earnestly felt that the students should not suffer; but they were particular so far as 2013-14 was concerned and said that they could be allowed only and only if they got approval from AYUSH and also get clearance from the University. Shri Ashok Goyal had rightly said that they are moved for the fate of poor students, who have been admitted by the College, but so far as admissions in future are concerned, they could not do anything unless they get clearance from AYUSH.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar enquired could they help the students even after the judgement of the Court and orders of the Government of India?

Principal Puneet Bedi enquired would the students, who had passed out or are passing out, from this Institution, be able to do practice? Were they helping them or playing with their careers?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in spite of getting no from the University as well as from AYUSH, the College admitted the students after taking affidavits from the students as well as from their parents that in case their admissions are not regularized, the College would not be responsible and they are taking admission at their own risk and responsibility. In this way, they had taken lakhs of rupees from the students as fee. As such, all the students as well as their parents knew in advance everything during all these years, including that the College did not have affiliation from the University and the admissions are being made under the orders of the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they had to find out from the Government of India what they did and on what basis they did so. Thereafter, they would proceed in the matter accordingly. As far as 2013-14 is concerned, the College had no orders from anywhere, i.e., neither of the Court nor Government of India; hence, nothing could be done for 2013-14.

When it was informed that the College had orders of the High Court for making admissions, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the High Court had asked the Government of India to pass final orders and the Government of India had now ordered that the Central Government had decided to grant permission to Shri Dhanwatry Ayurvedic College & Dabur Dhanwantry Hospital, Sector 46-B, Chandigarh, Punjab, for BAMS (UG) course with 50 seats, for the academic session 2010-11. Clarifying, he stated that after the University as well as the Court saying 'No', the AYUSH had given them personal hearing and, thereafter, they had said 'No' and in that orders, they had mentioned that the Panjab University had also refused to grant affiliation to the College and had also recommended that the College should not be allowed to make admissions. After those orders of the Government of India, the College again went to the Court, knowing fully well that the day the final order is passed, the students would be out. He added that, earlier, the Central Council for Indian Medicines (CCIM) was the final authority, but about 5 years back, the final authority had been made AYUSH and since the inception of AYUSH, the College had never got recognition/affiliation.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Dean, College Development Council or Deputy Registrar (Colleges) and Senior Law Officer of the University be asked to visit AYUSH themselves and find out and obtain the copies of the documents which the College had submitted claiming that Panjab University had given affiliation to Shri Dhanwatry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46-B, Chandigarh, for the academic session 2010-11. Thereafter, the matter be placed before the Syndicate for taking appropriate action.

**Recommendations of the  
Committee dated  
18.02.2014 with regard to  
Community Colleges  
Scheme**

**21.** Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 18.02.2014 (**Appendix-XVI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to

provide guidance to proceed further in the matter of Community Colleges Scheme w.e.f. the academic session 2014-15, which is to be designed as per Central Government directions in the recent past.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the last Syndicate, i.e., the Syndicate for the year 2013, had constituted a Committee comprising Dr. Jagwant Singh, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. R.P.S. Josh and Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh. The Committee had a meeting and also made certain recommendations, but there is neither any mention of that Committee nor is of its recommendation/s. How and why another Committee has been constituted? Though the Syndicate approves the names of the candidates for award of degrees of Doctor of Philosophy, the relevant papers are always supplied to the members of the Syndicate. But in the case under consideration the full background and the relevant papers have not been supplied to the members, which is not appropriate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that, initially, there was an observation that first of all the concept of these Community Colleges should be adopted by the University, which was done by the University Senate in its meeting held in the month of September 2013. Later on, as told by Shri Ashok Goyal, a Committee was constituted, which met and made certain recommendations, but at least they are not having those recommendations. The question is whether this Committee has been constituted just to take into consideration all those things and it did not matter whether all the guidelines are attached or not. But at the time when the concept was adopted, all the guidelines were supplied to the members of the Syndicate when the starting of certain courses under the Community Colleges Scheme was approved for Post Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh and two courses at Government College, Ludhiana, for the session 2013-14. At that time, two Colleges had been issued sanction letter for a sum of Rs.43 lacs (for each College) to run these courses, but the Government had not released any money so far. In the meantime, the issue regarding the guidelines, framework, fee structure, number of seats, etc. arose and the same was considered by this Committee in its meeting held on 18.02.2014. Now, the Committee had recommended Regulations, Rules, number of seats – 30 in each unit, 50:50 ratio of resource persons for teaching these courses from the University/Colleges and the industry, half fee structure of the existing courses to attract the students, etc. because this is an innovative scheme of the MHRD. They had not put any restriction of age bar for these courses. The guidelines and the courses had been duly approved by the University. The course module of Retail Management and Tourism has also been approved. He would also like to point out that the actual name of this course is **'Retail Management and Tourism'** and not Retail Management and Tourism and Finance Services. Whatever guidelines are there, the same have been approved and implemented.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired as to what is the concept of Community Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there had been numerous seminars and other fora where all these things had been discussed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that recently on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2014, the UGC floated the scheme for all the Colleges as well as Universities across the country.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as far as Community Colleges are concerned, the South Indian States are far ahead of North Indian

