

## **PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 25<sup>th</sup> January 2015 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### **PRESENT**

1. Professor A.K. Grover ... (in the Chair)  
Vice-Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor A.K. Bhandari
4. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
5. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
6. Principal (Dr.) Gurdip Kumar Sharma
7. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
8. Shri Jarnail Singh
9. Professor Karamjeet Singh
10. Shri Naresh Gaur
11. Professor Navdeep Goyal
12. Principal (Mrs.) Parveen Kaur Chawla
13. Professor Rajesh Gill
14. Professor Ronki Ram
15. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
16. Professor Yog Raj Angrish
17. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed all the distinguished members to the first meeting of the Syndicate and trusted that he would get full cooperation and guidance from all of them. He added that he would also like to take this occasion to register his thanks to all the members of the previous Syndicate.

### **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) Dr. P.C. Bansal, former Professor of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology and father of Professor Lalit K. Bansal, Dean Research, on 25.12.2014;
- (ii) Shri B.S. Bahl (b. 16.10.1912), former Principal of D.A.V. College, Jalandhar; and former Fellow and Syndic, Panjab University, a stalwart of DAV fraternity, renowned educationist and writer, on 14.1.2015;
- (iii) Smt. Prem Lata Garg wife of Mr. Justice G.C. Garg (Retd.), former Fellow, Panjab University, on 16.1.2015; and
- (iv) Shri B.R. Gupta, father of Professor. (Mrs.) Madhu Raka, former Dean of University Instruction and Advisor & Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor, on 17.1.2015."

**The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. P.C. Bansal, Shri B.S. Bahl, Smt. Prem Lata Garg and Shri B.R. Gupta 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 –

- (1) Hon'ble President of India, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, will grace the 64<sup>th</sup> Annual Convocation of Panjab University on March 14, 2015. Earlier, he was scheduled to arrive at 3.45 p.m., but now he would arrive at 12.30 p.m.
- (2) NAAC Peer Team comprising 15 members and Chaired by Professor D. Anil K. Bhatnagar, will visit the Panjab University, Chandigarh from March 1-5, 2015 for accreditation. The team would reach on March 1 and start its work on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2015.
- (3) Panjab University has secured the Overall Trophies of Theatre & Literary items and Runner-up Trophy in Fine Arts during the 30<sup>th</sup> North Zone Inter-University Youth Festival-2015 organized by A.I.U. at University of Jammu, Jammu, from January 15 to 20, 2015.
- (4) The Department of Science & Technology (DST), Government of India, has approved the application submitted by Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences and sanctioned the DST INSPIRE Internship Programme to Panjab University, Chandigarh with Dr. Anurag Kuhad as the Programme Coordinator. The annual budget of the DST INSPIRE Internship Programme will be approximately Rupees One Crore (Rs. 25 lakhs per camp) initially for five years (total grant of Rs.5 crore). Nobel Laureates, Bhatnagar Awardees, Science Academy Fellows and Eminent Scientists from National as well as International Institutes in the science streams shall be invited in these camps to motivate young school students studying in 11<sup>th</sup> standard.
- (5) Professor S.K. Tomar has been bestowed with P.L. Bhatnagar Memorial Award at the 80<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of Indian Mathematical Society. Professor Tomar delivered the 28<sup>th</sup> P.L. Bhatnagar Memorial Award Lecture during the Conference, held at Indian School of Mines, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, from December 27-30, 2014.
- (6) Professor Nishtha Jaswal of Department of Laws, has been appointed as a member of the Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights on part time basis by the Chandigarh Administration vide their notification No.SW3/SCPCR/2014/11698-99 dated 10.12.2014.

- (7) Professor Suresh K. Sharma of the Department of Statistics has been invited for a period of four months from 15<sup>th</sup> April to 15<sup>th</sup> August 2015 by the Department of Health & Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Eye Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, to work on the research areas of interest related to Statistical Genetics, Age related Macular Degeneration and Genetic networks.
- (8) Professor A.K. Agarwal; former CSIR Emeritus Scientist at the Department of Mathematics, has been conferred with the Emeritus Fellowship of University Grants Commission for a period of two years. This fellowship is provided to the superannuated teachers of recognized Universities and Colleges to pursue active research in their respective fields of specialization.
- (9) Professor Surya Kant of the Department of Geography, has been awarded Senior Fellowship by the Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi, for a period of two years to work on the topic 'Demonolthing Scheduled Caste Population in India' with consolidated fellowship amount of Rs.40,000/- per month besides other expenses on research assistance, etc.
- (10) Dr. Jagdish Rai, Assistant Professor at the Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology, has won an award of \$2500 from InnoCentive, Inc., USA, for suggesting an idea on their challenge on next generation DNA sequencing technology."

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to congratulate Director, Youth Welfare and Vice-Chancellor for having achieved the 'Overall Trophies of Theatre & Literary Items and Runner-up Trophy in Fine Arts'. However, he expressed his concern about the shortage of funds at the disposal of Director, Youth Welfare. He accepted that some amount was increased in previous years but he felt that the amount of remuneration and refreshment charges to the persons on duty was inadequate. He, therefore, pleaded that sufficient funds should be allocated for the purpose by the Department of Youth Welfare so that the University is able to make higher achievements.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) the Director Youth Welfare and the students for winning the Overall Trophies of Theatre & Literary items and Runner-up Trophy in Fine Arts during the 30<sup>th</sup> North Zone Inter-University Youth Festival-2015;
  - (ii) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, for getting sanctioned DST INSPIRE Internship Programme from the Department of Science & Technology (DST), Government of India;

- (iii) Professor S.K. Tomar, Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, on his having been bestowed with P.L. Bhatnagar Memorial Award at the 80<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of Indian Mathematical Society;
  - (iv) Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Department of Laws, Panjab University, on her appointment as member of the Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights;
  - (v) Professor Suresh K. Sharma, Department of Statistics, Panjab University, on his having been invited for four months by the Department of Health & Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Eye Institute, Bethesda, Maryland;
  - (vi) Professor A.K. Agarwal, former CSIR Emeritus Scientist at the Department of Mathematics, on having been conferred with Emeritus Fellowship of University Grants Commission for a period of two years;
  - (vii) Professor Surya Kanth, Department of Geography, on having been awarded Senior Fellowship by the Indian Council of Social Science Research for a period of two years; and
  - (viii) Dr. Jagdish Rai, Assistant Professor at Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology, on winning an award of \$2500 from InnoCentive, Inc., USA.
- (2) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Serial Nos. (1), (2) (3) and (4), be noted; and
  - (3) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014, as per **(Appendix-I)**, be noted.

**Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Economics**

**2(i).** Considered minutes dated 16.01.2015 **(Appendix-II)** of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Shri Dinesh Kumar said that though there is nothing specific on the agenda item, since the Dean of University Instruction, who is Chairman of the Screening Committee, is a member of the Syndicate and is present, he would like to point out that in the pro forma for promotion under the Career Advancement Scheme, there are three categories. In category two all the candidates had filled up the columns differently. He suggested that they should make the things clear.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Dinesh Kumar should come up with a proposal so that the same could be examined.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Satya Prasad Padhi be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **28.03.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 + 67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Evening Studies – Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre**

**2(ii).** Considered minutes dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Evening Studies – Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (Economics) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Economics) (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Evening Studies – Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. the dates mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 + 67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform their duties as assigned to them:

Dr. (Ms.) Neeraj Sharma	31.10.2013
Dr. (Mrs.) Suman Makkar	30.04.2014
nee Suman Bala Vohra	

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University School of Open Learning**

**2(iii).** Considered minutes dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Harsh Gandhar be promoted from Associate Professor (Economics) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Economics) (**Stage-5**) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **15.04.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 + 67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion as Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under CAS, in the Department of Economics**

**2.(iv)** Considered minutes dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Harpreet Singh be promoted as Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**), in the

Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **02.08.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion as Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under CAS, at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences**

**2.(v)** Considered minutes dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion for Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi be promoted from Assistant Professor (Economics) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Economics) (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **08.04.2014**, in the Pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Issue regarding appointment of Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**3.** Reconsidered minutes dated 14.10.2014 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professor (General) in the Department of Sociology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.10.2014 (Para 2(i) and 2(xv)), has resolved that a Committee comprising the following Syndics be constituted to examine the API scores awarded in the template/s for Academic Record & Research performance, etc., in respect of all the candidates, and the recommendation/s of the Committee be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting:

1. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath (**Chairman**)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor Karamjeet Singh
4. Professor B.S. Bhoop
5. Dr. Dalip Kumar
6. Principal Gurdip Sharma
7. Deputy Registrar (Estt.) (**Convener**)

In pursuance of above, the recommendations of the committee dated 26.11.2014 (**Appendix-VII**) were again placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.12.2014 (Para 3) and it was resolved that in the light of the discussion took place in the meeting, the appointment of Assistant Professor of

Sociology in the Department of Sociology be re-examined by the Committee.

2. Professor M.M. Aggarwal one of the members of the Selection Committee vide note (**Appendix-VII**) has concluded that the total API marks given by the screening Committee based on the attached documents is correct except for the 5 marks given for the teaching experience at the time of interview.
3. The DUI has observed that the comments given by Professor M.M. Aggarwal were examined from the document available in the office record along with the original application form of Ms. Jasleen Kewlani. The API score given by screening Committee are in order as already ratified by a Committee consisting of Professor Sherry Sabharwal, Professor Kiran Preet Kaur, Professor Ronki Ram, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Dr. M.S. Sidhu and D.R. (Estt.) (**Appendix-VII**). It has also been mentioned that as observed earlier, in view of the inputs received from GNDU, one mark for obtaining Gold Medal could be awarded to Ms. Jasleen Kewlani.
4. If one mark/score for Gold medal is awarded to Ms. Jasleen Kewlani (candidate on waiting list), her API score comes to 66.55 which is less than the API score of the candidate recommended for selection – Ms. Shipra Sagarika (69.01).
5. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).

The Vice-Chancellor, briefing the members about the background of the case, stated that this issue related to an appointment in the Department of Sociology, which was put up before the Syndicate a couple of months before. A Committee was appointed to examine the case and Committee had submitted its report. There was issue relating to objection to the score awarded to the waitlisted candidate. So there was some discrepancy regarding award of one mark to the person concerned for gold medal, which was not awarded to her at the time of interview/selection. Certain other additional marks had been awarded to her, which were not recommended by the Screening Committee. He had got a report from one of the member of the Selection Committee, who had validated that the Screening Committee had given marks on the API score correctly. Thereafter, he put up the case to the Dean of University Instruction, who is the Chairman of the Screening Committee; and he had also consented that there is difference/discrepancy of only one mark.

Shri Ashok Goyal drew the attention of the Vice-Chancellor towards the resolved part of Para 2(i) and 2(xv), which reads that a Committee comprising the following Syndics be constituted to examine the API scores awarded in the template/s for Academic Record & Research performance, etc., in respect of all the candidates, and the

recommendation/s of the Committee be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting:

1. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath (**Chairman**)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor Karamjeet Singh
4. Professor B.S. Bhoop
5. Dr. Dalip Kumar
6. Principal Gurdip Sharma
7. Deputy Registrar (Estt.) (**Convener**)

It was not mentioned that the matter be referred to one of the members of Selection Committee. Thus, the decision of the Syndicate has been by passed while taking action. Accordingly, the matter was supposed to come back to the Committee constituted by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the matter was sent back to the Screening Committee, which was chaired by the Dean of University Instruction. Syndicate Committee was asked to look into this matter and report back to next Syndicate meeting. Syndicate Committee submitted its report a little later and matter could be taken in the Syndicate meeting only two months later. The work of the Syndicate Committee is over, with their recommendations and observations. The matter was further entrusted to a colleague, who has been part of many selections in the P.U. System as a representative of physically handicapped persons. The said colleague physically obtains input from the candidates and help in revising marks to the candidates in the template, after the interview.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter was referred to the Chairman of the Screening Committee even though there was no decision of the Syndicate to refer the matter to any member of the Selection Committee by using the prerogative by the Vice-Chancellor. Now, the member of the Selection Committee had said that "5 marks have wrongly been awarded on account of teaching experience at the time of interview. He said that the dignity and authority of the Syndicate should not be undermined only because the Vice-Chancellor had some different perception. If the decisions of the Syndicate were to be implemented in such a way, then what was the purpose of taking the decisions? He had impleaded the Vice-Chancellor to tell the House whether any litigation about this case is pending in Court. In spite of that, while framing the item for reconsideration, there is no mention about the litigation. In fact, there should have been an office note that this appointment is subject to litigation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever decision is to be taken by the Syndicate, the same would be subject to the judgement in the litigation.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she went through the proceedings. There was some confusion and misinterpretation of facts. She had asked some papers in this regard on 19.1.2015 and again on 22.1.2015 to the Registrar. Ultimately, the documents were supplied to her yesterday (24.01.2015) at 7.30 p.m. She had given her comments in writing. She pleaded that the whole case should be finalized only after taking into consideration of her note which she would submit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item under consideration could not be kept pending for such a long period.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that at page 44 of the appendix a note had been given by the Vice-Chancellor that "I had phoned up Professor Rajesh Gill and urged her to attend the meeting and she consented to do so. However, I found that she did not come to the above meeting. I had been made aware that notings/remarks in the Pre-Screening/Screening Committees evaluations earlier were in the handwriting of Professor Gill and I did make her aware of it during my conversation". She regretted that this note had been incorporated in the agenda. Clarifying, she stated that she was a member of the Pre-Screening Committee so her name should be deleted from there as it is not in good taste. She was only a member of the Pre-Screening Committee and the minutes of the Pre-Screening Committee were submitted by the Chairperson on 12.6.2014. In the aforesaid Pre-Screening Committee, when they started putting API scores to this particular candidate, they all sat together and one person had to start writing, that happened to herself. As they went on, they found that many documents were missing like name of the publishers, etc. It was not for the first time that they were doing the screening. There were many influential and Senior Professors in the Committee. Not even a single document was attached with the whole case. They could see the minutes of the Pre-Screening Committee and the API Score Chart, which they submitted, they would find that it has been mentioned that for this candidate no API Score had been given; rather, it had been written that "to be verified". As such, she was not involved with the Screening Committee. When she was called by the Vice-Chancellor, she was not told as to why she had been called for. She was just told that they wanted to revalidate the scores.

The Vice-Chancellor said on his inquiry he was told that all the marks allotments are in her (Professor Gill) handwriting and this motivated him to reach her.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this was done by her in July 2014 and she never compiled the scores as the scores were to be verified because they did not want to do injustice to this candidate. Thus, where were her signatures on the Scores? She pleaded that either the whole information should be made public or not any of the information.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that he happened to be the Dean, Faculty of Arts and was part of the Screenings and Selections. In fact, the procedure is before the matter comes for final screening, the bio-data of the candidates are screened. As per the set practice in the University, the Screening Committee at the time of screening, check each and every document submitted by the candidate/s, as per University regulations & rules. So even after that if a candidate forgot to attach some documents and claimed his/her API score to be counted on the basis of that, the Vice-Chancellor is so open and liberal and provide an opportunity to the candidates to submit their documents at the time of interview. Thereafter, the API scores of the candidates are revised and selections made. Since the matter is in the Court, even if there is a lacuna, the matter did not end here as finally the case would be decided by the Court. On what basis and up to when they could keep the case pending. In the end, he said that if

they are not violating any law/statutes, the appointment should be approved subject to the decision of the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had no hesitation in removing his noting, pointed out by Professor Rajesh Gill, in the papers to be attached deliberations of the ongoing Syndicate meeting.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they tried to help the candidate till the last moment. The Pre-Screening Committee, which is at the initial stage, did not find the documents for awarding the marks. Thereafter, the Screening and Selection Committees met. Why after 5-6 months she was called to endorse something, which she did in the pre-screening? She, therefore, suggested that the item should be reframed and approved.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that some of the members were trying to make it a case as if they are lingering on the case. He reiterated that at least the Syndicate should not have been undermined. When in one of its previous meeting, it was clarified that a litigation is pending, why while bringing the item to the Syndicate for consideration, a note had not been given that the decision of the Syndicate would be subject to the outcome of the Court decision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that marks had been awarded out of 60 marks and all the eligible candidates had been called for the interview. He suggested that in future the candidates should be made aware of the marks awarded to them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, the marks were shown to the candidates, but the upward revised marks could not be shown to them as they leave by that time.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that in the last meeting they had suggested that the marks should be shown to all the candidates and their signatures should be got on the chart.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Selection Committees, which went to the affiliated Colleges, took signatures of the candidates on the API *pro forma* at the time of interview. Showing the marks to the candidates and getting their signatures meant that the candidates knew that their claims had been considered by the Selection Committee. In the University also, there might not be more than 5-10% candidates, who could say that they deserved more marks than awarded.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the candidate who had attended Conference at national level, knew that he is entitled for 1 or 2 marks. He, however, was of the view that the candidate should not be awarded more marks than claimed by him/her.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That Ms. Sipra Sagarika be appointed Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

Her appointment would remain subject to the decision of the litigation filed by the waitlisted candidate in the Court.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That Dr. (Ms.) Jasleen Kewlani be placed on the Waiting List.

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected and waitlisted candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the letter of promotion to the persons appointed under Item 2(i) to 2(v) and appointment to the person appointed under Item 3, be issued, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

**Award of Vigyan Rattan,  
Udyog Rattan and Sahitya  
Rattan**

**4.** Considered the recommendations dated 09.01.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the following persons be awarded Vigyan Rattan, Udyog Rattan and Sahitya Rattan for the year 2015 (to be given at the ensuing Convocation – March 14, 2015):

1. Dr. Amod Gupta **VIGYAN RATTAN**  
Professor Ophthalmology  
Post Graduate Institute of  
Medical Sciences and Research (PGIMER)
2. Shri Brijmohan Lall Munjal **UDYOG RATTAN**  
Founder & Chairman of Hero Group  
34, Community Centre  
New Delhi-110057
3. Shri Gulzar **SAHITYA RATTAN**  
'Boskiyana'  
Pali Hill- Bandra  
Mumbai-400050.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be awarded Vigyan Rattan, Udyog Rattan and Sahitya Rattan for the year 2015 (to be given at the ensuing Convocation – March 14, 2015):

1. Dr. Amod Gupta **VIGYAN RATTAN**  
Professor Ophthalmology  
Post Graduate Institute of  
Medical Sciences and Research (PGIMER)
2. Shri Brijmohan Lall Munjal **UDYOG RATTAN**  
Founder & Chairman of Hero Group  
34, Community Centre  
New Delhi-110057

3. Shri Gulzar  
'Boskiyana'  
Pali Hill- Bandra  
Mumbai-400050.

**SAHITYA RATTAN**

**Conferment  
of  
designation of Honorary  
Professor on Dr. Ved  
Parkash Kamboj**

**5.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj.

- NOTE:**
1. The Academic and Administrative Committees in their meeting dated 07.08.2014 (**Appendix-IX**) have recommended that Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj, who is alumnus of Department of Zoology and a well known Scientist of this country, be appointed as Honorary Professor in the Department of Zoology.
  2. While approving the above said recommendation of the Academic and Administrative Committees, the Vice-Chancellor has remarked that Professor Kamboj was honoured with Vigyan Rattana Award by P.U. some year ago and is a former President of National Academy of Sciences, India (NASI).
  3. Regulation 18 appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:
 

**18.** Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes.
  4. Bio-Data of Dr. V.P. Kamboj enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was discussed last year as well as the previous year that, in future, an intimation should be sent to the members of the Senate that in case they wanted to suggest somebody's name for consideration by the Committee constituted for this purpose before holding the meeting of the said Committee, they could do so. He pleaded that, in future, it should be ensured.

The Vice-Chancellor said that point made by Shri Ashok Goyal is well taken.

**RESOLVED:** That the designation of Honorary Professor in the Department of Zoology, be conferred on Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj.

**Conferment of designation of Honorary Professor on Professor Jai Rup Singh, former Vice-Chancellor of GNDU**

**6.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Professor Jai Rup Singh, Former Vice-Chancellor of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar (23 July 2006 – 28 February 2009), Founder Vice-Chancellor of Central University of Punjab, Bathinda (28 February 2009 –2 March 2014) and Visiting Professor of Universities of various countries (Germany, France and Mexico).

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Committee dated 16.01.2015 of Dean, Faculty of Science, enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

2. Regulation 18 appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

**18.** Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes.

3. Bio-Data of Professor Jai Rup Singh enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that everybody knew about Professor Jai Rup Singh and there was no need to attach such a huge bio-data. He, therefore, suggested that brief (maximum up to 2 pages) bio-data of Professor Jai Rup Singh should be appended with the item.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the brief bio-data of Professor Jai Rup Singh would be appended with the final proceedings.**

**RESOLVED:** That the designation of Honorary Professor at Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology, P.U., Chandigarh be conferred on Professor Jai Rup Singh, Former Vice-Chancellor of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar (23 July 2006 – 28 February 2009), Founder Vice-Chancellor of Central University of Punjab, Bathinda (28 February 2009 –2 March 2014) and Visiting Professor of Universities of various countries (Germany, France and Mexico).

**Institution of Sarvadaman Chowla Memorial Annual Lecture in Mathematics Department every year**

**7.** Considered the proposal (**Appendix-XI**) of the Academic & Administrative Committee of the Department of Mathematics that:

- (i) Sarvadaman Chowla Memorial Annual Lecture be started every year by an eminent Mathematician.
- (ii) the travelling expenses & hospitality to the speaker be made out of the Budget Head "Visiting Scientist/Visiting Fellow" of the department and an honorarium of Rs.5000/- be paid out of the "Office & General Expenses".

**NOTE:** The Academic & Administrative Committee of Department of Mathematics in its joint meeting dated 12.01.2015 (**Appendix-XI**) has proposed that Professor Manjul Bhargava, Professor of Mathematics, Princeton University, U.S.A. be invited to deliver Sarvadaman Chowla Memorial Annual Lecture during his visit to receive Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*) degree at the 64<sup>th</sup> Annual Convocation of the Panjab University to be held on 14.03.2015.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the provision for delivering of Sarvadaman Chowla Memorial Annual Lecture every year by an eminent Mathematician, be made; and
- (2) the payment of travelling & hospitality expenses to the speaker be made out of the Budget Head "Visiting Scientist/Visiting Fellow" of the Department of Mathematics and an honorarium of Rs.5000/- be paid out of the "Office & General Expenses".

**Issue regarding protection of pay of Dr. Sarabjit Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Punjabi**

**8.** Considered if, the pay of Dr. Sarabjit Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Punjabi, Panjab University, be protected at Rs.39100/- + AGP of Rs.8000/- in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 w.e.f. the date of his joining the University services, i.e., 15.10.2014 with next date of increment as usual, as per LPC issued vide No.PGGC-46/BCI/3829 dated 18.10.2014 (**Appendix-XII**) by the Principal, Govt. College, Sector-46, Chandigarh. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XII**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** Regulation 4.1 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, reads as under:

"Save as otherwise provided in the regulation, the fixation of salary, accelerated increments, grant of allowances, etc. shall in case of

employees holding permanent post, rests with –

(a) Senate- in the case of employees of Class A

(b) & (c) xxx xxx xxx”

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that as the Syndicate and Senate has already authorized the Vice-Chancellor to protect the pay, the cases of pay protection of the teachers should be considered by him instead of placing them before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that point made by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath is well taken.

**RESOLVED:** That the pay of Dr. Sarabjit Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Punjabi, Panjab University, be protected at Rs.39100/- + AGP of Rs.8000/- in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 w.e.f. the date of his joining the University services, i.e., 15.10.2014 with next date of increment as usual, as per LPC issued vide No.PGGC-46/BCI/3829 dated 18.10.2014 (**Appendix-XII**) by the Principal, Government College, Sector-46, Chandigarh.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 09.01.2015 regarding honorarium and other amenities to the Wardens and other Officers**

9. Considered the minutes dated 09.01.2015 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to take a policy decision regarding the revision of honorarium and other amenities to the Wardens and other Officers, on assignment of additional duties in the University.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.11.2014 (Para 11) has resolved that:

- (i) in principle, the recommendation/s of the Committee dated 30.10.2014, as per (**Appendix-XIII**), be approved.
- (ii) the implementation of the recommendation/s of the Committee dated 30.10.2014 be made applicable only after the approval of recommendations of the Sub-Committee.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for revision of honorarium and other amenities being given to the Wardens in its meeting held on 30.10.2014 recommended honorarium to the Wardens @ Rs.2000/- p.m. and to the Dean of Student Welfare @ Rs.5000/- and transport charges Rs.800/- and Rs.2500/-, respectively. When the above-said recommendations of the Committee were placed before the Syndicate, the members were of the unanimous view that it should be ensured that no category is left out. Now, the Committee again met and revised its own recommendations and recommended honorarium of Rs.2500/-, Rs.4000/- and Rs.6000/- p.m. to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors, respectively holding the additional charge of the posts like D.U.I., Dean Research, Dean of Student Welfare, Dean of Student Welfare(Women), Dean International Students, Dean Alumni Relations, Wardens, ASVC, etc. He suggested

that they should devise some mechanism to reduce the expenditure. However, the payment of honorarium should not be paid cadre-wise.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in the meeting of the Syndicate, they did not have any problem about the recommendation of the Committee, rather they observed that they should include other persons who are also doing similar additional duties. The Syndicate never said that the recommended amount is on the lower side and should be enhanced/revised. Instead of doing that the Committee had given recommendation contrary to its earlier recommendation.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that it was specifically pointed out by Professor Karamjeet Singh that why the other persons who are doing additional duties have not been included for grant of honorarium. They had searched the Calendar and found that there is a provision of honorarium of 10% of the basic pay to the non-teaching employees of the University, who are doing additional duties. On the basis of that provision, they made rough calculations and recommended honorarium to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors who are holding additional charge. He added that right from 27<sup>th</sup> July 1956, the teachers of Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh used to get salary on the basis of their qualifications. Whenever additional work is done by a person of a senior rank, the quality of work always improved. Keeping in view the above fact, they had recommended Rs.2500/-, Rs.4000/- and Rs.6000/- to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors, who are holding additional charge. He, therefore, proposed that the recommendation of the Committee should be accepted.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that there is a provision of honorarium @10% of the basic pay to the non-teaching employees for doing additional duties. The Committee made rough calculations and rounded off the amount and recommended the rate of honorariums.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that in an earlier meeting of the Syndicate when the item pertaining to honorarium to the Wardens, Dean of Student Welfare, etc. was considered, it was suggested that the Dean of University Instruction and 2-3 members of the Syndicate should be included in the Committee.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that the Committee had made recommendations on the basis of the provisions in the Calendar for grant of honorarium @10% of the basic pay to the non-teaching employees. They tried to include the persons who are performing additional duties. Secondly, the honorarium is being revised after a gap of 13-14 years. He, therefore, pleaded that the recommendations of the Committee should be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that honorarium could not be paid on the basis of rank. He reiterated that in the Syndicate, it was suggested that the Dean of University Instruction and 2-3 members of the Syndicate be included in the Committee, but it was never suggested that the honorarium should be revised upward.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the recommendations of the Committee should be approved.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Dr. I.S. Sandhu jointly said that the honorarium should neither be given category-wise nor on the basis of basic pay.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that the honorarium, including transportation charges, of Rs.6000/- p.m. should be paid to Dean of University Instruction, Rs.5000/- p.m. to Deans of Student Welfare (Men & Women) and Rs.3500/- p.m. to Wardens.

Professor Rajesh Gill observed that additional duties could not be defined.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that Honorary Director, Academic Staff College should be deleted from the list of officers as funds to Academic Staff College come from the U.G.C. directly.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to decide the quantum of honorarium, including transportation charges to be paid to Dean of University Instruction, Deans of Student Welfare (Men & Women) and to Dean Research, Dean International Students, Dean Alumni Relations, Wardens, A.S.V.C., N.S.S. Programme Coordinator, Chief of University Security and Director Sports. Thereafter, information in this regard be given to the Syndicate.

**Recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 11.12.2014**

**10.** Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 11.12.2014 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9):

**Item 1**

That the following provisions for establishing Cluster Innovation Centre in Bio-Technology (CIC-B) for the implementation of the project entitled “University Innovation Cluster (UIC) at Panjab University, Chandigarh” under the scheme of Bio-Technology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC), a Government of India Enterprise:

- (i) Rs.5.00 crore for setting up of the Bio-incubator in a staggered manner @ Rs.1.00 crore per year (2014-15 onwards) out of the interest earned/to be earned on the “Foundation for Higher Education Fund.”
- (ii) Rs.25.00 lac @ Rs.5.00 lacs per year (2014-15 onwards) as Panjab University contribution in cash out of the ‘Overhead’ income under the Plans/Schemes/Projects.

**NOTE:** 1. Bio-Technology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC) which is a Government of India Enterprise sanctioned a project of Rs.259.00 lacs for establishing a Cluster Innovation Centre in Bio-Technology with project entitled “University Innovation Cluster (UIC) at Panjab University, Chandigarh” vide sanction order No.BIRAC/ UIC/JAN/2013 dated 24.03.2014 as per following details:

- (i) Total Project cost Rs.259.00 lacs.
- (ii) BIRAC Contribution is Rs.234.00 lacs.
- (iii) The Panjab University contribution.

**In Cash:**

Rs.25.00 lacs @ Rs.5.00 lacs per year for 5 years.

**In Kind:**

- Dedicated Chief Mentor: Prof. Rupinder Tewari
- Space – 2800 sq.ft. for UIC Office & Lab Space, Existing Lab Infrastructure, equipments.
- The University has agreed to give Rs.5.00 crores for setting up the Bio-Incubator.
- Accommodation of young innovators in Hostels.
- Access to all the instruments lying in the Instrumentation Facilities of the Department as well as University.
- All possible support for organizing industry related workshops Monitoring by University experts, both at technical and business levels.

2. The copy of sanction order is placed at **Appendix-I** (P-21 to 24).

**Item 2**

That the pay-band of Sh. Ratnesh Kumar, Foreman, Department of Physics and Shri Dinesh Kumar, Workshop Superintendent, CIL who are already working in the pay-band of Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5700 + Rs.2000 as Secretariat pay w.e.f. 4.11.2012 against the posts (as personal to them) be revised to Rs.15600-39100 + GP 6600 (with initial pay of Rs.25250/-) plus Secretariat pay Rs.2500/- p.m. at par with the pay-scale of Assistant Registrar's w.e.f. the date of approval of the competent authority i.e. Senate. On vacation, these posts shall be filled in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5400.

**Item 3**

That the posts of the Security Officers existing in the pay-band of Rs.10300-34800+GP 5000 be allowed special allowance of Rs.500/-

per month for performing strenuous duties at odd hours as per **Appendix – II (P- 25-26)** and simultaneously information as suggested by Shri Sandeep Hans may also be obtained from Punjab Government and Vice-Chancellor is authorized to see if any further action is to be taken on receipt of such information.

***Additional Liability : Rs.12,000/- per annum***

**NOTE:** 1. The following posts of Security Officer exist in the University Budget:

- (i) 3 No. posts in the scale of Rs.6400-10640 (un-revised) revised to Rs.10300-34800+GP 4200 w.e.f. 1.1.2006.
  - (ii) 2 No. posts in the scale of Rs.7220-11660 for Officers completing 5 years of satisfactory service (un-revised) revised to Rs.10300-34800+GP 5000 w.e.f. 1.1.2006.
2. On the basis of Notifications of Govt. of Punjab dated 19.5.1998 and 27.5.2009 the Board of Finance/ Syndicate/Senate dated 19.07.2013/24.08.2013/29.09.2013 respectively revised the pay-band of posts of Security Officers of (i) above from Rs.10300-34800+GP 4200 to Rs.10300-34800+GP 4400.
  3. The incumbents in senior scale i.e. Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000 also requested to give corresponding enhancement.
  4. The Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee to look into the matter. The information was obtained from neighboring Universities of the region as well as PESCO regarding existing pay-band and qualifications for the post of Security Officers. The pay-band for the post of Security Officer is less in neighboring Universities except Punjabi University Patiala where a post of Security-cum-Transport Officer exist in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP 8200 with higher qualifications.

The Committee after considering the pay-scale prevailing in the neighboring institutions as well as in Punjab Government, recommended that the request for enhancement of Grade Pay cannot be accepted. However, keeping in view the strenuous duties and fact that they are called for duties beyond their

normal working hours as per the duty roaster, the Committee unanimously recommended that the posts of Security Officers in the pay band of Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000 may be sanctioned a special allowance of Rs.500 per month.

#### Item 4

Noted & ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the BOF/ Syndicate/Senate that the following petitioners/retired Assistant Librarians and Deputy Librarians from various Departments of the University be placed at the minimum stage of Rs.14940/- in the pay-scale of Rs.12000-18300 (Selection Grade) who completed 5 years service in the scale as on 1.1.1996 under Career Advancement Scheme of the UGC in pursuance of the decisions of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana, in the CWP No. 5019 of 2012, w.e.f. 1.1.1996 **Appendix – III (P- 27 to 32):**

Sr. No.	Name of Employee/ Designation/Department	Date of placement in selection Grade/ drawing Basic pay	Completion of 5 years service in the pay scale of Rs.12000-18300(S.G.)	Earlier date of placement at the stage of Rs.14940/	Revised date of placement at the stage of Rs.14940/- as per directions of the Hon'ble Court
1	Sh. R.S. Dang, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.10.1998), Deptt. of Maths., P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
2	Sh. G.S. Thakur Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 30.9.2006), AC Joshi Lib. P.U.	3.8.1989	3.8.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
3	Sh. B.D. Sehra Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.1.2009), Deptt. of Maths., PU	20.3.1988	20.3.1993	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
4	Sh. Hari Mitter Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.12.2007), VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur	26.11.1989	26.11.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
5	Ms. Aruna Sud Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.3.2008), VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur	8.1.1986	8.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
6	Shri K.C. Ahuja Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 30.9.2000), PU Ext. Library, Ldh.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
7	Ms. Santosh Rajput Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.10.2007), AC Joshi Library, P.U.	14.9.1986	14.9.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996

8	Ms. Shabad Kapur, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 30.6.2002), AC Joshi Lib.P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
9	Mrs Vinod Kanwar Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 28.2.2006), AC Joshi Lib. P.U.	17.11.1987	17.11.1992	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
10	Mrs. K. Inder Puri, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.8.2000.), AC Joshi Lib.P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
11	Mrs Asha Markan, Dy. Librarian (Retd. Voluntary on 4.7.2006), AC Joshi Lib.P.U.	5.9.1989	5.9.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
12	Mrs Shail Bajaj, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.8.2002), AC Joshi Lib.P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
13	Sh. Prem Parkash, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.12.2003), PU Ext. Library, Ldh.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
14	Sh. Sulakhan Singh, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 28.2.2002), PU Ext. Library, Ldh.	14.7.1988	14.7.1993	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
15	Sh. Kirpal Singh, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.1.2000), PU Ext. Library, Ldh.	16.7.1987	16.7.1992	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
16	Ms. Jatinder D. Paul Kapoor, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.1.2008), PU Ext. Library, Ldh.	18.2.1990	18.2.1995	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
17	Sh. Om Parkash Sharma, Assistant Librarian (Retd. on 31.1.2001), PU Ext. Library, Ldh.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
18	Ms. Renu Gagneja, Assistant Librarian (Retd. Voluntary on <b>30.6.2006</b> ), PU Ext. Library, Ldh.	19.5.1989	19.5.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
19	Sh. S. S. Bedi, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.10.2009), UBS, PU	30.9.1986	30.9.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
20	Sh. V.P. Bhalla, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.7.2000), AC Joshi Lib.P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996

**Additional Financial Liabilities : Rs.33,41,250/- approx.**

**NOTE:** The UGC letter No.F.3-1/94(PS)-7 dated 19.10.2006 as well as the Punjab Govt. Notification No.10/39/01-5E.1/2460 dated 20.09.2007 which has already been adopted by the BOF/Syndicate in its meeting dated 17.06.2008/28.06.2008 and also approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 28.08.2008, has been implemented in the University w.e.f. 27.07.1998. Accordingly as per Clause (1) of the UGC letter, the benefit to employees for placement at the minimum of Rs.14940/- was given w.e.f. the date of implementation of the revised Career Advancement Scheme i.e. 27.07.1998.

However, as per the decision of the Hon'ble High Court, the benefit of placement at a minimum stage of Rs.14940/- is to be given to the Deputy Librarians/Assistant Librarians (Selection Grade) with 5 years service as on 1.1.1996 as per Clause (vi) of the UGC letter dated 19.10.2006 as per **Appendix-IV (P – 33 to 36)**.

#### Item 5

That the following amendment in Clause 5 of the terms and conditions for “Merit-cum-Means Loan Subsidy Scheme” be made:

<b>Existing Provision</b>	<b>Proposed Provision</b>
“To be eligible for this scheme, the family income of the student applying under the scheme must not exceed Rs.2.00 lacs in support of which the student shall submit an affidavit duly attested by the Executive Magistrate along with the application for loan subsidy.”	“To be eligible for this scheme, the family income of the student applying under the scheme must not exceed Rs.4.80 lacs per annum in support of which the student shall submit an affidavit duly attested by the Executive Magistrate along with the application for loan subsidy.”

**NOTE:** The Board of Finance vide Item No.25 of its meeting held on 17.10.2012 has already approved the “Merit-cum-means loan subsidy Scheme” in Self-Financing Courses for providing interest subsidy to the financially weaker and meritorious students out of the interest earned on corpus of Rs.1.00 crore created out of the “Foundation for Higher Education and Research Fund”. This recommendation have also been approved by the Syndicate dated 04.11.2012 as per **Appendix – VI (P – 38 to 42)**.

#### Item 6

Noted & ratified the following actions taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

- I. in anticipation of approval of the BOF/Syndicate/Senate for sanctioning a sum of Rs.12,84,000/- out of “Estate Fund” for making provision of Toilets for Security

Staff/Santry Post near Gates at Panjab University Campus, Sector-14 and 25, Chandigarh as per **Appendix-VII(P-43 to 50)** with stipulation that while approving the site plan for the proposed toilet the position of proposed underpass shall be kept in view.

- II. in allowing additional payment of Rs.13,876/- (Rs.9493/- + Rs.4383/-) (for the months of July & August 2014 respectively) beyond the fixed limit of Rs.10000/- p.m. w.r.t. Sumptuary Expenses incurred for conducting University meetings in Vice-Chancellor's Office.
- III. in making following modifications in the budget provisions relating to the Department of Microbial Biotechnology for the year 2014-15:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Budget Heads</b>	<b>Existing provision</b>	<b>Proposed provision</b>
1.	Salaries & Provident Fund	4155800	4155800
2.	Office & General Expenses	100000	200000
3.	Seminar/Symposia/Workshop/ Special Lecture	20000	20000
4.	Books, Journals, Magazines, Newspapers, subscriptions, software spectrum licenses etc.	75000	75000
5.	Running, repair & maintenance of equipments etc.	350000	200000
6.	Field work, Study Tours, Educational Trips, Training Internship etc.	50000	50000
7.	Purchase of consumables, chemicals & glassware testing	900000	700000
8.	Guest Faculty charges	50000	50000
9.	Lab. Charges for students against receipts		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5700800</b>	<b>5450800</b>
	Lab. Charges	5,50,000 to be transferred from Non-Plan to Development Fund Account	*8,00,000 to be transferred from Non-Plan to Development Fund Account

\*The Lab. Charges collected from the students shall be utilized to the extent of actual fee receipt or the proposed provision, whichever is less, and shall be transferred from Non-Plan account to the 'Development Fund Account' to be utilized for purchase of equipments and upgradation of Laboratory/ infrastructure.