States. He further said that the concept of Community Colleges had been well articulated time and again. Right now, they have a concrete proposal. He was in agreement that there are shortcomings in the writing of minutes of the meetings of the Committee, which are in cryptic form.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that all the details should be provided to them. He added that he had gone through the scheme and knew that there is provision of exit route and award of associate degree. Ultimately, they have to amend their regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whenever something new is introduced, a concept paper has to be attached/provided. **Since the minutes of the meeting of the Committee are too cryptic, a comprehensive note would be prepared by the office and attached with the proceedings as an annexure.**

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that since they were not aware whether the private Colleges could also apply for the courses under this Scheme of Community Colleges, several private Colleges, including his College (DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh), could not apply.

**The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the courses under the Scheme of Community Colleges are for every College. He asked the Dean, College Development Council, to send an e-mail on the issue to all the Colleges stating that the last date for applying is 15<sup>th</sup> April 2014.**

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 18.02.2014, be approved, as per **Appendix-XVI**, with the modification that the nomenclature of the courses run at Post Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, be approved as (i) Retail Management and Tourism; and (ii) Finance Service and similarly for SCD Government College, Ludhiana, the nomenclature of the courses is: (i) Software Development; and (ii) Stock Market Trading and Operations.

**Agenda Items 22 and 23 being Ratification and Information Items, these be read under Items 33 and 34.**

**Consideration of following items 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 on the agenda was deferred:**

## Deferred Items

**24.** To consider if –

- (i) the request dated 17.09.2013 of the Chairman, Governing Body of new proposed College namely-Rayat & Bahra College of Law, Bohan, District Hoshiarpur for opening of Law College to conduct B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (5 years Integrated) course with intake of 60 seats from the session 2014-2015, be accepted and processed further or not.
- (ii) the Vice-Chancellor's nominee be appointed on the Inspection Committee constituted by the DPI(Colleges) Punjab for grant of NOC.

**NOTE:** A detailed office note was enclosed.

**25.** To consider minutes dated 18.11.2013 & 19.2.2014 of the Committees constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the



implementation of Semester System at Undergraduate level w.e.f. the session 2014-15 in the light of discussions at the level of Vice-Chancellor of P.U., GNDU and Punjabi University, Patiala and the visit of Secretary, HE, MHRD to P.U. on 16.8.2013.

**26.** To consider minutes dated 21.5.2013 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to frame the policy for internal promotion of the teachers working in the Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector-26, Chandigarh.

**NOTE:** An office note was enclosed.

**27.** To consider if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to P.G. Govt. College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh for Add-on-Courses in Advance Diploma course in Entrepreneurship Career Oriented course, as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self financing Scheme for the session 2014-2015.

**NOTE:** Inspection Report and Office note were enclosed.

**28.** To consider if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to National College for Women, Machhiwara (Ludhiana) for Add-On Courses, in Certificate Course in Computer Based Accounting and Advance Diploma in Fashion Designing Career Oriented Courses, as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self financing Scheme for the session 2014-2015.