**NOTE:** It does not involve any financial implications as the overall proposed outgo remains the same.

**Item 7**

That a sum of Rs.50,17,000/- be sanctioned out of 'Estate Fund Account' for concrete flooring of backside streets of B, C & D Type Houses in Panjab University Campus, Sector-14, Chandigarh as per **Appendix – VIII (P – 51 to 54)**.

**NOTE:** The Joint Consultative Machinery in its meeting held on 29.05.2014 has recommended that the work of providing backlanes with concrete work for B, C & D Type Houses which are in dilapidated conditions may be taken up providing congenial environment to the residents **Appendix – IX (P – 55 to 57)**.

**Item 8**

That the Audited Annual Statement of account for the financial year 2013-2014 as follows **Appendix-IX (P – 58 to 74)** be approved:

	<b>Page No. of Appendix</b>
i) Plans/Schemes/Projects (Other than UGC) Account	1-3
ii) Plans/Schemes/Projects (UGC) Account	4-5
iii) Resource Mobilization Account	6
iv) Provident Fund Account	7
v) General Provident Fund Account	8
vi) Youth Welfare Fund Account	9
vii) Estate Fund Account	10
viii) Building & Infrastructure Fund Account	11
ix) Revolving Fund Account of the College Development Council	12-14
x) Employees Welfare Scheme Account	15
xi) Infrastructure Development Account	16
xii) Constituent Colleges Account	17

**Item 9**

Noted & ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor, in enhancing the budget provision in the Estate Fund Account for expenditure under the budget head 'Legal Expenses, T.A., Advertisements and Unforeseen Charges' from Rs.2.00 lac to Rs.4.00 lac.

**NOTE:** Due to increase in 'Legal Expenses, T.A., Advertisement Charges' and revision of D.C. rates, the enhancement is required.

**Referring to Sub-Item 2,** Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since the Grade Pay and Secretariat Pay of the Assistant Registrars had been revised to Rs.6600 and Rs.2500, respectively with effect from 01.04.2014, the Grade Pay and Secretariat Pay of these persons should also be revised from 01.04.2014.

When it was clarified that the decision of the Board of Finance could not be altered, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if any amendment in the decision of the Board of Finance is to be made, the matter is to be referred back to the Board of Finance for reconsideration. As far as the item is concerned, since they had already revised the Grade Pay and Secretariat Pay of Assistant Registrars w.e.f. 01.04.2014, to give the same benefit to the persons under consideration from 01.04.2014, the matter needed to be referred back to the Board of Finance.

It was clarified that the nomenclature of Foreman and Workshop Superintendent did not exist in the pay-scale notification issued by the Punjab Government. The University is giving special treatment to these persons. So far as pay band is concerned, it had already been given to them. Though there is no provision for Secretariat Pay, they are giving them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that keeping in view the hierarchies, democratic and academic set up in the University, they could grant such things to its employees.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of Board of Finance contained in its minutes dated 11.12.2014 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9), be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

## Deferred Item

**11.** Item 11 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**11.** To re-affirm the following qualifications for the post of Dean College Development Council (DCDC) in the pay-band of Rs.37400-67000 + GP Rs.10,000/- and allowances under the University rules and offer a furnished accommodation at the campus:

- A. (i) An eminent scholar with Ph.D. qualification(s) in the concerned / allied/relevant discipline and published work of high quality actively engaged in research with evidence of published work with a minimum of 10 publication as books and/or research/policy papers.
- (ii) A minimum of ten years of teaching experience in University/College, and/or experience in research at the University/National level Institutions/ Industries, including experience of guiding candidates for research at doctoral level.
- (iii) Contribution to educational innovation, design of new curricula and courses, and technology-mediated teaching learning process.
- (iv) A minimum score as stipulated in the Academic Performance Indicator (API) based Performance Based Appraisal System (PBAS).

**OR**

- B. An outstanding professional, with established reputation in the relevant field, who has made

significant contributions to the knowledge in the concerned/allied/ relevant discipline, to be substantiated by credentials.

- NOTE:**
1. The appointment will be on a tenure basis for three years and the person can be re-appointed for another three years or upto a maximum age of Sixty years, whichever is earlier.
  2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 29.05.2011 (Para 27) has resolved that the post of Registrar, Controller of Examinations and Dean, College Development Council be re-advertised as per UGC Notification/Guidelines. Accordingly, the post of DCDC was advertised vide Advt. No.6/2011 and Professor Naval Kishore was appointed.
  3. The tenure of three years of present DCDC viz. Professor Naval Kishore is going to expire on 02.04.2015. The process (i.e. approval of qualifications from the Syndicate, publishing of advertisement & selection) for filling up the post of DCDC is required to be completed before 31.03.2015.
  4. During the discussion in the Syndicate meeting, in connection with the Registrar's appointment and offer of furnished accommodation to him, it emerged that DCDC should also be considered for offer of a furnished accommodation.
  5. An office note enclosed.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that earlier also no qualifications were prescribed by the UGC for the post of Dean, College Development Council. The University had appointed a Committee to suggest qualifications for the post of Dean, College Development Council. He, therefore, suggested that they should form a Committee to see as to what qualifications are required for the post of Dean, College Development Council and make recommendations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so far as the post of Dean, College Development Council is concerned, neither any guidelines nor qualifications had been prescribed by the UGC. Last time, the post of Dean, College Development Council was advertised with the above

quoted qualifications. Moreover, after the implementation of the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission's recommendations and also as far as functioning of the University since 2011 is concerned, when the post was advertised last time, nothing had changed. Therefore, he recommended that the qualifications, with which the post of Dean, College Development Council was advertised last time, should be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the item before the Syndicate is for re-affirming the qualifications for the post of Dean College Development Council. However, this is not required because it looked as if they have to complete the process, e.g., issue advertisement and fill up the post. It meant that they had already taken a decision to replace the existing Dean, College Development Council. Therefore, according to him, the item should have been to consider re-appointing Professor Naval Kishore as Dean, College Development Council for another three years' term or up to the age of 60 years, whichever is earlier. He added that earlier, the Syndicate had taken a decision in respect of certain other termed posts, wherein the incumbent/s was/were re-appointed for another term or up to the age of 60 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the re-appointment could also be by open competition.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the term of the present incumbent is ending on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 and perhaps, it would take some time to complete the entire process of filling up the post and could not complete by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 under any circumstances. He, therefore, suggested that the incumbent Dean, College Development Council should be allowed to continue till the post is advertised and fill up. Secondly, there are certain works started by Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, which are yet to be completed.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that according to him it is not an appropriate occasion and there is no recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor. Therefore, the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal observed that extension could be given to the incumbent up to the age of 60 years, without issuing any advertisement.

Shri Dinesh Kumar stated that the post of the Dean, College Development Council is also a termed post and in the note, it was mentioned that during discussion in the Syndicate meeting, it had emerged that the Dean, College Development Council should also be provided furnished accommodation on the pattern of Registrar. He pleaded that a house should be earmarked for allotment to the Dean, College Development Council on the pattern of Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, etc., so that as and when any Dean, College Development Council joins the University, furnished accommodation could be provided to him/her. He enquired could they consider re-appointment of Professor Naval Kishore as Dean, College Development Council or extension to him up to the age of 60 years?

The Vice-Chancellor observed that they should not take this decision *impromptu*.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred and the item be placed before the Syndicate in its February 2015 meeting after re-framing the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should do it in such a manner that question does not arise again and again.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of **Item C-11**, on the agenda, be deferred.

### **Confirmation of Senior Law Officer and Law Officer**

**12.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following persons, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Person/ Designation and Branch</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
1.	Shri Sandeep Chopra Senior Law Officer Legal Cell	17.10.2013	17.10.2014
2.	Shri Sushant Batish Law Officer Legal Cell	22.10.2013	22.10.2014

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

**NOTE:** The date of confirmation of these persons is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Person/ Designation and Branch</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
1.	Shri Sandeep Chopra Senior Law Officer Legal Cell	17.10.2013	17.10.2014
2.	Shri Sushant Batish Law Officer Legal Cell	22.10.2013	22.10.2014

**NOTE:** The Date of confirmation of these persons is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.

### **Academic Calendar for Teaching Departments/ Regional Centres of P.U. and affiliated Colleges**

**13.** Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 09.01.2015 (**Appendix-XV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalize the Academic Calendar to be observed during the session 2015-16 by the Teaching Departments/Regional Centres of the Panjab University and its affiliated Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce) having Annual/Semester System of examination.

Initiating discussion, Shri Dinesh Kumar pointed out that recently the University had issued circular/s revising the Academic Calendar, however, the Academic Calendar, which was approved in

the month of May 2014, is still on the University website. The revised Academic Calendar is on the website of the Dean, College Development Council, which everybody did not visit. Due to this, several teachers had to get their reservations cancelled. He suggested that the approved Academic Calendar should be uploaded on the University website and, if in future, it is revised, the same should also be uploaded on the University website.

Principal Gurdip Sharma pointed out that in Annexure 'B' and 'C' the date for starting of teaching for new classes has not been mentioned. He suggested that the date for starting of teaching for the new classes should be mentioned in the afore-said annexures.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the date for starting of teaching for new classes is 14.07.2015 and the same would be incorporated in both Annexure 'B' and 'C'.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that a representation had come from the PUTA that the University should not change the Academic Calendar, especially the vacations schedule more often, which resulted into cancellation of reservations by the teachers.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Academic Calendar to be observed during the session 2015-16 by the Teaching Departments/Regional Centres of the Panjab University and its affiliated Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce) having Annual/Semester System of examination, as per **Appendix-XV**, be approved with the stipulation that the date 14.07.2015 for starting of new classes be incorporated in Annexure 'B' and 'C'.

**Proposal for setting up a Department of 'Skill Development & Entrepreneurship'**

**14.** Considered the proposal for setting up a Department of "Skill Development & Entrepreneurship" with the following arrangement (**Appendix-XVI**) to make a large reform in enhancing skills to train the workforce of the country being a challenge to put people in right work:

1. Professor Suresh Kumar Chadha : Honorary Director  
UBS (Honorary Director, CPC)
2. Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha : Coordinator  
Associate Director, CPC
3. Professor Deepti Gupta : Honorary Coordinator  
Associate Director, CPC
4. Dr. Manu Sharma : Honorary Coordinator  
Associate Director, CPC
5. The Association of Professor Sanjeev Sharma (UIAMS), Professor Deepak Kapoor (UBS) and Dr. Gurmala Suri (UBS) be sought as Adjunct Faculty of this new Department.

**NOTE:** It has been mentioned in the proposal (**Appendix-XVI**) that the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) had organized "Workshop on Skills in Higher Education" on 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> December,

2014, at New Delhi. The MHRD recommended that Universities should involve experts from the industry as Adjunct Faculty to bridge the skill gaps of the students through a structured program. It was also discussed that there is a severe dearth of highly-trained, quality workforce and also large number of students possesses little or no job skills.

The Government of India has already established a separate Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship with an idea to make large reform in enhancing skills that will change the face of India. The main objective of the Ministry is to “train the 500 million workforce of the country as it is a challenge to put people into right work”.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it is good that the Panjab University has decided to start skill oriented courses for the students. He added that a Harvard Scholar wishes to establish Rural Skill Development Centre at Mahilpur. Since it is a very good idea as also that it has come from the MHRD, the University must look into its possibility as to how they could replicate it in different affiliated Colleges. With this the youth of the country would be made employable.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Karamjeet Singh said that resource persons from industries from Ludhiana should also be associated. Secondly, the proposal is for setting up of Department of “Skill Development & Entrepreneurship”, whereas the MHRD had asked for setting up of a Cell for “Skill Development & Entrepreneurship”. He, therefore, suggested that instead of Department, a Cell for “Skill Development & Entrepreneurship” should be set up as the same would be more effective.

Professor A.K. Bhandari suggested that it would be better to establish a Cell for “Skill Development & Entrepreneurship”. If they set up a Department, they would face the problem of rotation of headship.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that adjunct faculty should also be taken from the industries.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that Centre for Skill Development & Entrepreneurship is appropriate instead of Department; otherwise, there would be a problem of rotation of headship on the pattern of other Departments/Institutions of the University.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that affiliated Colleges should also be associated with the proposed Cell. Secondly, they needed to identify the areas, courses, etc. which they wanted to run as also the industries to be associated with.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that one of the industries, i.e., G.S. Auto Industry, Ludhiana, is doing a wonderful work in this regard.

The said Industry could be associated with the proposed Cell/Centre. If asked, he would talk to Mr. Ranjodh Singh, G.S. Auto Industry, Ludhiana, who is a very helpful person.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Centre for “Skill Development & Entrepreneurship”, be set up with the following arrangement (**Appendix-XVI**) to make a large reform in enhancing skills to train the workforce of the country being a challenge to put people in right work:

1. Professor Suresh Kumar Chadha : Honorary Director  
UBS (Honorary Director, CPC)
2. Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha : Coordinator  
Associate Director, CPC
3. Professor Deepti Gupta : Honorary Coordinator  
Associate Director, CPC
4. Dr. Manu Sharma : Honorary Coordinator  
Associate Director, CPC
5. The Association of Professor Sanjeev Sharma (UIAMS), Professor Deepak Kapoor (UBS) and Dr. Gurmala Suri (UBS) be sought as Adjunct Faculty of this new Centre.

**Dates for the meetings of the Faculties to be held in March 2015**

15. Item 15 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

15.

To fix the dates for the meetings of the Faculties to be held in March 2015 for the purpose of election of various Boards of Studies (i.e. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Boards of Studies) for the term 1.4.2015 to 31.3.2017, as provided under Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“The election of teachers from the affiliated colleges of Under-graduate and Post-graduate Boards of Studies by the Faculties concerned shall be held by March 31 every alternate year by Single Transferable Vote System.

The Syndicate shall fix a date or dates on which meetings of the various Faculties shall be held for the purpose of electing Board of Studies.  
xxxxxxx xxx”.

2. An office note along with a copy of the schedule approved last time for the term i.e. 01.04.2013 to 31.03.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).
3. The above item was deferred in the Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 (Para 7).

**RESOLVED:** That the meetings of the Faculties to be held in March 2015 for the purpose of election of various Boards of Studies (i.e. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Boards of Studies) for the term 1.4.2015 to 31.3.2017, as provided under Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, be fixed for 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> March 2015.

**Items C-16 to C-21 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together:**

**Nomination of members/  
Conveners of various  
Board of Studies**

16. Item 16 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

16. To nominate, members of various Board of Studies/Conveners, under Regulation 4 at pages 56- 57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in the following subjects for the term 1.4.2015 to 31.3.2017:

1. Arabic
2. Architecture & Planning
3. Arts & Fine Arts
4. Bengali
5. Chemical Engineering
6. Chinese
7. Civil Engineering
8. Computer Science & Application (UG & PG)
9. Dental Surgery
10. Defence & Strategic Studies
11. Electrical Engineering
12. Electronics & Electrical Communication
13. French
14. Gandhian Studies
15. German
16. Home Science
17. Indian Theatre
18. Law
19. Library Science
20. Mechanical Engineering
21. P.G. Medical Education & Research
22. Music & Dance
23. Mass Communication
24. Postgraduate in Nursing
25. Nursing
26. Persian
27. Pharmacy
28. P.G. in Pharmaceutical Science
29. Physical Education (Undergraduate)
30. Physical Education (Post graduate)
31. Russian
32. University Institute of Legal Studies
33. Tibetan

34. Tamil
35. Telugu
36. Kannada
37. Malayalam
38. Assamese
39. Slovak
40. Urdu
41. Sindhi

**Nomination of members/  
Conveners of various  
Committees to discharge  
the functions of Board of  
Studies**

17. Item 17 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

17. To nominate, members of various Committees to discharge the function of Board of Studies/Conveners, under Regulation 6 at page 57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in the following subjects for the term 1.4.2015 to 31.3.2017:

1. M. Tech. Energy Management
2. M.Tech. (Instrumentation)
3. M.Tech. (Microelectronics)
4. Applied Sciences Engineering
5. B.E./M.E. (Information Technology)
6. B.E. (Food Technology)
7. B.E. (Bio-Technology)
8. M.E. (Electronics & Communication Engineering)
9. B.E./M.E. (Computer Science & Engineering)
10. M.E. (Construction Technology & Management)
11. M.E. (Instrumentation & Control)
12. M.E. (Manufacturing & Technology)
13. Police Administration
14. M.Tech. (Engineering & Education)
15. Human Genomics
16. Vivekananda Studies
17. Women's Gender Studies
18. P.G. Diploma in Health, Family Welfare & Population Education
19. Human Right and Duties
20. M.Sc. Solid Waste Management
21. M.Tech. Nano-Science & Nano-Technology
22. Nuclear Medicine & Medical Physics
23. Social Work
24. MBA CIT
25. Geology
26. Ayurveda
27. Biochemistry
28. Environmental Education
29. Social Sciences
30. Homoeopathy
31. Biotechnology
32. Bioinformatics
33. Microbiology
34. Gemology and Jewellery
35. Fashion Design
36. Public Health
37. M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology
38. M.Sc. Instrumentation

39. Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering  
40. If any.

**Appointment of two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance**

18. Item 18 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

18. To appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term February 1, 2015 to January 31, 2016 under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**Appointment of Standing Committee to deal with cases of alleged misconduct and use of unfair means in the examinations**

19. Item 19 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

19. To appoint the following Committee for the period noted below:

Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
Standing Committee to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations.	Regulation 31 at page 14, P.U., Calendar, Volume II, 2007.	Calendar year 2015 i.e. 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015.

**Formation of Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM)**

20. Considered the formation of Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 1.1.2015 to 31.12.2015.

**NOTE:** The composition of Joint Consultative Machinery is as under:

(a) Chairman	To be nominated by the Syndicate from amongst its members
(b) One member of the Syndicate	To be nominated by the Syndicate
(c) Two non-Syndic Senators	To be nominated by the Syndicate
(d) Registrar, the Member-Secretary	
(e) Controller of Examinations	
(f) Finance & Development Officer	
(g) Five Office Bearers of P.U. Staff (Non-teaching) Association (PUSA)	
(h) President and General Secretary of P.U. Stenographers' Association (PUSTA)	
(i) President and General Secretary of P.U.C.C.S.A.	

**Appointment of Vice-Chairperson of Advisory Committee of P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana**

21. Item 21 on the agenda was read out, viz.–

21. To appoint Vice-Chairperson of P.U. Extension Library, Advisory Committee Ludhiana, for a term of two Calendar years, i.e. 1.1.2015 to 31.12.2016, as per Rule 1 (ii) appearing at page 36 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 1 (ii) *ibid* reads as under:

“The Committee shall consist of:

(i) xxx                      xxx      xxx

- (ii) Vice-Chairman: To be appointed by the Panjab University Syndicate out of the Principals of Local Degree Colleges for a term not exceeding two Calendar years.”
2. Dr. Gurdev Singh, Principal, G.G.N. Khalsa College, Ludhiana, was appointed as the Vice-Chairperson of the Advisory Committee for the term of two calendar years i.e. 01.01.2013 to 31.12.2014.
  3. List indicating the names of the Principals of Local Degree Colleges of Ludhiana enclosed.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that a Committee comprising Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal S.K. Arora should be appointed to nominate Members/Conveners of various Board of Studies, Members/Conveners of various Committees to discharge the function of Board of Studies, appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance, appoint Standing Committee to deal with cases of alleged conduct and use of Unfair Means, Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) and to appoint Vice-Chairperson of Advisory Committee for P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that either the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized for the above-said purpose or if any Committee of the Syndicate is to be constituted, in the fitness of the things, it should not give an impression that the Committee had been constituted belonging to a particular group.

Shri Jarnail Singh clarified that the Committee had been suggested keeping in view the fact that representation could be given to the University, the affiliated Colleges and the rest of the society.

Professor Karamjeet Singh also endorsed his views that the Vice-Chancellor to be authorized.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that there used to be a practice of authorizing the Vice-Chancellor for the above-said purposes, but at some stage, the said practice was discontinued and some people took the responsibility on behalf of the Syndicate, which reflected groupism. Though they all were here as individuals, they should take decision/s collectively by examining merit of case. The way the structure of the Syndicate is, since it required collective action/s and campaigning, it is very natural that the groups get formed. Last year, they re-set the old norm and authorized the Vice-Chancellor for this purpose. Now, either they should endorse the same or constitute a Committee which would one way or other would lead to groupism, which would not be a healthy practice. Since they were starting with a fresh Syndicate, they should take a decision which they would not have to revisit. They, however, should discuss the matter threadbare. Either they could endorse the consensus of last year or go by the majority/minority decision after a threadbare discussion.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it is very important that they should follow the same rule/convention throughout.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that since it is the power of the Syndicate, the Committee of Syndics proposed by him should be constituted to appoint members on various Committees/Boards.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the decision should not be based on pick and choose, i.e., not that it suited one particular group, the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized for this purpose and if not, a Committee of Syndics be constituted. If the Vice-Chancellor is to be authorized for this purpose, he should be authorized for all times to come.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to tell them that right from the beginning, they had always maintained the dignity of the office of the Vice-Chancellor, Syndicate and Senate and also the dignity of the teaching and non-teaching community of the University. But unfortunately due to some group politics, this healthy practice was done away with. But to say that they should take a decision for all times to come that all the powers of the Syndicate for constituting the Committees/Boards would be delegated to the Vice-Chancellor, would not send a healthy signal as the same would mean that the Syndicate is running away from its responsibility. There had been instances where the Vice-Chancellor had been saying that he did not want to take this power and he wanted the Syndicate to help him out. Taking the decision that let it be included in the powers of the Vice-Chancellor's delegated by the Syndicate, probably would not be in tune with the regulations. But so far as forming of academic bodies are concerned, this had been the practice, which had been taught to them by Shri Chatrath himself, that the Vice-Chancellor used to be authorized by the Syndicate because in spite of groups being formed, the groups used to have faith in the Vice-Chancellor that while making these bodies there would not be any signal that any pick and choose policy has to be adopted. But if he says that if they give the authority to the Vice-Chancellor today, it would be for all times to come or if they did not give authority today, it would never be given, that probably would also not be good. Therefore, his view is that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to make Committees/appoint members on the Boards, on behalf of the Syndicate. If anybody had objection to it, then at least the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to make a Committee of the Syndicate.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that it would be in the fitness of the things to authorize the Vice-Chancellor to make Committees/appoint members on the Boards, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, agreeing with Professor Ronki Ram, stated that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to make Committees/appoint members on the Boards, on behalf of the Syndicate, in consultation with the members of the Syndicate, if he wanted to.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that according to him, to bring in more transparency, they suggested to form the Committee to make Committees/appoint members on the Boards, on behalf of the Syndicate. However, there is some fear amongst some of his friends

that the representation of other group might not increase. Therefore, the formation of these Committees/Boards should be in such a manner that it should not be seen that more members of one particular group had been included in them. He had seen during the last 14-15 years, whenever it suited to any group, it tried its best to authorize the Vice-Chancellor to make these Committees/Boards and when it did not suit it, it tried to form the Committees/Boards by appointing a Committee of Syndics. Therefore, here the discussion should be threadbare and even if a Committee is to be formed, it should comprise of senior persons so that they did not face any problem in future.

Professor Karamjeet Singh reiterated that it would be in the fitness of things that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to constitute all such academic bodies as he is the Chief Executive Officer of the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to form the Committees/Boards, on behalf of the Syndicate and if not, the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized, at least, to appoint the Committee of Syndics for the purpose.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he wants to opt out of any of the Committee.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that it is most important that these posts are extremely significant in view of the duties assigned and performed over the past few years. She had seen that there had been too much of criticism. Therefore, since the Vice-Chancellor is the leader of the House, he should make these Committees/Boards in such a manner that they are able to give an academic result/outcome.

Shri Ashok Goyal was of the opinion/view that they should set the system in such a way that the people at large should not be able to criticize them. But some people are trying to give an impression as if Syndics are opportunists. He clarified that it was only in 2012 and 2013 that something unfortunate had happened. However, in 2014 they realized and came back to the same age old system in spite of the fact that Syndicate was almost evenly divided, but still the Vice-Chancellor was authorized to make Committees/Boards. Today, a similar situation was being created, which was prevailing in 2012. Though he had no problem, that was why, he had endorsed the proposal of Shri Jarnail Singh and also given the option that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized or that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to appoint Committee of Syndics, but he wanted to make it clear that he is also not keen to become member of any of the Committees. But his only concern is that it should not be reflected that one particular group is ruling the University and not the Vice-Chancellor.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal that whenever they talked about democracy, the difference of opinion is bound to emerge. They also know that in the Syndicate today, in the past and in future also, there would be difference of opinion. Shri Ashok Goyal has suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to make Committees/Board and he thought that Shri Goyal had quoted his (Professor Ronki Ram) viewpoint.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate is a body elected out of the given Senate and the tenure of the Senate is four years. Thus, any decision taken by a given Syndicate cannot have unlimited tenure, particularly, it ought not extend beyond the life/term of a given Senate.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that here in the University, the things are altogether different and the decisions taken by a given Syndicate in the year 1987 are prevailing even today.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that a given Syndicate if it delegates its power to the Vice-Chancellor, it should only be revisited when either the new Senate is formed or a new Vice-Chancellor joins. Secondly, it is enjoyed upon the given Vice-Chancellor, who is given this responsibility of constituting the various Committees/Boards, to constitute Committees/Boards in such a manner that the University progress smoothly as all the decisions are taken on behalf of the University and ultimately those decisions have to be brought to the Governing Body of the University, namely the Syndicate, for validation.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that democracy meant criticism, whereas on the one hand they apprehend criticism and at the same time they criticize.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, now, there are two options: (i) that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to appoint the Committees/Boards as was done last year; and (ii) that a 3-Member Committee of the Syndicate should be constituted, which either should work on its own or with the office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor should consult at least the 3 Members (suggested by/ proposed by Shri Jarnail Singh), but should not be debarred to consult other members of the Syndicate.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee comprising the following Syndics, be formed to nominate Members/ Conveners of various Board of Studies, Members/ Conveners of various Committees to discharge the function of Board of Studies for the term 1.4.2015 to 31.3.2017, appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 1.2.2015 to 31.1.2016, to appoint Standing Committee to deal with cases of alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with examinations, Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) for the term 1.1.2015 to 31.12.2015 and to appoint Vice-Chairperson of Advisory Committee for P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana for a term of two Calendar years, i.e., 1.1.2015 to 31.12.2016, on behalf of the Syndicate, who would consult other members of the Syndicate while constituting afore-said Committees:

- |    |                             |          |
|----|-----------------------------|----------|
| 1. | Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath | Chairman |
| 2. | Professor A.K. Bhandari     |          |
| 3. | Professor Navdeep Goyal     |          |
| 4. | Shri Ashok Goyal            |          |
| 5. | Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora.    |          |

**The following Items 22 and 34 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together:**

**Issue regarding grant of extension for submission of Ph.D. synopsis beyond 2 years**

**22.** Considered if Ms. Preeti Abrol, a Ph.D. candidate (enrolled on 01.08.2012) in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, UIET, be granted, further extension of six months beyond 2 years for submission of her Ph.D. synopsis, as a special case.

- NOTE:** 1. Ms. Preeti Abrol, vide her application dated 15.12.2014 (**Appendix-XVIII**) had requested for grant of permission to submit her Ph.D. synopsis as she could not submit the same within a period of two years i.e. up to 31.07.2014, as her father has a serious spinal problem due to which he was flown to Ganga Ram Hospital at Delhi. The trauma was not yet over when her two first cousins aged 19 and 17 died in an accident following which their grandfather too expired within a span of two days.

The result of above was that her mother-in-law suffered a heart attack. Her home town is Jammu (J&K) and she had to bring her down to PGI, Chandigarh and was treated here.

2. Para 11 & 13 of the new UGC guidelines, 2009, is reproduced below:

**“11.** Within 1½ years of the Regulation, the candidate shall apply through Chairperson of the Department for Approval of Candidacy. Extension up to six months may be granted by the Dean of University Instruction on the recommendation of the Chairperson with a normal fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time. In case the candidate does not apply for extension within the stipulation time, he/she may be charged double the fee.”

**“13.** In case a candidate fails to submit synopsis to the Chairperson of the Department within a period of two years, his/her registration shall stand as automatically cancelled. No separate intimation will be sent to the candidate.”

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

**Amendment of Guidelines for Ph.D.**

**34.** Considered the following recommendations dated 12.11.2014 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to frame guidelines/ Regulations for relaxation given to a

particular candidate for submission of his/her Ph.D. synopsis over and above the prescribed period that:

1. in order to avoid and confusion about submission of application for approval of candidacy and synopsis within a period of two years, the Ph.D. candidate/s be asked to submit a copy of the application for approval of candidacy and his/her synopsis to the Deputy Registrar (General) as well. Similarly, the Dean of University Instruction be requested to write the Chairpersons of the Departments to convene the meeting/s of the Pre-R.D.C. as early as possible; and
2. to facilitate the above recommendations, Clause 12 and 13 of the Revised Guidelines for the award of Ph.D. degree (which are in conformity with U.G.C. Minimum Standards and Procedures for award of Ph.D. degree Regulation 2009), be amended as proposed below:

Existing Guidelines	Proposed Guidelines
12. A candidate will be required to submit the synopsis (soft as well as hard copy) to the Department concerned. The Chairperson shall send the soft copy of the synopsis to all the members of the Administrative and Academic Committees. The members may give their suggestions in writing. The Chairperson shall forward the synopsis to the University office after getting the suggestions incorporated, if necessary and approved in the meeting of Administrative & Academic Committees. This process, in any case, should not take more than 20 working days.	12. A candidate will be required to submit the synopsis (soft as well as hard copy) to the Department concerned <b>and a copy of the application for approval of candidacy and his/her synopsis to the Deputy Registrar (General) as well</b> . The Chairperson shall send the soft copy of the synopsis to all the members of the Administrative and Academic Committees. The members may give their suggestions in writing. The Chairperson shall forward the synopsis to the University office after getting the suggestions incorporated, if necessary and approved in the meeting of Administrative & Academic Committees. This process, in any case, should not take more than 20 working days.
13. In case a candidate fails to submit the synopsis to the Chairperson of the Department within a period of two years, his/her registration shall stand as automatically cancelled. No separate intimation will be sent to the candidate.	13. In case a candidate fails to submit the synopsis to the Chairperson of the Department <b>and to the Deputy Registrar General (DRG)</b> within a period of two years, his/her registration shall stand as automatically cancelled. No separate intimation will be sent to the candidate.

3. to reiterate that in case a candidate fails to submit synopsis to the Chairperson of the Department and the Deputy Registrar (General) within a period of two years, his/her registration shall stand as automatically cancelled. No separate intimation will be sent to the candidate. This be implemented in letter and spirit and no relaxation be given in this regard.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that they never relaxed this condition of submission of Ph.D. synopsis by the candidate within a period of two years even for a day. Thereafter, the UGC introduced this Pre-Ph.D. course work of minimum of one semester. Now the

candidates had difficulty in completing the Pre-Ph.D. course work and three types of requests are coming from them, viz. (i) delay in conduct of Pre-Ph.D. course work; (ii) departmental delay, which had been taken care of by the Committee recently (Item 34 on the agenda); and (iii) personal reasons. Then it was felt that there should be some guidelines as to whom to allow to submit the Ph.D. synopsis after the period of two years, but personal reasons could not be verified. As such, he suggested the formation of the Committee, the recommendations of which have come for consideration (Item 34). So far as guideline/s as to when the condition of submission of synopsis after a period of two years is to be relaxed and not is concerned, the Committee was of the view that no relaxation should be given after a period of two years. However, so far as delay on the part of the department is concerned, the same had been taken care of as it had been recommended that the candidate would be required to submit the synopsis (soft as well as hard copy) to the Department concerned and a copy of the application for approval of candidacy and his/her synopsis to the Deputy Registrar (General) as well). However, there is dilemma as to which candidate is to be allowed to submit his/her Ph.D. synopsis after a period of two years and which not. In his view, they should take some decision as he had gone through the UGC Guidelines wherein there is no condition that the candidate must submit his/her Ph.D. synopsis within a period of two years. If they wanted the candidate could uniformly be allowed to submit their Ph.D. synopsis within a period of 2½ years or so.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that, as per University guidelines, the candidate is required to successfully do the Pre-Ph.D. course work of six months and submit his/her Ph.D. synopsis within a period of six months. But certain Departments did not conduct the requisite Pre-Ph.D. course work for years. Citing an example, he said that one of the teachers of Abohar enrolled/registered himself for Ph.D. in the subject of Hindi, but the Department did not conduct Pre-Ph.D. course work for two years. Resultantly, the enrolment/registration of the candidate was automatically cancelled. The candidate concerned had to get himself registered again. He pleaded that the Pre-Ph.D. course work of various subjects should be conducted in time bound manner.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that, as per Ph.D. Guidelines, the candidates would have to submit their Ph.D. synopsis within a period of two years after successful completion of Pre-Ph.D. course work of one semester. But problem is how to ensure the candidate attends the Pre-Ph.D. course work as he/she would say that he would do the Pre-Ph.D. course work after a period of four or five years. However, where the Pre-Ph.D. course work has not been conducted by the University for years, the candidate could be allowed to submit the synopsis and he/she could be allowed to do the course work later on.

The Vice-Chancellor said that one more problem is that the NET qualified persons get job on temporary basis, so they would not be able to attend Pre-Ph.D. course work?

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that since the condition of submission of Ph.D. synopsis within a period of two years is not laid down by the UGC; rather it had been prescribed by the University itself, the candidates could be allowed to submit their Ph.D. synopsis without doing the Pre-Ph.D. course work, which they could do later on.

To this, Professor Ronki Ram said that if the candidates are allowed to submit Ph.D. synopsis without doing the Pre-Ph.D. course work, the quality of synopsis would not be up to the mark because the condition of Pre-Ph.D. course work had been prescribed to improve the quality of synopsis. He, therefore, pleaded that the candidates should be allowed to submit their Ph.D. synopsis only after successfully completing the Pre-Ph.D. course work. He further said that they are facing another problem that sometimes the Ph.D. students submitted their synopsis just a couple of days before completion of two years and the Department could not convene the meeting of the Pre-Research Degree Committee in the stipulated period of two years. He pleaded that the synopsis of the candidates submitted by them in the Department concerned within a period of two years should be accepted. However, the meetings of the Pre-Research Degree Committees could be held later on so that quality of research did not suffer.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the problem had arisen only after introduction of Pre-Ph.D. course work by the U.G.C. Another practical problem, which has been pointed by Dr. I.S. Sandhu, that the Pre-Ph.D. course work had not taken place. His suggestion in this regard is that instead of removing the condition of submission of Ph.D. synopsis within a period of two years, the candidates should be asked to do the Pre-Ph.D. course work within a stipulated period. With this, the problem of automatic cancellation of enrolment/registration due to non-submission of Ph.D. synopsis within a period of two years would also be solved. He remarked that if the duration of submission of Ph.D. synopsis was extended to 2½ years, 3 years or 5 years even, the problem would not be solved. There has been inordinate delay; hence, the matter needs to be addressed on priority.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the condition of submission of Ph.D. synopsis within a period of two years should be applied after the conduct of Pre-Ph.D. course work.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that one of the teachers working at Solan came to the University for attending to the Pre-Ph.D. course after taking leave from his employer, but the course work was not conducted. She, therefore, suggested that responsibility of the Chairperson concerned for conducting the Pre-Ph.D. course work should be fixed.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that though they had not made it mandatory to hold the Pre-Ph.D. course work within a year, they have to see that the Pre-Ph.D. course work of 105 hours is conducted by the Departments.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that immediate relief which needed to be given is that the candidates should be allowed to submit their Ph.D. synopsis within a period of two years without doing the Pre-Ph.D. course work, which they should be asked to do later on, but within a stipulated period. He added that certain Departments, including Department of English and Cultural Studies, did not conduct Pre-Ph.D. course work. Recently, the Dean, College Development Council arranged to conduct the Pre-Ph.D. course work in the subject of Punjabi.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, as per UGC, the Pre-Ph.D. course work of at least one semester is mandatory and the same should not be diluted. He added that certain Departments of the University were conducting the Pre-Ph.D. course work of two semesters even before this had been introduced by the UGC. Therefore, instead of diluting the Pre-Ph.D. course work, they should at least follow what is prescribed by the UGC.

Professor Ronki Ram opined that the candidates should not be allowed to submit their Ph.D. synopsis before successfully doing the Pre-Ph.D. course work.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that even if they gave extension to Ms. Preeti Abrol in the submission of Ph.D. synopsis by her for six months, the purpose would not be served as about five months had already been passed. Moreover, some more time would be required for writing of minutes of this meeting. He further stated that in this case candidate had given personal reasons for delay in the submission of Ph.D. synopsis, which they, of course, could not verify, but could definitely ask the candidate concerned to provide documentary proofs/evidences. So far as this case is concerned, they should grant extension to the candidate concerned, but in future, they should seek documentary evidences of personal reasons so that a message should not go that whatever reason/s the candidate might quote, extension would be granted by the Syndicate.

Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction, said that the Committee, proposed to be constituted above, would examine this issue and frame necessary guideline/s.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that in certain cases, the Pre-Ph.D. course work of the students did not take place for months together.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the provision for automatic cancellation of registration if the candidate did not submit his/her Ph.D. synopsis within a period of two years, needed to be redrafted because if the registration is cancelled, they could not process the case even for placing the same before the Syndicate.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that this would also be examined by the aforesaid Committee.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) Ms. Preeti Abrol, a Ph.D. candidate (enrolled on 01.08.2012) in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, UIET, be granted, further extension of seven months, i.e. up to 28<sup>th</sup> February 2015, beyond 2 years, for submission of her Ph.D. synopsis, as a special case.
- (2) in order to avoid confusion about submission of application for approval of candidacy and synopsis within a period of two years, the Ph.D. candidate/s be asked to submit a copy of the application for approval of candidacy and his/her

synopsis to the Deputy Registrar (General) as well. Similarly, the Dean of University Instruction be requested to write the Chairpersons of the Departments to convene the meeting/s of the Pre-R.D.C. as early as possible; and

- (3) to facilitate the above, Clause 12 and 13 of the Revised Guidelines for the award of Ph.D. degree (which are in conformity with U.G.C. Minimum Standards and Procedures for award of Ph.D. degree Regulation 2009), be amended as proposed below:

Existing Guidelines	Proposed Guidelines
12. A candidate will be required to submit the synopsis (soft as well as hard copy) to the Department concerned. The Chairperson shall send the soft copy of the synopsis to all the members of the Administrative and Academic Committees. The members may give their suggestions in writing. The Chairperson shall forward the synopsis to the University office after getting the suggestions incorporated, if necessary and approved in the meeting of Administrative & Academic Committees. This process, in any case, should not take more than 20 working days.	12. A candidate will be required to submit the synopsis (soft as well as hard copy) to the Department concerned <b>and a copy of the application for approval of candidacy and his/her synopsis to the Deputy Registrar (General) as well</b> . The Chairperson shall send the soft copy of the synopsis to all the members of the Administrative and Academic Committees. The members may give their suggestions in writing. The Chairperson shall forward the synopsis to the University office after getting the suggestions incorporated, if necessary and approved in the meeting of Administrative & Academic Committees. This process, in any case, should not take more than 20 working days.
13. In case a candidate fails to submit the synopsis to the Chairperson of the Department within a period of two years, his/her registration shall stand as automatically cancelled. No separate intimation will be sent to the candidate.	13. In case a candidate fails to submit the synopsis to the Chairperson of the Department <b>and to the Deputy Registrar General (DRG)</b> within a period of two years, his/her registration shall stand as automatically cancelled. No separate intimation will be sent to the candidate.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee, comprising Professor A.K. Bhandari (Dean of University Instruction), Principal Gurdip Sharma, Professor Karamjeet Singh, Professor Yog Raj Angrish and Dr. I.S. Sandhu, be constituted to look into the whole issue and make recommendations up to what period the candidates could be allowed to submit their Ph.D. synopsis, whether synopsis could be accepted before doing the Pre-Ph.D. course work or not.