**NOTE:** Inspection Report and Office note were enclosed.

**29.** To consider the recommendations of the Board of Control dated 12.8.2014 of Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies and Development P.U., Chandigarh to increase the number of seats in M.A. in Women's Studies from 17 to 30.

**NOTE:** No additional infrastructure is required for this purpose.

**30.** To consider the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that a sum of Rs.10.00 lac be sanctioned out of 'Depreciation Fund' for purchase of following items in the Department of Biochemistry, P.U., Chandigarh:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Amount (Rs. In lacs)</b>
(i)	Nanodrop spectrometer	: Rs.8.50 lacs
(ii)	Five Refrigerators for labs	: Rs.1.50 lacs
	<b>Total</b>	<b>: Rs.10.00 lacs</b>

**NOTE:** 1. The above would require approval of the Syndicate in term of decision of the Senate vide (Para L (7B)) dated 18.12.2005 as under:

7(b) The power to sanction and incur expenditure per item out of

'Depreciation Fund' Account be fixed as under:

- |    |                 |                                   |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | Vice-Chancellor | :                                 |
|    |                 | up to 5 lacs                      |
| 2. | Syndicate       | :                                 |
|    |                 | up to 10 lacs                     |
| 3. | Senate          | :                                 |
|    |                 | without any limit<br>for any item |

2. The above articles have been written off by the Committee constituted for the purpose.

### **Donation for institution of Endowment**

**31.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for establishing Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap's Oration Award in the memory of eminent Botanist from Panjab University, Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap with the endowment money of Rs.4,00,000/- out of which Rs.3,00,000/- contributed by Smt. Uma Sood (famous as Kamini Kaushal) daughter of Professor Kashyap and Rs.1,00,000/- by way of voluntary contribution from faculty and students of Department of Botany on the following terms and conditions:

- (i) The interest earned on the endowment shall be utilized for conduct of Annual Oration which *inter-alia* includes expenditure of TA/DA/ honorarium of awardee, hospitality expenditure etc.
- (ii) On annual basis, the departmental academic and administrative Committee shall recommend a panel of three eminent scientists for consideration of Vice-Chancellor to approve the name for conferment of Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap Oration Award.

**NOTE:** 1. Professor Kashyap was a great aluminous of Department of Botany who had nurtured great botanists such as Professor A.C. Joshi (Former Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University), Dr. M.S. Randhawa (Former Vice-Chancellor PAU, Ludhiana), Professor Birbal Sahni and Professor P.N. Mehra. A brief biography of Professor Kashyap was enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).

2. For the first year, the Vice-Chancellor has approved the name of Professor M.S. Swaminathan, Emeritus Chairman & Chief Mentor, M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation, Chennai, for Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap Oration Award.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for establishing Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap's Oration Award in the memory of eminent Botanist from Panjab University, Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap with the endowment money of Rs.4,00,000/- out of which Rs.3,00,000/- contributed by Smt. Uma Sood (famous as

Kamini Kaushal) daughter of Professor Kashyap and Rs.1,00,000/- by way of voluntary contribution from faculty and students of Department of Botany, be approved, on the following terms and conditions:

- (i) The interest earned on the endowment shall be utilized for conduct of Annual Oration which *inter-alia* includes expenditure of TA/DA/ honorarium of awardee, hospitality expenditure etc.
- (ii) On annual basis, the departmental academic and administrative Committee shall recommend a panel of three eminent scientists for consideration of Vice-Chancellor to approve the name for conferment of Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap Oration Award.