**Issue regarding inclusion of Punjabi Culture cherished by Sanskrit Scholars in curriculum of undergraduate classes**

**23.** Considered the following recommendations dated 16.12.2014 of Faculty of Languages (Item 5) (**Appendix-XX**) duly approved by the Board of Studies in Sanskrit, be implemented for the session 2015-16:

“The members discussed the importance of Sanskrit Language and its relation with Punjab and Punjabi in detail. Members feel that the greater Punjab being the cradle of Ancient Indian Culture and the most important region of Aryavartta. Punjab is

accepted the homeland of Vedas, Ramayan, Mahabharat and Purana. The world famous writer of Astadhayi Maharishi Panini belonged to Punjab. Punjab can very rightly be called the Motherland of Sanskrit Shastras, Poetry, Grammar and Linguistics. In the light of the above fact, the members recommended that the works of Punjabi Culture cherished by Sanskrit Scholars may be included in the Curriculum of Under-Graduate classes and optional with History and Culture of Punjab and the works of Sanskrit Poets (like Nirmala-Sikh-Sampraday, Valmiki, Panini etc.) may be taught to the Students in this paper so that students may know the evaluation of Punjabi Culture in the box of Sanskrit”.

- NOTE:**
1. The Sanskrit Language is taught as one of the Elective Subjects at Under Graduate Level.
  2. As per Regulation 2.2 at page 37, P.U. Calendar Volume-II, 2007, the following category of students shall be entitled to take the option of History & Culture of Punjab in lieu of Punjabi as a compulsory subject:
    - (i) Students who are not domiciled in Punjab and have not studied Punjabi up to class 10<sup>th</sup>.
    - (ii) Wards of/and Defence Personnel and Central Govt. employee/employees who are transferable on all India basis.
    - (iii) Foreigners.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that it is a very good idea because if they study the History and Culture of Punjab from the ancient times, they would find that the Vedas had been written in Punjab. Therefore, it is a good suggestion to include the Punjabi Culture cherished by Sanskrit scholars in the syllabus of History and Culture of Punjab Paper.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item was not required to be placed before the Syndicate, especially when it related to syllabus. Secondly, it had already been approved by the Faculty of Languages on the recommendation of the Board of Studies in Sanskrit and only thing is that its language needed to be corrected.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the works of Punjabi Culture cherished by Sanskrit Scholars, be included in the curriculum of Paper: History and Culture of Punjab (at undergraduate level) and the works of Sanskrit Poets (like Nirmala-Sikh-Sampraday, Valmiki, Panini etc.) be taught to the students in this paper so that they should know the value of Punjabi Culture, which is available in the book/s of Sanskrit.

**Qualifications for the post of Multipurpose Supervisor (Male)**

24. Considered the recommendations dated 14.11.2014 (Appendix-XXI) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the following qualifications be prescribed for the post of Multipurpose Supervisor (Male):

**Qualification:**

10+2 with 3 years experience of supervising the work of Cleaners and Head Jamadars.

**Age:**

Between 18-37 years (5 years relaxation in case of SC/ST) Regular employees and the daily wage workers in P.U. having at least 10 years of contractual service fulfilling the said qualifications and experience, be considered to be eligible by allowing them relaxation in the upper age limit.

**Duties to be performed by Multipurpose Supervisor:**

1. To supervise the cleanliness, Head Jamadars etc.
2. To ensure proper environmental sanitation in the Departments/Hostels/Offices/Roads etc.
3. Distraction of dogs and monkeys from the Departments/Offices/Hostels etc.
4. Any other supervisory duty which the DSW/Head would like to entrust.

After some discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the following qualifications be prescribed for the post of Multipurpose Supervisor (Male):

**Qualification:**

10+2 with 3 years experience of supervising the work of Cleaners and Head Jamadars.

**Age:**

Between 18-37 years (5 years relaxation in case of SC/ST) Regular employees and the daily wage workers in P.U. having at least 10 years of contractual service fulfilling the said qualifications and experience, be considered to be eligible by allowing them relaxation in the upper age limit.

**Duties to be performed by Multipurpose Supervisor:**

1. To supervise the cleanliness, Head Jamadars etc.
2. To ensure proper environmental sanitation in the Departments/Hostels/Offices/Roads etc.
3. Distraction of dogs and monkeys from the Departments/Offices/Hostels etc.
4. Any other supervisory duty which the DSW/Head would like to entrust.

**Issue regarding grant of benefit of ACPs to Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer-II**

**25.** Considered if Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer-II, P.U. Construction Office, be granted benefit of ACPs after completion of 14 years service with one increment in the next pay-scale mentioned against his name on the clear understanding that he will continue to discharge the same duties of the original post and shall remain on the strength of the same cadre, it is subject to recovery if guidelines/clarifications to be issued by the Punjab Govt. runs contrary to the previous notification dated 19.5.1998/21.12.2000 and in such a situation the Panjab University is bound to withdraw the placement scale granted to him without prejudice to his right:

Name/Designation	Date of appointment	Date of completion of 14 years service	Date of entitlement for grant of one increment in the next scale
Shri Satish Kumar Padam Executive Engineer-II	27.04.1995 as Sub- Divisional Engineer	27.4.2009  He was promoted as X.E.N. on 30.5.2007. There is a provision in the Budget Estimate to account of service as SDE and XEN for granting ACPs of 14 years	Effective from 1 <sup>st</sup> day of the year i.e. 1.1.2010 in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP Rs.8600**

- NOTE:**
1. \*\*All placements in higher scale shall be given effect to from the first day of January of the year next to the year in which an employee completes the span of service required for placement.
  2. Shri Satish Kumar Padam was placed under suspension in a bribe case w.e.f. 7.7.2010. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 12.07.2014 (Para 9) resolved that Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer-II (under suspension), Construction Office, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be reinstated subject to the decision of the CBI Court, Chandigarh, before which his case has been pending since long, but he would not be posted against any post, which involves financial dealing. In the meanwhile, he would not be considered for promotion on the basis of his seniority alone. He would not be promoted till his case is finalized. His re-instatement would neither have any bearing on the charges/ allegations being faced by him nor his re-instatement would entitle him to claim any financial benefit for the period he has remained under suspension.
  3. Accordingly, he was reinstated w.e.f. 30.7.2014. His 14 years regular service

has been counted w.e.f. 27.4.1995 to 27.4.2009; hence, he is entitled for the benefit of 14 years ACPs.

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer-II, P.U. Construction Office, be granted benefit of ACPs after completion of 14 years service with one increment in the next pay-scale mentioned against his name on the clear understanding that he will continue to discharge the same duties of the original post and shall remain on the strength of the same cadre, it is subject to recovery if guidelines/clarifications to be issued by the Punjab Govt. runs contrary to the previous notification dated 19.5.1998/21.12.2000 and in such a situation the Panjab University is bound to withdraw the placement scale granted to him without prejudice to his right:

<b>Name/Designation</b>	<b>Date of appointment</b>	<b>Date of completion of 14 years service</b>	<b>Date of entitlement for grant of one increment in the next scale</b>
Shri Satish Kumar Padam Executive Engineer-II	27.04.1995 as Sub-Divisional Engineer	27.4.2009  He was promoted as X.E.N. on 30.5.2007. There is a provision in the Budget Estimate to account of service as SDE and XEN for granting ACPs of 14 years	Effective from 1 <sup>st</sup> day of the year i.e. 1.1.2010 in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP Rs.8600**

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 16.10.2014 regarding procedure for release of retiral benefits to the University employees**

**26.** Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 16.10.2014 (**Appendix-XXII**), regarding the procedure to be adopted for the release of the retirement benefits to the employees of the Panjab University such as Pension, Gratuity, Leave Encashment, Furlough etc.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the Committee had made good recommendations and the same should be approved. However, he wanted to add that there are seven departments from where the employees are required to take 'No Due Certificates' and Establishment and Accounts Branches are two of them. As they had fixed number of days for processing and completing the adjustment of advances, the number of days for processing the cases for Pension should also be fixed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in order to make the employees conscious, a circular about these be issued and, if need be, on their personal e-mail ID.

Shri Ashok Goyal observed that though the pension of any employee cannot be stopped, it was being stopped earlier. However, if some dues are pending against the employee/s then release of their Provident Fund may be stopped. He further said that some people had pointed out that the Registrar had issued certain instructions instead of stating the authority under whose possession the service books are kept, the person/employee concerned would be responsible for its safe custody.

It was clarified that the circular had been issued so that the employees concerned could keep track of the movement of their service books so that the same is not lost.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal pleaded that since the person/employee concerned could not take care of his/her service book, the authority under whose custody the service books are kept, should be held responsible in case the service book is lost. He, therefore, suggested that the afore-said circular should be modified.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 16.10.2014, as per **Appendix-XXII**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That, in order to make the employees conscious, a circular on the basis of the recommendations of the Committee be issued and, if need be, sent to the employees on their personal e-mail ID.

**Admissions to M.A. Geography, Masters in Disaster Management & Masters in Remote Sensing & GIS through CET**

**27.** Considered the recommendations of the Board of Control dated 17.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXIII**) that w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16, the admissions to M.A. Geography (Campus only), Masters in Disaster Management and Masters in Remote Sensing & GIS be made through CET Entrance conducted by Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. The admissions for the M.A. Geography, Masters in Disaster Management and Masters in Remote Sensing & GIS courses were earlier done by conducting an aptitude test by the department for which no fees was charged from the students.
  2. The Department attracts large number of applicants (approximately 500) for all three courses for which the adequate space and manpower is not available.
  3. Out of the three courses, two courses i.e. Masters in Disaster Management and Masters in Remote Sensing & GIS are run exclusively by the Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh and M.A. Geography is taught only in Govt. College, Ludhiana other than Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh. As per the current practice, the Govt. College, Ludhiana admits the students independent of P.U. Campus.
  4. The admissions through CET is therefore exclusively for P.U. Campus, Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for all the three courses: M.A. Geography (campus only), Masters in Disaster Management and Masters in Remote Sensing & GIS.

5. A copy of letter dated 29.12.2014 of the Chairperson, Department of Geography enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the other Departments of the University, which offered postgraduate courses, should be asked whether they wanted to make admissions on the basis of Entrance Test to be conducted by the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Dinesh Kumar should give him a note on the issue, so that the same could be discussed in the meeting of the Chairpersons.

**RESOLVED:** That w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16, the admissions to M.A. Geography (Campus only), Masters in Disaster Management and Masters in Remote Sensing & GIS, be made through CET (PG) conducted by Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**Sanction of an amount of Rs.29.71 lac out of Budget Head “Depreciation Fund Account” for purchase of three vehicles**

**28.** Considered if an amount of Rs.29.71 lac out of the Budget-head “Depreciation Fund Account” be sanctioned for purchase of following three vehicles, for the use of official work:

Sr. No.	Name of the Vehicle	Appox. Amount
1.	One Innova	Rs.15.07 lac
2.	Two Swift Dezire	Rs.14.64 lac
	Total Fund required	Rs.29.71 lac

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

**NOTE:** 1. Innova is to be used, inter-alia by the Controller of Examination for official work which is to be performed even at odd hours all around the year in light of Introduction of Semester System at Undergraduate level in 192 affiliated Colleges and other numerous competitive examinations and also to attend day-to-day confidential work relating to the conduct of examinations and Two Swift Dezire (Diesel Version) for general pool as replacement of following three old vehicles out of ‘Depreciation Fund Account’:

Sr. No.	Name of the Vehicle	Purchase Date/ Model	Office which was using the Vehicle
1.	Ambassador CH01-G-1625	1998	XEN Office
2.	Tata Sumo CH01-G-1868	1998	Admn. Block
3.	Ambassador CH01-G-1635	12.8.1998	P.U.R.C., Ludhiana

2. The auction process is lengthy and can take longer time to complete the required formalities. However, after auction, the

amount so received from the old three vehicles will be deposited in the concerned Budget-Head.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about justification for purchase of Innova.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the University did not have a large vehicle, the Innova has been proposed and the same is mostly required by the Examination Branch. At the same time, there are certain other Departments, including the Dean, College Development Council, which needed such type of vehicle.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to him, the quoted cost of Rs.15.07 lac is of top model of Innova.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the price of the Innova had been enhanced and now the cost is more than Rs.16 lac.

Shri Ashok Goyal apprehended that the Innova might not be used as proposed for the Controller of Examinations. Instead it would be for General Pool, while other two cars would be used by individual Officers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposal was to replace the existing three vehicles.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though all the three vehicles were not for general pool, now practically all the three vehicles are being purchased for general pool. He felt that the justification as given that the Innova would be used by Controller of Examinations for official work round the year keeping in view the introduction of Semester System may not hold good as the examination work would entail movement of teachers as well as officials so ultimately the vehicle will go in General Pool. It appeared that keeping in view the schedule of examinations, a situation of urgency has been expressed to waive off the writing off and disposing off the old vehicle before purchasing a new vehicle as is being followed in the University. He suggested that rationalization of the need of a particular type of vehicle for particular purpose be made before proposal is made and vehicles may be used strictly for the same purpose, barring occasional used for some other purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor informed that the vehicles have to meet the stipulated condition of 15 years exploitation before their condemnation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though it was mandatory to meet the condition of 15 years of exploitation; hence, in case the vehicle being unrepairable/ unserviceable, the vehicle can be discarded. He, therefore, urged the Vice-Chancellor to do the entire exercise because the item would have to be placed before the Board of Finance and he did not want that the Vice-Chancellor or for that matter the University should face any embarrassment. Hence, they should go to the Board of Finance with full homework. He further suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred and the item should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting with full details.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be deferred because the Board of Finance is going to meet in the second week of February 2015. He added that one of the vehicles would be made available to the Director, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

Shri Ashok Goyal urged the Vice-Chancellor to see that for what purposes the old vehicles, which they are going to condemn, were purchased and vehicle should be earmarked accordingly. So far as Innova is concerned, if it is being given to the Controller of Examinations, they would not be able to justify if the same is used for other purposes.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that Innova should be purchased for general pool instead of specifically for Controller of Examinations; otherwise, they would face problem later on.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that earlier the Tata Sumo was earmarked for Controller of Examinations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the Tata Sumo was not earmarked for Controller of Examinations, but for examination related works to be used by Controller of Examinations or any other person deputed by him. But the Tata Sumo was always used for the examination related works. If they ensured that the Innova would be used only for the examination related works, then it is okay. But the Vice-Chancellor is saying that since the University did not have a bigger vehicle, which they needed very frequently, probably, it is not justified to say that the Innova is being purchased for the Controller of Examinations.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that Innova is cheaper than other vehicles and its maintenance is also minimum. If need be, more Innovas could be purchased.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that instead of making investment in vehicles, outsourcing/hiring of vehicles should be done as it is much cheaper. That was why, the Corporate Houses/Big Companies had started outsourcing/hiring of vehicles instead of purchasing them. Moreover, the persons/officials travelling in the official cars/vehicles are not insured and if an accident took place, they could not take claim from the Insurance Company concerned.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That an amount of Rs.29.71 lac be sanctioned for purchase of following three vehicles, out of the Budget-head “Depreciation Fund Account”, for the use of official work:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Vehicle</b>	<b>Appox. Amount</b>
1.	One Innova	Rs.15.07 lac
2.	Two Swift Dezire	Rs.14.64 lac
	Total Fund required	Rs.29.71 lac

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 25.11.2014 regarding grant of travel subsidy to teachers/officials for attending conferences/seminars**

**29.** Considered minutes dated 25.11.2014 (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for reviewing existing rules regarding grant of travel subsidy to teachers/officials for attending conferences/seminars within India.

The Vice-Chancellor said that though the Committee had recommended Rs.500/- per day accommodation charges to the teachers/officials or actual expenditure, the same should be increased to at least to Rs.1500/- per day or actual expenditure.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the minimum of Rs.1,500/- per day or actual expenditure on accommodation, whichever is less, subject to production of receipt within overall limit of Rs.20,000/- per annum, be allowed to the teachers/ officials for attending Seminars/Conferences, etc. within India.

**Withdrawn Item**

**30.** Considered the amendment in Sr. No.13 of XLVII (Delegation of Authority) at page 588 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, as proposed below:

Existing Provision				Proposed Provision			
Sr. No.	Subject	Authority under Regulation	Delegated by Senate/Syndicate to	Sr. No.	Subject	Authority under Regulation	Delegated by Senate/Syndicate to
13	Grant of leave upto 6 months	Syndicate	Vice-Chancellor	<b>13</b>	<b>Grant of leave</b>		
					(i) Upto 3 months	Vice-Chancellor	Registrar
					(ii) beyond 3 months upto 6 months	Vice-Chancellor	No Change

Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, as per Regulation 11.1 at page 119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, the authorities competent to grant leave (other than casual) is – Syndicate – for employees of Class A for leave of more than six months; and (ii) Vice-Chancellor – for employees of Class A for leave up to six months. Now, if the Vice-Chancellor wishes to, he could delegate his power to the Registrar or anybody else, but there is no need to get the same approved from the Syndicate. It could be done only by issuing an administrative order. He, however, suggested that if the Vice-Chancellor desired, he could delegate his power to sanction leave (other than casual) upto three months to the Dean of University Instruction in the case of teaching staff and Registrar in the case of non-teaching staff.

**RESOLVED:** That Item 30 on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn.

**Endowment in the name of “Smt. Prem Lata and Professor Jain Research Foundation”**

**31.** Considered if an Endowment namely “Smt. Prem Lata and Professor Jain Research Foundation” be created in the Department of Chemistry & Centre for Advance Studies in Chemistry, P.U. to promote Scientific Research as per (**Appendix-XXVI**).

- NOTE:**
1. The Academic and Administrative Committee of the Department of Chemistry in its joint meeting dated 18.12.2014 has decided to start “Smt. Prem Lata and Professor Jain Research Foundation” as MOU with the University to promote the Scientific Research.
  2. The Dean Research has observed that there is no need of MOU, it is just a creation of endowment for Research Promotion.

**RESOLVED:** That an Endowment namely “Smt. Prem Lata and Professor Jain Research Foundation”, as per **Appendix-XXVI**, be created in the Department of Chemistry & Centre for Advance Studies in Chemistry, P.U. to promote Scientific Research.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 28.11.2014 regarding fee structure for International Students**

**32.** Considered the minutes dated 28.11.2014 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to device a fee structure for International Students to do a ‘study abroad’ for one semester.

Shri Dinesh Kumar pointed out that it had been mentioned at page 179 of the Appendix (Sr. No.2) that the semester fee will be half of the normal annual fee, but it had not been clarified of which annual fee, the fee would be halved, i.e. whether half of the annual fee of Indian students or NRI/PIO/Foreign Nationals.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath clarified that semester fee under this category would be charged as half fee of the normal annual fee being charged from the NRI. He suggested that, in future, wherever the words NRI students are to be written, it should be written as “NRI/PIO/Foreign students”.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are two kinds of international students, who are coming to Panjab University – (i) NRIs or PIOs; and (ii) Foreign Nationals. If they had different fee structure for NRIs/PIOs/Foreign Nationals, then it is rightly written that the semester fee would be half of the normal annual fee of those very students, i.e., NRIs/PIOs/Foreign Nationals. The proposal, however, does not explained whether the students would come to Panjab University and then go to other or their own country.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had raised this issue because nowadays the University is signing a lot of MoUs with different Universities/Institutions in other countries, the students of which could either come here for study or the students of Panjab University could go to their country for the purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was sure that the Dean International Students must be aware of the problem being faced by these students. In fact, it is also applicable to those students, who are

not international students, but go for one semester study abroad. However, in what context this item had been brought to the Syndicate, had not been explained.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that this proposal is not for the students of Panjab University who would go abroad for one semester study. This is only for those NRI/PIO/Foreign students, who came to this University for one semester study.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that he had talked to the Dean International Students, who had informed him that the Accounts Branch officials say that they knew only about the annual fee and not the semester fee.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 28.11.2014, as per **Appendix-XXVII**, be approved, with the clarification that the semester fee will be half of the normal annual fee of the category to which they belong to.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 03.12.2014 regarding weightage to deaf and dumb students**

**33.** Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 03.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to internal assessment weight age and criteria of passing for deaf and dumb students and other such students with severe disabilities.

**NOTE:** Ms. Anu Yadav, student of M.A. Sociology appeared in 3<sup>rd</sup> semester examination held in December, 2013 under Roll No. 46927 as a regular student of DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh. Her result was declared as re-appeared R (Soc-438, Soc-439 & Soc-632). But, Dr. Rashmi Yadav mother of Anu Yadav, made a representation that the result of her daughter may be declared pass by merging the theory paper and Internal assessment as her daughter is deaf by birth (hearing impairment more than 90%) and the definition/classification of disability has been defined by the Govt. for all purpose with enactment of the person with disabilities (Equal opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the recommendations of the Committee pertained to a case of the year 2013. He enquired from which date, these recommendations would be implemented.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 03.12.2014, as per **Appendix-XXVIII**, be approved with the addition that these be also applied in the case of Ms. Anu Yadav, a student of M.A. (Sociology), who appeared in 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester examination in December 2013 under Roll No.46927 as a regular student of D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh.

**Item 34 on the agenda had been taken up for consideration along with Item 22.**

**Approval of names of candidates who have passed various examinations and have become eligible for award of degrees**

**35.** Considered that the names of the candidates, who have passed examinations for the various degrees of the University and have become qualified under the regulation for admission to such degrees, be approved for the award of degrees at the 64<sup>th</sup> Convocation to be held on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2015, under Regulation 1 at page 27 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, as under:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Examination</b>	<b>Degrees to be conferred in the Convocation to be held on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
	<b>Part-A</b>	
1. 2. 3.	D.Sc. D. Litt. Ph.D.	To all the candidates whose viva-voce are conducted and cases submitted to the Vice-Chancellor from 8 <sup>th</sup> March, 2014 to 13.3.2015, on behalf of the Syndicate.
	<b>Part-B</b>	
	M. Phil.	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 2.3.2014 to 7.3.2015 (7 days before the Convocation).
	<b>Part-C</b>	
1. 2.	M.D. M.S.	To all the candidates whose results stand declared from 2.3.2014 to 7.3.2015 (7 days before the Convocation).
	<b>Part-D</b>	
1. 2. 3. 4.	LL.M. M.Tech. M.E. (Chem. Engg.) Masters Degree of Engg. (All Branches)	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 2.3.2014 to 7.3.2015 (7 days before the Convocation).
	<b>Part-E</b>	
1. 2.	Masters degree (M.A./M.Sc. Annual & Semester System) Examinations in various Faculties and other Post Graduate Courses  Following Bachelor's degree examinations: (a) B.E. Chemical B.E. Food Technology B.E. Telecom. & Inf. Tech. B.E. Electro. & Comm. Engg. B.E. Bio-Tech. B.E. Comp. Sci. & Engg. B.E. Electrical & Electronics B.E. Mechanical B.E. Civil B.E. Electronics & Electrical Comm. Engg. (b) B. Pharmacy (c) B.Sc. (Hons. School) (d) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Year Integrated course (e) Bachelor of Arts (Hons. School Economics)	First three first divisioners whose results of April/May 2014 Examination stand declared from 2.3.2014 to 7.3.2015 (7 days before the Convocation).

Sr. No.	Name of Examination	Degrees to be conferred in the Convocation to be held on 14 <sup>th</sup> March 2015
	(f) Bachelor of Dental Sciences (g) <b>Any other newly instituted Examination.</b>	

**RESOLVED:** That the names of the candidates, who have passed examinations for the various degrees of the University and have become qualified, under the regulation for admission to such degrees, be approved for the award of degrees at the 64<sup>th</sup> Convocation to be held on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2015, under Regulation 1 at page 27 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, as under:

Sr. No.	Name of Examination	Degrees to be conferred in the Convocation to be held on 14 <sup>th</sup> March 2015
	<b>Part-A</b>	
1. 2. 3.	D.Sc. D. Litt. Ph.D.	To all the candidates whose viva-voce are conducted and cases submitted to the Vice-Chancellor from 8 <sup>th</sup> March, 2014 to 13.3.2015, on behalf of the Syndicate.
	<b>Part-B</b>	
	M. Phil.	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 2.3.2014 to 7.3.2015 (7 days before the Convocation).
	<b>Part-C</b>	
1. 2.	M.D. M.S.	To all the candidates whose results stand declared from 2.3.2014 to 7.3.2015 (7 days before the Convocation).
	<b>Part-D</b>	
1. 2. 3. 4.	LL.M. M.Tech. M.E. (Chem. Engg.) Masters Degree of Engg. (All Branches)	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 2.3.2014 to 7.3.2015 (7 days before the Convocation).
	<b>Part-E</b>	
1. 2.	Masters degree (M.A./M.Sc. Annual & Semester System) Examinations in various Faculties and other Post Graduate Courses  Following Bachelor's degree examinations: (a) B.E. Chemical B.E. Food Technology B.E. Telecom. & Inf. Tech. B.E. Electro. & Comm. Engg. B.E. Bio-Tech. B.E. Comp. Sci. & Engg. B.E. Electrical & Electronics B.E. Mechanical B.E. Civil B.E. Electronics & Electrical Comm. Engg. (b) B. Pharmacy (c) B.Sc. (Hons. School)	First three first divisioners whose results of April/May 2014 Examination stand declared from 2.3.2014 to 7.3.2015 (7 days before the Convocation).

Sr. No.	Name of Examination	Degrees to be conferred in the Convocation to be held on 14 <sup>th</sup> March 2015
	(d) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Year Integrated course (e) Bachelor of Arts (Hons. School Economics) (f) Bachelor of Dental Sciences (g) <b>Any other newly instituted Examination.</b>	

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 24.12.2014 regarding accreditation of A, B and C Certificate and weightage to NSS Volunteers**

**36.** Considered minutes dated 24.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXIX**) in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 22.11.2014 (Para 13), regarding accreditation of A, B and C Certificate and weightage to NSS Volunteers, **and to be incorporated the same in Hand Book of Information.**

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.11.2014 (Para 13) (**Appendix-XXIX**) had resolved that the recommendation of the Committee dated 21.10.2014, be reviewed.

Principal Gurdip Sharma requested Professor Yog Raj Angrish, who is also the Programme Coordinator and Chairperson of the Committee, to clarify as to what would be the fate of those students and teachers, who attend the camps, but in other College/s.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish clarified that they normally allowed such persons to attend the camps and issue certificate/s on the recommendation of the Principal concerned. He further clarified that the weightage had been recommended by the Committee in accordance with the national policy. It was necessary as they had yet to receive grant from the U.T. Administration for this purpose.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 24.12.2014, as per **Appendix-XXIX**, be approved.

**Recommendations of the Revising Committee dated 30.12.2014 regarding appointment of Paper Setters/Examiners/Evaluators for the examinations of 2014-15**

**37.** Considered minutes dated 30.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXX**) of the Revising Committee in respect of appointment of Paper Setters/Examiners/Evaluators for the examinations of 2014-2015.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that there is a lot of confusion in the recommendation of the Revising Committee, e.g., it had not been made clear anywhere whether these are for Postgraduate or Undergraduate courses. Secondly, in recommendation 1, it had been mentioned that only the regular teachers having at least five years teaching experience be recommended for appointment as paper-setter. Sometimes the teacher had experience at Undergraduate level. Since it is question of Postgraduate course, the experience should be specifically mentioned that the experience should be at the Postgraduate level. Thirdly, it had been recommended at Sr. No.5 that only the teachers committed to set the question paper strictly according to the PU syllabus be recommended for the job. How would it be ensured that the recommended teacher would set the question paper strictly according to the PU syllabus? Fourthly, at Sr. No.3, it had been recommended that the norms of only one teacher from one

Institute/College in a particular faculty may be recommended for the paper-setting. Since there could be number of subjects, how could it be ensured.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it had been observed that normally the paper-setters set the question papers as per their own wishes and understanding. That is why, this clause has been incorporated.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that it was for a particular faculty. Meaning, that if two subjects, e.g., History and Political Science, are being taught in a College, only one teacher from that College could be recommended.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be read as “that only one teacher from one Institute/College in a particular subject should be recommended”. Referring to recommendation 5, he said that it meant that only those teachers should be recommended, who had some experience.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the language of the recommendation/s is not proper and the same needed to be modified. Secondly, how would the Board ensure that the person recommended for paper-setting is committed or not?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Board is supposed to make its judgement whether the recommended person would serve the purpose.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath remarked that though the work of paper-setting is very difficult, the remuneration given to the paper-setters is very less.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, this had always been the concern of those, who were recommending the paper-setters. The respective Boards of Studies always expected that the papers should be set in terms of the syllabus of the University, but in spite of that, as had been pointed out, paper/s out of syllabus had been set. Though thousands of question papers are set, there is no system to ensure that the paper-setters are committed ones and set the question papers strictly in accordance with the syllabus of Panjab University. Therefore, they must emphasize in the covering letter to be written to the paper-setters recommended by the Board of Studies to set the question paper as per the enclosed syllabus, as it had been observed time and again that the question papers are set beyond the syllabus.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he was a member of the Board of Studies in Laws for the last two years and he had observed that whenever the Examination Branch sent the list of paper-setters of the previous year, it is found written “refused” against the names of some of the examiners. He suggested that the paper-setters, who refused to set the question paper or are not interested to set the question paper at all, their names should not be there in the list so that the Board did not recommend them again.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he was a member of Boards of Studies in Punjabi (both Undergraduate and Postgraduate) and he had found that one of the instructions to the Board is that only those names for paper-setting should be recommended, who should not

have taught the subject. He, therefore, observed that these instructions were of 25-30 years old and needed to be relooked into. He further said that though the work of setting of question paper is most tedious and difficult one, the remuneration to them is much less. He, therefore, suggested that the remuneration to the paper-setters should be raised to at least Rs.1500/-.

Professor Ronki Ram remarked that to set the question papers and evaluation of answer-books is part and parcel of the duty of the teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that instead of cash, mementos could be given to the paper-setters, on behalf of the University, at the Convocation as a token of respect.

Principal Sanjeev Kumar Arora, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Dr. I.S. Sandhu, said that the problem of setting of question papers out of syllabus mostly come when the University appoints paper-setters from other Universities or Colleges affiliated with them.

Principal Parveen Chawla endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Principal Sanjeev Kumar Arora.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the old instructions, which are given to the paper-setters, should be examined by the Dean of University Instruction along with 2-3 senior persons. Secondly, the Board of Studies should make everything in the syllabi crystal-clear, e.g., course contents, units, allocation of marks, etc. Thirdly, the paper-setters should be requested to set the question papers in their own handwriting and not type the same on computers and if they still send the question-papers written on computers, the same should not be accepted as they keep one copy of the question-paper with them or on their computer, which is risky. He further suggested that the names of the paper-setters, who refused to set the question paper/s, should not be recommended again at least for 3 years.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Revising Committee dated 30.12.2014, as per **Appendix-XXX**, be approved.

**Proposal of certain  
Fellows and Syndics for  
grant of Golden Chance**

**38.** Considered the proposal (**Appendix-XXXI**) of the certain Fellows and Syndics for grant of Golden Chance to Graduate/Postgraduate students of (Annual System) to improve their performance and the class wise proposed fee structure is as under:

- (i) Rs.5000/- for Postgraduate students per class
- (ii) Rs.3000/- for Graduate students per class

**NOTE:** Last year number of students missed the said Golden opportunity due to heavy examination fee structure i.e. Rs.5000/- for Graduate and Rs.10,000/- for Postgraduate per class.

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is a sale of golden chance because golden chance was earlier given with the fee structure of Rs.5,000/- for graduate and Rs.10,000/- for postgraduate classes. Now, a request had been received signed by 46 members of the Senate and such requests would keep on pouring in as they all are public men and could not say that it is not good. But their concern should be as to how long it has to continue, which unfortunately is also beyond the regulations, beyond the power of the Syndicate and Senate and any other statutory authority. Therefore, they should take a conscious decision in this regard.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since they had switched over from Annual System to Semester System and certain students of Annual System are still in the pipeline, one Golden Chance should be given.

On a point raised by Dr. I.S. Sandhu that the students, who are given special chance to clear the subject of compartment of 1<sup>st</sup> Year examination after passing the 2<sup>nd</sup> Year examination, are not permitted to take admission in 3<sup>rd</sup> Year, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the students who are placed under Compartment in 1<sup>st</sup> Year are allowed to take admission in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Year. When they appeared in examination of 2<sup>nd</sup> Year and also in the compartment paper of 1<sup>st</sup> Year, if they are unable to pass in the Compartment subject, in their result of 2<sup>nd</sup> Year, it is mentioned 'RLL but Pass'. Such students are given a special chance to clear the compartment, but are not allowed to take admission in 3<sup>rd</sup> Year. He felt that in such cases, they should take some decision in favour of the students; otherwise, there is no benefit of giving a special chance to the students. He suggested that the Controller of Examinations should be authorized to allow such students to take admission in 3<sup>rd</sup> Year of their respective course.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that if the student passed 2<sup>nd</sup> Year examination, he/she is granted a special chance to clear his/her compartment of 1<sup>st</sup> Year. According to him, there is a provision under which the Controller of Examinations could permit such students to take admission in the next higher class.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the students, whose results are declared as 'RLL but Pass', should be allowed to take provisional admission in the next higher class, subject to qualifying the lower examination. He suggested that the results of such students should be declared in such a manner so that they could take admission in the next higher class. In fact, what happened is that the results of such students are not declared until he/she qualified the lower examination. Therefore, the Colleges did not admit such students to next higher class.

It was suggested that the suggestion for admitting those students, whose results are declared as 'RLL but Pass' and are given a special chance to clear the compartment of their lower class, should be allowed to take admission in the next higher class provisionally subject to qualifying of lower examination, should be referred to the Regulations Committee for making necessary amendments in the relevant Regulation/s.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that a suggestion had been given that the matter of the students, whose results are declared as 'RLL but Pass' and are given a special chance to clear the compartment of their lower class, should be allowed to take admission in the next higher

class provisionally subject to qualifying of lower examination, should be referred to the Regulations Committee for making necessary amendments in the relevant Regulation/s. He suggested that till the regulations are amended by the Regulations Committee, the Controller of Examinations should be authorized to allow such cases.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that it is effective only for one or two years because they had already shifted from Annual System to Semester System and all the Regulations are being amended accordingly. Between the transitory period of one or two years, the above suggestion for allowing the students, whose results are declared as 'RLL but Pass' and are given a special chance to clear the compartment of their lower class, should be allowed to take admission in the next higher class provisionally subject to qualifying of lower examination.

**This was agreed to.**

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that, in fact, in their original Regulations, it had been mentioned that the students are required to clear their compartment within a period of two years, but later on, the Regulations had been wrongly got amended and the two years had been substituted with two consecutive chances.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That a Golden Chance be granted to Graduate/Postgraduate students of (Annual System) to clear their compartment/s and also to improve the performance, for which the class-wise fee structure be as under:

- (i) Rs.10,000/- for Postgraduate students per class
- (ii) Rs.5,000/- for Graduate students per class

The candidates belonging to economically weaker sections of the society, who could not pay this fee of Rs.10,000/- and Rs.5,000/-, should make their representations to the Dean of Student Welfare and Dean, College Development Council, who would examine their cases and, if need be, their fee would be subsidized on behalf of the University.

**Deferred Item**

**39.** Considered the following proposal dated 9.7.2014 of the Observers deputed by Vice-Chancellor, regarding admission of B.Com. 1<sup>st</sup> in the District Ludhiana:

1. from the session 2015-2016 of the admission in District Ludhiana be centralized on the pattern of Centralized admissions in the Chandigarh Colleges.
2. one Co-ordinator from University be appointed along with one Co-ordinator from Ludhiana for centralized admission process for the session 2015-2016

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the Syndicate had already decided that the admission to B.Com. course should be left to the affiliated Colleges; hence, there was no reason to suggest centralized admissions.

Professor Ronki Ram said that on the one hand, they were talking about autonomy and on the other hand, they were making centralized admissions.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the centralized admission is good and beneficial for the students; otherwise, the students would have to shell out extra money to purchase prospectus of different Colleges. When the centralized admissions were made earlier, there might have been certain drawbacks in the system, due to which the system was discontinued. In nutshell, he said that the system of centralized admissions is very good and it is working very well in certain other courses and also in other Institutions.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that, according to her, it is not beneficial to the students as most of the students, who took admission in Colleges in Ludhiana, belonged to rural areas and they did not know how to fill up the form/s On-line, which lead to harassment by the people of Cyber Café. The people at the Cyber Café fill up the preferences of the students at their own. Secondly, if admissions to other courses are being made on merit basis by the Colleges themselves, then the B.Com. course should not be singled out for centralized admissions.