**RESOLVED FURTHER :** Thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to the donors.

**Increase in number of seats of Post Graduate courses in the affiliated Colleges**

**32.** Considered if the number of seats be increased in Post Graduate courses at Colleges affiliated to Panjab University w.e.f. the session 2012-2013 onward, as per circular issued by the Colleges Branch vide letter No. 8105-8224 dated 29.6.2012 (**Appendix-XVIII**) as under:

- (i) Course with practical 40 seats
- (ii) Course without practical 60 seats

Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

**RESOLVED:** That the number of seats of Post Graduate courses in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, be increased, w.e.f. the session 2012-2013 onward, as per circular issued by the Colleges Branch vide letter No. 8105-8224 dated 29.6.2012 (**Appendix-XVIII**), as under:

- (i) Course with practical 40 seats
- (ii) Course without practical 60 seats.

**Agenda Items 22 and 23 being Ratification and Information Items, these be read under Items 33 and 34.**

**Routine and formal matters**

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

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 17.2.2014 (**Appendix-XIX**) to review the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the re-employment of Dr. (Ms.) Neelam Grover, Professor in Geography, University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, on contract basis up to 07.02.2019 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date she join as such with one day break as usual, as per

rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58)/29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) 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, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.
  2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 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.”

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of Er. V.K. Bhardwaj, Technical Advisor, Construction Office, P.U. for another one year w.e.f. 22.02.2014 to 21.2.2015, on the previous terms & conditions.
- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has executed the Memorandum of the Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XX**) between TEQIP Knowledge Incubation Centre, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur and University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed Shri Manohar Lal, Deputy Registrar, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, to retire voluntarily w.e.f. 3.1.2014, by

waiving off the condition of three months notice, keeping in view of having his bad health & monetary position, under Regulation 17.5 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and sanctioned the following retiral benefits, under Regulation 17.9 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007:

1. **Gratuity:** as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007.
2. **Furlough** for six months as admissible under Regulation 12.2 (B) (iii) at pages 124-125 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough; and
3. **Encashment of Earned Leave:** as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar Volume III, 2009.

**Referring to Sub-Item 33-R(i)**, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired wherein and how the existing qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security had been revised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the post of Chief of University Security was advertised with certain physical conditions and it was observed that the police personnel of a certain age group were not eligible according to the advertised physical conditions. Therefore, they decided to revise the qualifications.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he thought that the earlier qualifications were laid down by the Syndicate. The difficulty narrated by the Vice-Chancellor should have been shared with the Syndicate, so that the Syndicate could take up whether to revise the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security or not. The proceedings of the meeting of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to review the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security, held on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2014 are with them. Though the said-proceedings had been approved by the Vice-Chancellor on 20<sup>th</sup> February itself, the same had not been placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014. Instead of placing the matter before the Syndicate on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014, the Vice-Chancellor preferred to approve the recommendations of the Committee, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate. Referring to the minutes of the Committee, he stated that Professor Anil Monga is the only expert, who had attended the meeting and the other expert, Lt. General B.S. Dhaliwal could not attend the meeting. He did not know wherefrom these persons had taken the guidelines regarding the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security. It seemed as if the qualifications had been framed keeping in view a particular person, which probably, is not appropriate. One of the qualifications is 'Police Officers (DSP & above) having minimum of 10 years' experience and, that too, below the age of 50 years' which is hardly to be found. He wondered whether they could get any DSP with 10 years experience below the age of 50 years, unless and until the person concerned had joined as DSP directly. If they recruit the Chief of University Security at the age of 50 years, would the person be redundant after attaining the age of 55 years. If the person recruited at the age of 50 years did

not become redundant after attaining the age of 55 years, why they are demanding a person below the age of 50 years? In view of the above, he suggested that the recommended qualifications needed to be re-looked into and re-framed. Since the post had already been advertised, the same should be kept in abeyance and the qualifications for the post of Chief of the University Security should be got laid-down by the experts.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the post of Chief of University Security had been advertised several times. Earlier, 10 years experience was prescribed, but the same was reduced to 5 years as they did not find candidates with ten years experience. Now, the experience had again been raised to 10 years. Normally, Commissioned Officers retired at the age of 52 years and they also get extension of three years in the same rank, which is counted for calculation of pension. As such, the Commissioned Officers retired at the age of 55 years. He, therefore, suggested that a Committee should be constituted to re-frame the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the maximum age should be below 56 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the qualification for the post of Chief of University Security would be re-framed and thereafter a Corrigendum would be issued.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Item 33 – R-(ii) to R-(v)** on the agenda, be ratified.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee be constituted comprising experts to re-frame the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security and once the recommended qualifications are approved, a corrigendum be issued.

## **Routine and formal matters**

**34.** The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(vi)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

**(i)** The Vice-Chancellor has nominated following two University Lecturers, i.e., one from the Science Faculty and one from the other Faculties, on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2014 to 31.01.2016, under Regulation 1.1(k) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Dr. Gurmeet Kaur  
Department of Geology  
Panjab University, Chandigarh
2. Mrs. Shruti Bedi  
University Institute of Legal Studies  
Panjab University, Chandigarh

**NOTE:** Regulation 1.1(k) *ibid* provides that two University Lecturers (one from Science Faculty and one from other Faculties) shall be nominated by the Syndicate, by rotation, every alternate year, for

two years term, beginning from February 1.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, has nominated following two University Readers, i.e. one from the Science Faculty and one from the other Faculties, on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2014 to 31.01.2016, under Regulation 1.1(m) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Dr. (Ms.) Sheena Pall  
University School of Open Learning  
P.U., Chandigarh
2. Dr. Latika Sharma  
Department of Education  
P.U., Chandigarh

**NOTE:** Regulation 1.1(m) *ibid* provides that two University Readers are to be nominated by the Syndicate on the Academic Council. These members shall hold for two years term beginning from February 1.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 20.2.2014 (**Appendix-XXI**), has allowed three students (Kunal Choudhary, Harshit Mahajan and Gaurav Johar) to exit from Five Years Integrated B.E. MBA (Chemical Engineering) after four years as one time exception.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor in accordance with the decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013 (Para 5) has granted Extra Ordinary Leave without pay to Dr. Devi Sirohi nee Devi Verma, Professor (Re-employed), Department of History for one year w.e.f. 07.02.2014 (F.N.) to enable her to join as Chairperson of the Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights.

(v) 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. Salochna Rani Assistant Registrar Examination-I	08.03.1976	31.03.2014	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Salwinder Singh Superintendent (Proof-Reading) General Branch	05.06.1981	31.03.2014	
3.	Shri Jagdish Parsad Superintendent Single Window Enquiry	05.01.1976	31.03.2014	
4.	Shri Darshan Singh Superintendent Examination-IV	10.12.1979	31.03.2014	
5.	Shri Ratti Ram Superintendent University School of Open Learning	29.09.1980	31.03.2014	

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 15<sup>th</sup> March 2014

6.	Shri Hira Singh Section Holder P.U. Press	06.11.1973	28.02.2014	} Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulation.
7.	Shri Kapur Singh Randhawa Superintendent Accounts (Fee-checking)	12.02.1982	31.03.2014	
8.	Shri Daman Kumar Work-Inspector (Technician) G-III Construction Office	12.06.1985	31.03.2014	

**(vi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in term of the decision dated 12.11.2013 of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.2974 of 2012, has approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor, in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000.

**Referring to Sub-Item 34-I(ii)**, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that, as per Regulation 1.1(m) at page 32 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, two persons are to be nominated on the Academic Council – one from the Faculty of Science and another from other Faculties. But none of the nominated persons belongs to Faculty of Science. He, therefore, suggested that one person should be nominated from the Faculty of Science.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in Item **34-I(i) and I-(iii) to I-(vi)**, on the agenda, be noted.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That since none of the persons nominated on the Academic Council (**Item 34-I(ii)**), as per Regulation 1.1(m) at page 32 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, belonged to the Faculty of Science, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to nominate a person from the Faculty of Science on the Academic Council in place of Dr. (Mrs.) Sheena Pall or Dr. Latika Sharma.

**At this stage, it was decided that the next meeting of the Syndicate be fixed on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2014 at 2.00 p.m.**

A.K. Bhandari  
Registrar

Confirmed

**Arun Kumar Grover**  
**VICE-CHANCELLOR**