Principal Sanjeev Arora said that it has been observed that when centralized admissions to B.Com. Part I were made in Ludhiana Colleges, the students from Chandigarh, who did not get admission here, took admission in Ludhiana and majority of them shifted to Chandigarh in 2<sup>nd</sup> year, due to which the B.Com. Part II and III seats remained vacant. The Colleges concerned have to bear a big loss as they had appointed requisite faculty for the purpose. He, therefore, suggested that admission to B.Com. course should be allowed to be made by the Colleges themselves instead of centralized admissions.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the centralized admission even in Chandigarh was started because certain complaints were received in respect of one or two Colleges. He pleaded that even in Chandigarh, the admission to B.Com. course should be allowed to be made by the Colleges themselves and, if need be, the University could send its observers to oversee the admission process.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in the name of autonomy, if they had to do away with the transparency and objectivity in the admission process that probably is not acceptable. Shri Jarnail Singh is right that centralized admissions had been started in Chandigarh due to complaints in Chandigarh. At that time the complaint might be in Chandigarh and tomorrow, it could be in Ludhiana. As such, the complaints are being received by the University only. A valid point has been raised by Principal Gurdip Sharma that once it had already been decided by the Syndicate that centralized admissions are not to be made in Ludhiana Colleges, then the matter should not have been placed before the Syndicate. Probably, Principal Gurdip Sharma did not know that it is again on the basis of complaint received by the University from Ludhiana.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the suggestion for making centralized admission in Colleges of District Ludhiana from the session 2015-16 had been given by the Observer, who was appointed by the Vice-Chancellor to see the admission process to B.Com. course in Ludhiana Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the suggestion had been made by the Observer and Coordinator for B.Com. Centralized Admissions, on the basis of interaction with some of the students, parents and faculty members.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that year before last, they made centralized admissions to B.Com. course in Ludhiana, but one of the un-aided Colleges did not follow the University instruction and made the admissions at its own. The University did not approve the admissions and the College gets the same approved by the University through the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. Thereafter, the matter came to the Syndicate, wherein they decided to do away with the centralized admissions. As per 11-Judge judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the famous TMA Pai case, the Universities could not interfere in the admission process up to graduate level and the same was quoted by the Advocate of the College/s concerned. He was against centralized admissions to B.Com. course even in Chandigarh. The students preferred to take admission to B.Com. course in GGSD College, Sector 32, Chandigarh. Thereafter, their preferences are DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh; Postgraduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh; and GGS College, Sector 26, Chandigarh. Similarly, for 10+1 for Commerce Stream, the students preferred Pt. Mohan Lal SD Public School, Sector 32, Chandigarh. He suggested that the affiliated Colleges should make admissions to B.Com. course on merit basis and the merit list should be displayed on their notice boards and a copy of the same should be sent to the Dean, College Development Council for information.

The Vice-Chancellor sought the solution to counter the argument that the students had to purchase several prospectuses (at least 6-7) to apply in various Colleges for taking admission to B.Com. course. Due to this, they have to shell out extra money.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that it is a material fact that 10 to 15 of the first students, who took admission in a College, join other courses/Colleges/ Institutes and also kept their chance in the B.Com. as well, which resulted into non-confirmation of their admissions. Resultantly, the entire process is delayed and the admission lists are revised time and again. However, if the admissions are made by the Principals of the affiliated Colleges, they could do so at their own level.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the fact of the matter is that if the admissions are not made centralized, the students would have to purchase prospectus of at least 6-7 Colleges/Institutes.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the price of 6-7 prospectuses would be around Rs.3,500/- and a student would have to spend at least Rs.3,500/- for purchasing the prospectuses. However, if there is centralized admission, he had just to pay the fixed fee to the University.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there are 5-6 Government Colleges in Chandigarh and the prospectus of which is common and the price of the prospectus is about Rs.100/-. Similarly, there are three Women Colleges and three aided Colleges. As such, the cost is not too much.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that when the centralized admissions to B.Com. Part-I in the affiliated Colleges of Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur and Chandigarh were started for the first time, he was the Co-ordinator. However, Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management, District Ludhiana, refused to make admissions through the centralized process. This College had neither followed any reservation policy nor charged the fee prescribed by the University; rather charged much higher fee from the students. Therefore, their main concern is to protect the interests of the students. Ludhiana has a unique problem as there are two types of Colleges, i.e., City and rural area Colleges. When they invited applications, there were excess applications than number of seats for B.Com. course in this particular College (Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management). The College had refused to make admission through centralized process claiming it to be a rural College. According to him, practically the whole cream/intelligent students get admission in that very College, due to which 50% or more seats of nearby Colleges, i.e., Ramgaria Girls College and Master Tara Singh College, SDP College, Ludhiana, remained vacant. In fact, the issue at the core of heart is the practice adopted by Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management, which is charging exorbitant fee from the students and did not admit SC/ST students in accordance with the reservation policy of the Punjab Government/Government of India. Unfortunately, he could not get any representation from the SC/ST candidates. He suggested that whosoever is appointed Observer, it should be made sure in the interest of the students that this College also falls in line.

On a point of information, Shri Jarnail Singh enquired as to what fee was charged by the University from a student for On-line admission.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the total On-line fee and other charges were Rs.1200/- only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that meant that the students would have to keep the back-up and for that they had to buy the prospectuses of different Colleges. Therefore, his earlier query regarding prospectuses is not important.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the query is still relevant from cost point of view also because if one did not get admission to B.Com., he/she did not have to keep a backup of purchasing the prospectuses for B.A./B.Sc. from 7 Colleges. At the most, the students have to purchase the prospectus for admission to B.A. from the same very College, where he earlier preferred to take admission to B.Com. course.

At this stage, Professor Karamjeet Singh clarified that the University charged only Rs.120/- for On-line centralized admissions to B.Com. course and not Rs.1200/- as said by him earlier.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, none of them is interested to interfere with the autonomy of the Principal or for that matter. The idea is that no College should be allowed to exploit the situation and nobody should be allowed to admit students by adopting the policy of pick and choose. Shri Jarnail Singh is right that the centralized admissions in Chandigarh Colleges were started in view of the mal-practices being done by one of the Colleges. However, before starting the centralized admissions to B.Com. course, the University

tried its best to control the College, and ultimately, it was decided by the Syndicate that admissions to B.Com. course be made through centralized process. At that time, it was done because of one College of Chandigarh. Now, as informed by Principal Chawla, the problem had arisen because of one College in Ludhiana. And the College, due to which they took the decision to make centralized admissions, went to the Court and got the stay and the other Colleges are being made to suffer. If they felt that if only that College, which is doing something wrong, he did not think that the University is so helpless that it could not control the said College. Though the cost is there, the expenses on account of purchase of prospectuses are there. Probably, for taking admission in Government Colleges in Chandigarh, one needed to purchase only one prospectus. Let them take a decision that for taking admission in any of the affiliated Colleges, one need only to purchase one prospectus and the cost of prospectus as well as fee to be charged for the course be also fixed by the University as is in the case of On-line admissions and wherever the student took admission, he/she has to purchase prospectus of that College only. How to ensure that admissions by the College had been made on merit unless and until the University had a copy of the application form, which had been submitted by the candidate in the College or the University send an Observer, who should be supplied copies of applications of all the applicants? Basically, the idea is only to ensure that the meritorious students are admitted to the course and not to interfere in the autonomy of the Colleges. Professor Karamjeet Singh is right in saying that Sri Aurobindo College had gone to the Court and got stay, but unfortunately, the order of the Court had never been brought to the Syndicate. They only knew that the College had taken the plea that the College (Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management) did not fall within the Municipal Limit of Ludhiana, so it should not be considered one of the Colleges of Ludhiana, though the Syndicate had approved that centralized admission should be made in the Colleges of Ludhiana and its agglomeration area. Even if they took the decision today, it would be against the decision of the Court. He, therefore, suggested that consideration of the item should be postponed and consider it next time in the light of the orders of the Court. If they were not in a position to take a decision to make centralized admissions in Ludhiana, what are the steps to ensure that particular College (Sri Aurobindo College) are made properly or for that matter in other Colleges of Ludhiana did not follow the malpractices.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that a meeting of the College Principals should be called before taking any final decision in the matter; otherwise, there should not be centralized admissions.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had also some responsibility towards the society and could not leave everything to the Colleges. If the complaints are received by the University, it is the duty of the University to safeguard the interests of the students.

Principal Gurdip Sharma remarked that thousands of complaints are received by the University.

Principal Sanjeev Arora said that, first of all, they must know the purpose of centralized admissions – whether it is cost or pick and choose policy or something else, so that they could take decision accordingly. If the purpose is cost, the cost should be determined by the University and adjusted in the fee where the student actually took admission. If it is pick and choose policy, then some other decision

should be taken. If Sri Aurobindo College is outside the Municipal Limit of Ludhiana, the centralized admissions would not serve the purpose. And if a College did not accept the conditions of the University, action should be taken against it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is why he was saying that the University should take the decision after examining the issue legally in the light of the order of the Court. At this time, they did not have the orders passed by the Court and the plea of the College on the basis of which the stay had been granted by the Court.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the matter needed to be examined and the Principals of the affiliated Colleges have to be informed accordingly. Therefore, the consideration of the item today should be deferred.

It was clarified that the University had received certain complaints, on the basis of which Observers were sent to certain Colleges in Ludhiana. The Observers had submitted their reports stating that the merit lists be sought from the Colleges and had also recommended that from next year centralized admission to B.Com. course should be made in the Colleges in Ludhiana and the item had been placed before the Syndicate for consideration. The University had sought merit lists from the Colleges where admissions to B.Com. course took place and did not find anything wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to convene a meeting of Principals of the affiliated Colleges, wherein B.Com. course offered and the Heads, Department of Commerce of the Colleges concerned should also be invited to the meeting, so that broader view of the matter is taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Dean, College Development Council had made a statement that they had sought merit lists of the students from the Colleges and did not find anything wrong. He entirely differed with his statement. Had the list been appended with the item or supplied to them, it would have been better?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested the Vice-Chancellor to see whether it is to be written District Ludhiana or Ludhiana City for making centralized admissions to B.Com. course.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposal would be only for the affiliated Colleges in the City limit of Ludhiana.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the University had filed reply to the Writ Petition under which the College had been granted stay. According to him, the University has not filed any reply so far. This is how litigations are going on and what could they do?

**RESOLVED:** That consideration of the item be deferred and in the meanwhile the Dean, College Development Council would convene a meeting of Principals of the affiliated Colleges, wherein B.Com. course offered and the Heads, Department of Commerce of the Colleges concerned be also invited to the meeting, so that broader view of the matter is taken.

## Inspection Report

**40.** Considered grant of permanent affiliation in respect of the following courses w.e.f. the session 2013-14 to National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research, Sector-26, Chandigarh:

- (i) M.Tech. Engg. Education (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (ii) M.E. Manufacturing Technology (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (iii) M.E. Construction Technology & Management (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (iv) M.E. Computer Science and Engineering (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (v) M.E. Instrumentation & Control (66 Seats = Regular-26 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (vi) M.E. Electronics & Communication Engineering (59 Seats = Regular-19 seats and Modular-40 seats).

**NOTE: 1. The permanent affiliation will be with the stipulation that it is valid subject to getting the approval from AICTE and the College will mandatory inform the University of AICTE affiliation regularly, as the College gets AICTE approval for various courses for year to year basis.**

- 2. The Director, NITTTR, Sector-26, Chandigarh, has been requesting for permanent affiliation since 2012 vide applications dated 03.01.2012, 03.02.2012, 17.09.2013, 10.07.2014 and 23.09.2014 & 16.10.2014 (**Appendix-XXXII**).
- 3. The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/ Senate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation instead of permanent affiliation for above said courses vide circular No. Misc./A-5/84 dated 15.01.2014 (**Appendix-XXXII**).
- 4. The Vice-Chancellor after looking into the case has passed orders that the Institute is required to apply for grant of temporary extension of affiliation as per rules for the M.E. Courses running in the Institute in each session along with the prescribed affiliation fees till the permanent affiliation is granted vide circular No. 57656-57670 dated 08.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXXII**).

5. An office note enclosed  
(**Appendix-XXXII**).

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that though National Institute of Technical Teachers Training & Research is a very good institute, would they grant permanent affiliation to it with the stipulation that the affiliation would be valid subject to getting approval from the AICTE.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that either they should not grant permanent affiliation to this Institute or if permanent affiliation is to be granted, it has to be conditional.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if the AICTE grant affiliation to this institute on year to year basis, how could the University grant it permanent affiliation?

The Vice-Chancellor said that this national institute is one of the top national institutes of the country and if the institute wanted permanent affiliation, they should grant the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to what is the idea/purpose of getting permanent affiliation.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that one of the condition for getting TEQIP-II is that the institute/College must have permanent affiliation.

It was clarified that, firstly, the AICTE grant affiliation on year to year basis and never grant permanent affiliation. For permanent affiliation NAAC accreditation is a must. University would grant permanent affiliation only if the institute is accredited by the NAAC. When the meeting of the Regulatory Body was held here wherein the Chairman of AICTE had told him during the discussion that they give affiliation on year to year basis, but the University could grant permanent affiliation. The Institute had applied for NAAC accreditation, which they would definitely get. Therefore, the University could grant permanent affiliation to this institute so that it could get TEQIP-II grant.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research, Sector-26, Chandigarh, be granted permanent affiliation w.e.f. the session 2013-14 in respect of the following courses with the stipulation that the permanent affiliation would be valid subject to getting approval from AICTE and the institute would mandatory inform the University of AICTE affiliation regularly as the institute gets AICTE approval for various courses on year to year basis:

- (i) M.Tech. Engg. Education (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (ii) M.E. Manufacturing Technology (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)

- (iii) M.E. Construction Technology & Management (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (iv) M.E. Computer Science and Engineering (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (v) M.E. Instrumentation & Control (66 Seats = Regular-26 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (vi) M.E. Electronics & Communication Engineering (59 Seats = Regular-19 seats and Modular-40 seats).

**Assignment of Fellow to the Faculties**

**41.** Considered the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name in anticipation of the approval of the Senate:

Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra (Minister of Water Supply and Higher Education) Education Minister Punjab, Chandigarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arts</li> <li>2. Law</li> <li>3. Business Management &amp; Commerce</li> <li>4. Education</li> </ul>
---	--

**NOTE:** An office note along with letter dated 3.12.2014 & 13.1.2015 enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIII)**.

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

Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra (Minister of Water Supply and Higher Education) Education Minister Punjab, Chandigarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arts</li> <li>2. Law</li> <li>3. Business Management &amp; Commerce</li> <li>4. Education</li> </ul>
---	--

**Recommendation dated 29.12.2014 of the Executive Committee of PUSC regarding quorum for General Body Meeting of PUSC**

**42.** Considered the recommendation dated 29.12.2014 (Item 21) **(Appendix-XXXIV)** of the Executive Committee of PUSC that the quorum of the General Body meeting should not be less than 35 members instead of  $\frac{1}{4}$  of total membership of the Committee and be incorporated the same in the Official Handbook of PUSC.

- NOTE:**
- 1. The change in quorum has been recommended due to less attendance of the members in the previous General Body meeting.
  - 2. A Photo-copy of Rule 1 appearing at page 24, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, relating to composition of PUSC enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIV)**.

**RESOLVED:** That the quorum for the General Body meeting of Panjab University Sports Committee be not less than 20% of the members and the same be incorporated in the Official Handbook of PUSC.

**Issue regarding approval to the appointment of certain teachers in DAV Post Graduate College, Chandigarh on permanent basis after completion of probation**

**43.** Considered approval to appointment of Ms. Mandeep Josan and Mr. Gagandeep Singh Brar as Assistant Professors in Computer Science on permanent basis (probation for one year w.e.f. 19.06.2013) against uncovered post in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+ AGP of Rs.6000/- at DAV Post Graduate College, Sector-10, Chandigarh. Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Ms. Mandeep Josan and Mr. Gagandeep Singh Brar have been awarded Ph.D. degree in Computer Science in the year 2012 i.e. on 19.12.2012 by the CMJ University, Shillong (Meghalaya).

2. In pursuance of public Notice available on the UGC website, the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.07.2013 (Para 46) **(Appendix-XXXV)** has resolved that degree/s awarded by CMJ University, Shillong (Meghalaya), irrespective of year of award of degree, which are placed or are to be placed before the Registrar or Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate after 12.06.2013, be not granted equivalence. Accordingly, a circular dated 14.08.2013 was issued stating therein that:

(i) xxx xxx xxx

(ii) the degree/s awarded by C.M.J. University, Shillong (Meghalaya), irrespective of year of award of degree, shall be deemed as derecognized w.e.f. the session 2013-14.

3. Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, vide letter dated 29.09.2014 **(Appendix-XXXV)**, has opined that the degrees awarded to the students by CMJ University are valid and the appointments of the candidates (Ms. Mandeep Josan and Mr. Gagandeep Singh Brar) made on the basis of the said degrees by duly constituted Selection Committee are legally entitled to approval by the University. He further stated that this considered opinion is purely advisory and it is purely the discretion of the authority.

4. One Shri Dharam Pal Singh, 770/1 West Amber Talab, Near Ram Nagar Chowk, Roorkee - 247667 (Uttarakhand) vide applications dated 25.04.2014 and 26.04.2014 sought information from the Joint Director/ Public Information Officer, Directorate of Higher & Technical Education, First Floor, Addl. Secretariat Building, Shillong, under RTI Act 2005.

Dr. Gagandeep Singh Brar vide representation dated 25.06.2014 requested that the approval of his appointment as Assistant Professor may be granted. He was advised to send the authentic proof (attested copies) of the document received through RTI, as the information sought under RTI belongs to third person viz. Shri Dharam Pal Singh. Hence, Dr. G.S. Brar vide application dated 2.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXXV**) submitted the following document (**copies enclosed**):

- (i) RTI in original
- (ii) Copies of RTI applications dated 25.04.2014 and 26.04.2014
- (iii) Copy of letter from UGC
- (iv) Copy of letter from Punjab Technical University
- (v) Copies of proceedings and orders of MGS University

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the only thing, which had been made the basis for approval of these appointments, is the legal opinion and the legal opinion started with the words "The Special Leave Petitions are accordingly disposed of with a direction that within three months from today the State Government shall, after giving an opportunity to the petitioners to show cause against the action proposed to be taken, pass a speaking order under Section-48 of the 2009 Act. The students whose admission and degrees were declared illegal may also make representation to the State Government and seek an opportunity of hearing from it. The request made by them shall be sympathetically considered by the State Government". So far as he remembered, the Syndicate in July 2013 had taken a decision not to accept the degrees awarded by this University (CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya) irrespective of year of award of the degree. Now, the Vice-Chancellor had also given opinion that as far as cancelling of appointments are concerned, it should be done only after legally examining. According to him, subsequently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2013 had also passed some orders in the case of CMJ University, but the Legal Retainer had not referred to those orders in his legal opinion. He suggested that first they should see the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court and thereafter decide the issue accordingly because if they are barred from approving such appointments by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, could they approve them on the basis of a legal opinion, which did not refer to the Judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court. The operative part of the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India says that the students, whose admissions and degrees are declared illegal, may also make representation to the State Government and seek an opportunity of hearing and their representations/requests shall be considered sympathetically by the State Government. Meaning thereby, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India had accepted that the degrees had been declared illegal. Now, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India says that if anybody is aggrieved by the orders of the Court or by the decision of the University, he/she had a right to represent to the Government and his/her case should

be considered sympathetically. It had also been directed in the judgement that all the candidates so aggrieved shall submit representations within a period of three months and the aggrieved candidates must have submitted their representations to the Government of Meghalaya and the Government must have fixed some date/s for hearing in the instant case also. He knew that for all the candidates belonging to Chandigarh, the Government of Meghalaya had fixed only one date. As per the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, if the hearing had been granted/given by the Government of Meghalaya, these persons should be asked to bring the orders passed by the Government of Meghalaya and the decision could be taken accordingly. But nowhere in the item had any reference been made to the orders passed by the Supreme Court of India, which had been passed subsequent to the decision of the Syndicate of Panjab University in July 2013. It is also in tune with the observation of the Vice-Chancellor that they had to get the case/s legally examined. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India had come with its orders that yet the degrees are invalid and the Supreme Court nowhere said that the Visitor of the University is not empowered to declare the degrees illegal. The only concession, which the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India gave, is that the persons be heard and their cases be considered by the Meghalaya Government sympathetically. Another case which had been made is that a person had filed an application under the RTI Act and the reply, which had been received by him, had been annexed with the item in support of the case for approval of the candidates, who had been granted hearing and definitely the orders must have been passed by the Meghalaya Government subsequent to the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The candidates concerned did not provide the copy/copies of orders of the Meghalaya Government. Is it not in the fitness of the things that the candidates should be asked whether they were granted hearing by the Meghalaya Government and, if no, whether they did represent to the Government; and if not, why they did not represent to the Meghalaya Government in spite of the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India? If yes, what is the outcome of the hearing and if the outcome unfortunately is negative, is this University empowered to approve these appointments? As such, the orders passed by the Meghalaya Government are necessary to decide the cases under consideration.

Professor Naveep Goyal stated that the Panjab University Syndicate took decision not to recognize the degrees of CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya, in July 2013 and by that time, some other Universities also decided not to recognize the degrees awarded by this University. Thereafter, of course, a lot of representations were made to various quarters, including the U.G.C. and in response to one of the representations made by PTU, the UGC vide its letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013 (copy appended with the item) *inter alia* replied that "...UGC vide letter No.F.8-21/2010(CPP-1/PU) dated 22.10.2013 forwarded a copy of the report to the Governor Secretariat, Meghalaya and Chief Secretary, Meghalaya Government with the request to take appropriate action against CMJ University as per the provisions of the University Act or any other law as the Governor Secretariat/State Government deems fit. The Governor Secretariat/Meghalaya Government were also requested to take a decision about the validity of the degrees already awarded by CMJ University in the past keeping in view that only those degrees can be terms as valid for which courses were conducted by CMJ University in regular mode at its main campus at Shillong and that too with the prior approval of Statutory Council(s) concerned, wherever required. It was also

informed that M.Phil./Ph.D. can be conducted by any University in regular mode at the main campus and as per the provisions contained in the UGC (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Awards of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees), Regulations, 2009...". As such, the UGC clearly says that the degrees awarded by CMJ University in regular mode at its main campus are as per the provisions contained in the UGC (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Awards of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees), Regulations, 2009.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the question is whether the degrees of the candidates under consideration satisfy this condition. Is there a way to find out whether these degrees are in a regular mode?

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as far as the earlier decision of the syndicate is concerned, the same needed to be changed and as far as these candidates are concerned, the Vice-Chancellor could be authorized to obtain affidavit for the satisfaction of the University that they had completed their Pre-Ph.D. course work in accordance with the UGC Regulations 2009.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the appointments have been placed before the Syndicate for approval, they have to satisfy that what they are doing is correct. Is it possible to seek information from the University itself as they did not know whether the University is in existence or not?

When Professor Navdeep Goyal told that the University is existing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, as per the papers supplied to them, the CMJ University had been dissolved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that without knowing whether the University existed or not, they should find out whether the letter of the U.G.C. dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013 is authentic. If it is authentic, they should find whether these candidates had attended the Pre-Ph.D. course work as per the UGC (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Awards of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees), Regulations, 2009.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since these candidates had been granted hearing on the direction of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the candidates must have got the hearing and the Government of Meghalaya must have passed some orders. Therefore, the candidates should be asked to provide the copy of the orders passed by the Government of Meghalaya. He added that in the instant case, the Ph.D. had been completed by the candidates within a period of two years.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that there is no order on record whereby the recommendations of the visitor that the University (CMJ University) be dissolved has been issued. Since the University had come into being because of the State Legislature Act, unless and until the State Legislature dissolved it, it continued to be in existence. He was shocked to read it in the newspaper that the degrees of CMJ University had been declared invalid/illegal. Had anybody the authority to say that all the degrees, notwithstanding the date on which the degrees have been awarded to the candidates, are hereby declared illegal. Whereas the law is – when an institution is dissolved, all the degrees to be awarded by it are declared illegal from that day onward and not from retrospectively and he had a judgement of the

Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in this regard. He handed over a copy of the judgement to the Registrar and asked him to go through the same and provide a copy of the same to the Vice-Chancellor. The judgement says two things – (i) those who have on the date, before the date when the degrees were derecognized, their degrees shall be accepted; and (ii) in a Haryana case the Supreme Court had said that those who have been admitted, would be allowed to complete the course and their degrees would also be valid. When about thousand Universities were established and the same was challenged by Professor Yash Pal, the former Chairman, UGC, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India struck it down by saying that the authority under which the Universities had been declared, is declared invalid and at the same time told that those students, who had been admitted to these institutions, may be transferred to other Universities, which have been created by the State. There is not even a single judgement of the Court, wherein the degrees of the students, who had been awarded the degrees/admitted to the degrees before passing of the orders, are declared invalid. In the instant case, the candidates had done Ph.D. on the campus of the University by attending to the pre-Ph.D. course work. He added that there was a complaint against some of the technical courses offered by the Haryana Government and the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court struck it down. Since he was a member of the Selection Committee, he had been shown that the candidates had done the Ph.D. at the campus and had attended to the course work also and, thereafter, he got satisfied. He, therefore, pleaded that the appointments of the candidates under consideration should be approved.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there was no official communication stating the Government had dissolved CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya and the decision was taken by the Syndicate on the basis of newspapers report.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that they took the decision in 2013 on the basis of hearsay or report of the newspapers that the Hon'ble Governor of Meghalaya had dissolved CMJ University, whereas the Governor had just recommendation to the Meghalaya Government and till date the recommendation had not been accepted and the name of this University still existed in the list of the U.G.C. approved Universities. Therefore, if these candidates had got the Ph.D. degrees complying with the UGC (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Awards of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees), Regulations, 2009, their appointments should approved.

Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Principal Gurdip Sharma, Shri Jarnail Singh said that if these candidates had done Ph.D. in accordance with the U.G.C. Regulations, the appointments of the candidates in question should be given approval.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora said that on whatever basis, the Syndicate might have taken the decision in 2013, but now since the U.G.C. in its letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013 that M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees obtained by the candidate/s from any University in regular mode at their main campus, are valid. How could they declare those degrees invalid? He, therefore, pleaded that if the candidates in question had done Ph.D. in regular mode, their appointments should be approved.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that they should verify the letter of the U.G.C. dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and if it is found to be valid one and the candidates had also done their Ph.D. in regular mode, the appointments of these persons should be approved.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that they took a decision in July 2013 which had consequences because the admissions of certain students were cancelled in the University on the basis of this decision of the University in July 2013. As such, reversion of their earlier decision would have its own consequences. She, therefore, suggested that the decision should be taken very carefully after verification of all the relevant documents. Though certain documents had been appended with the agenda item, there might be certain more documents, which had not been appended. Therefore, the decision should not be taken in haste as it would have far reaching consequences.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that in view of the UGC letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013, certain University including Punjab Technical University, Jalandhar, had declared the degrees of CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya, valid. Secondly, he had himself seen the degree of one of the students of CMJ University, who is working in Jalandhar, and had seen that it had been mentioned in the degree in which mode the students had done the degree, i.e., regular or distance mode. As such, verification – whether the candidates in question had done Ph.D. in regular mode, could be done very easily. Thirdly, certain candidates, who had done Ph.D. from CMJ University during the last 2-3 years, had sought information under the RTI Act from the UGC as to whether their Ph.D. degrees are valid and the UGC had replied in affirmative. If they wish, the certificate of pre-Ph.D. course work could be seen and if found valid, the appointments of these candidates should be approved.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that when the report about the CMJ University was published in the newspapers, the UGC immediately in August 2013 constituted a Committee, which had submitted its reports. Now, the status of this University is available on the website of the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the verification which the Vice-Chancellor wishes to, the UGC had tried its level best to verify, but could not succeed. The letter, which is being referred to, is dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and had been addressed to Punjab Technical University in response to their letter dated 24.07.2013, and it had been written that “The Governor Secretariat/Meghalaya Government were also requested to take a decision about the validity of the degrees already awarded by CMJ University in the past keeping in view that only those degrees can be termed as valid for which courses were conducted by CMJ University in regular mode at its main campus at Shillong and that too with the prior approval of Statutory Council(s) concerned, wherever required. It was also informed that M.Phil./Ph.D. can be conducted by any University in regular mode at the main campus and as per the provisions contained in the UGC (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Awards of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees), Regulations, 2009. The Governor Secretariat and Government of Meghalaya have been requested to inform the decision taken as the UGC is receiving lot of queries about CMJ University and validity of degrees already awarded by it. The UGC is yet to receive any response from Governor Secretariat (Meghalaya) and Government

of Meghalaya". In fact, the UGC is saying that according to them, any degree, which had been done with the course work on the main campus of the University is valid, but they have asked the Meghalaya Government to verify whether the degrees awarded by CMJ University, keeping in view these norms, are valid or not. The UGC had sought the response immediately, but the UGC is saying that the response is still awaited. As such, the Meghalaya Government had not verified anywhere that 'yes' they had rendered these degrees valid. Why should they rely on a response given to the PTU? Why could they not straightaway write to the Meghalaya Government?

The Vice-Chancellor said that it meant that they should go and verify whether these degrees are valid. They would contact PTU and also see the certificate and, thereafter, take a call.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why should they verify from the PTU. Why could they not verify from the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright, they would verify these two sentences from the UGC.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that if any authority derecognizes any degree from today, it would not be effective from retrospectively. When these candidates did their Ph.D. at the main campus of the University, the degrees were recognized and stood recognized as stated in the Judgement in the case Suresh Kumar Vs. State of Haryana, which he had already supplied. He proposed that the approval to these appointments should be granted.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, earlier, the Syndicate had not taken the decision on the basis of hearsay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on the basis of earlier decision of the Syndicate, the admissions of number of students were cancelled, who is responsible for that. The decision should be taken keeping in view the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that the students, whose admissions and degrees were declared illegal, could make representation to the State Government for consideration of their cases sympathetically.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that what is before them are the recommendations received from the Selection Committee/s, which they had sent to a College and the same had come to them for approval. When the Selection Committee/s was/were sent, this thing was not there. When this issue arose, they took certain decision with regard to cancellation of admissions of certain students and also kept this in abeyance because the situation at that stage was even handed. Further developments took place and there is a letter of the UGC dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and there is also a letter of Assistant Registrar (College Development), PTU, which had been addressed to Director-Principal of all the affiliated Colleges of PTU.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to see whether the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India is there in the file.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India is about the candidates, whose degrees and admissions had been cancelled. What about those whose degrees and admissions have not been cancelled?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is what he is saying. In fact, the degrees of the persons under consideration had been cancelled and they had represented to the Government of Meghalaya.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would ask these candidates to give an affidavit stating that their degrees have not been cancelled.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that an affidavit should be sought stating that they had not filed any representation to the State Government for personal hearing.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that it is not the issue. The issue is whether they had done their Ph.D. in regular mode on the main campus of the University and in accordance with the UGC Regulations 2009. As such, only this affidavit should be sought.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when they give judgement either on the students or University employees or any other person, do they give judgement by thinking that the person concerned is a culprit.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that any decision, whether affirmative or negative, they are just a body appointed via election by a larger body namely Senate. If they took a wrong decision, the Senate had authority to undo it.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the Senate had no authority to approve it and even the Syndicate also had not. In fact, it had to be approved by the Vice-Chancellor and he did not know as to why this item had been brought to the Syndicate. All the approvals to the appointments of teachers in the affiliated Colleges are granted by the Vice-Chancellor himself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had brought it to the Syndicate because earlier discussion on it was held in the Syndicate.

**Concluding, the Vice-Chancellor said that he would seek affidavit from the concerned persons and he would try to verify whether the Ph.D. degrees of these persons are within the stipulation referred to in the letter of the UGC dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013. He would also verify whether the UGC letter of 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013 is valid one. Thereafter, he would take appropriate decision.**

## **Report of Enquiry Committee**

**44.** Considered the report of an Enquiry Committee in pursuant to a discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26.4.2014.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that item could not be discussed in the absence of copies of the statements made by various persons. Enquiry report did not have any annexures appended to it.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that this Enquiry Committee was appointed in pursuance of discussion held in a meeting of the Syndicate earlier. The discussion held in the said meeting had been supplied to them enabling them to know the background of the case. Now, he had received the report from the Enquiry Committee and was duty bound to place the same before the Syndicate. He did not wish to make any statement at this stage. He could provide all the annexures to the members in the sealed envelopes before the next

meeting of the Syndicate. One option could be forwarded the report of the Enquiry Committee in its entirety to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had not attended the meeting of the Enquiry Committee as he was afraid.

The Vice-Chancellor said that once Shri Ashok Goyal had said that typically the Syndicate had no right to discuss the Enquiry report and the same should be forwarded to the Senate.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this provision is only for the case/s where the appointing/punishing authority is the Senate. In the instant case, the Vice-Chancellor had appointed the Enquiry Committee on the basis of the discussion took place in one of the Syndicate meeting and now the Enquiry Committee had submitted its report, the same should be placed before the Syndicate. He further said that in the instant case the Senate is not the punishing authority.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal, i.e., Senate is not punishing authority in the instant case.

After some discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That, for the time being, the consideration of the item be deferred and the item be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting and all the relevant documents/annexures be supplied to the members in sealed envelopes.

**Issue regarding extension in the term of appointment of Professor A.K. Bhandari as DUI**

**45.** Considered if the term of appointment of Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction (DUI), be extended, for a period of one year w.e.f. 1.2.2015, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

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

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

2. Professor A.K. Bhandari, Department of Mathematics was appointed as Dean University Instruction for a period of one year w.e.f. 1.2.2014 vide Syndicate/ Senate decision dated 4/16.1.2014 (Para 6) and 25.5.2014 (Para XLVIII), respectively.

3. The date of retirement of Professor A.K. Bhandari (after completion the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years) is 31.5.2017.

**RESOLVED:** That the term of appointment of Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction (DUI), be extended for a period of one year w.e.f. 1.2.2015, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

### Award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
1.	Ms. Neha Singh H.No.2370, Top Floor Sector-38-C Chandigarh	Science/ Biotechnology	DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF NANOCARRIER BASED PHYTOCHEMICAL COMPOUNDS AS HEPATOPROTECTANTS
2.	Ms. Shuchi Sharma H.No. 1255, LIG Phase-X Mohali	Science/ Botany	EVALUATION OF EFFECTS OF SELENIUM APPLICATION ON SOME CEREAL CROPS
3.	Mr. Jitendriya Mishra At Rahani P.O. Birasal Badasuanlo Dhenkanal Odisha	Pharmaceutical Sciences	PHARMACOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS ON THE ADENOSINERGIC, DOPAMINERGIC AND AUTOPHAGIC MECHANISMS IN EXPERIMENTAL MODEL OF HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE
4.	Ms. Shally Loomba H.No. 3219, Sector 27-D Chandigarh	Science/ Physics	RICCATI GENERALIZED SOLITARY WAVE SOLUTIONS ON NONLINEAR EQUATIONS
5.	Ms. Pooja Soni H.No. 347, Phase – XI SAS Nagar, Mohali	Science/ Statistics	STATISTICAL INFERENCE USING QUANTILES
6.	Ms. Prachi Gupta 828/12, Gali – 4 Prof. Colony Kurukshetra	Science/ Biophysics	STUDIES ON CHEMOPREVENTIVE POTENTIAL OF LYCOPENE IN N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE INDUCED HEPATIC CARCINOGENESIS IN MICE
7.	Mr. Sapam Ranabir Singh Boy's Hostel-5/1/23 Panjab University	Science/ Anthropology	LOCATING TEXTS OF SOCIAL VULNERABILITY IN DISASTER PRONE SITES - AN EMERGING CHALLENGE IN CYCLONE AFFECTED PURI DISTRICT OF ORISSA: PERSPECTIVES FROM ANTHROPOLOGY
8.	Mr. Varun Rishi Kapoor H.No. 3679 St. Panditen Near Mehna Chowk Bathinda	Pharmaceutical Sciences	DEVELOPMENT OF NOVEL FORMULATIONS OF CLOFAZIMINE WITH ENHANCED BIOAVAILABILITY

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Candidate</b>	<b>Faculty/ Subject</b>	<b>Title of Thesis</b>
9.	Ms. Monika Bhalla H.No. 121, Balaji – 2 Lohgarh Road, Zirakpur District Mohali	Languages/ Hindi	RAVINDAR KALIA KE SAHITYA MEIN SAMAJIK YATHARTH KA SWAROOP
10.	Ms. Anshu Batra, H. No. 859, Sector-15 Sonapat, Haryana	Arts/ Mass Communication	PUBLIC DISSEMINATION OF SCIENCE: THE SCIENTIST AS COMMUNICATOR
11.	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Village Raheg P.O. Chalehi Tehsil Ghumarwin District Bilaspur (H.P.)	Design & Fine Arts/Music	SITAR VADAN KE GHARANO MEIN ALAP AUR JODALAP KI PRAKRIYA-EK VISHLESHNATMAK ADHYAYAN
12.	Ms. Sharanpreet Kaur D/o S. Harmaishpal Singh V.P.O. Rajowala Tehsil & District Faridkot	Arts/ Psychology	CONGNITION-EMOTION INTERFACE AS A FUNCTION OF TASK AND PERSON VARIABLES
13.	Ms. Kamalpreet Kaur House No.157/1 Achme Heights Kharar, Mohali	Languages/ Punjabi	PUNJABI SUFI KAAV VICH HASHIAGAT MANUKH DI CHETNA (SHAH HUSSAIN, SULTAN BAHU, BULLEH SHAH, FARD FAQUIR ATE WAZEED DE SANDARBH VICH)
14.	Mr. Saeed Jabbar Abbas Mohamed H.No. 154, Sector-15-A Chandigarh	Science/ Physics	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERIZATION OF CONDUCTIVE POLYMERS NANOCOMPOSITE THIN FILMS
15.	Ms. Kamaljeet Kaur H.No.2074, Phase VI Mohali	Languages/ Persian	TASIRAT-E-PANJAB VA PANJABIYAT DAR ASSAR-E-FARSI-E-GURU SAHEBAN VA AQYEB-E-MAZHAB-E- SIKHHA
16.	Mr. Tijender Kumar H.No.2562, D.M.C. Sector-38 (w) Chandigarh	Design & Fine Arts/Music	SANGEET NIRDESHAK SHRI A.R. RAHMAN SAHEB KE SANGEET NIRDESHAN KA SAIDHANTIK VIVECHAN
17.	Ms. Dimple Yadav Department of Gandhian & Peace Studies P.U., Chandigarh	Arts/Gandhian Studies	ETHICS IN BUSINESS: A STUDY IN GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE
18.	Ms. Priyanka 35, Ajanta Avenue Maqbool Road Amritsar	Arts/Mass Communication	COMMUNICATION PATTERNS OF VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS: A SURVEY BASED STUDY IN PUNJAB
19.	Ms. Poonam Jyoti Sharma H.No. 123 Harmilap Nagar P.O. Kuldeep Nagar Near DRM Office Ambala Cantt.	Arts/Public Administration	JOB SATISFACTION AMONG NURSES: A CASE STUDY OF SIR SUNDERLAL HOSPITAL, BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY, VARANASI
20.	Ms. Kanchan Sharma D/o Rakesh Kumar V.P.O. Dhalwari Via Chintpurni District Una (H.P.)	Science/ Physics	OPTICAL AND ELECTRICAL PROPERTIES OF AMORPHOUS AND NANOCRYSTALLINE SEMICONDUCTORS

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
21.	Ms. Manpreet Kaur Soodan 5411/3, Modern Housing Complex, Manimajra Chandigarh	Languages/ English	THE POLITICS OF MEMORY IN GABRIEL GARCIA MARQUEZ'S THE AUTUMN OF THE PATRIARCH, SALMAN RUSHDIE'S SHALIMAR THE CLOWN AND MILAN KUNDERA'S THE BOOK OF LAUGHTER AND FORGETTING

### Appointment of System Managers at Computer Centre and UIET

**47.** Considered minutes dated 15.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of System Manager-02 (Computer Centre-01 & U.I.E.T.-01) vide Advt. No.1/2013, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP RS.7600, plus allowances as admissible under Panjab University Rules.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons, in order of merit, be appointed System Managers at Computer Centre-01 and University Institute of Engineering & Technology-01, on one year's probation in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP Rs.7600/- plus allowances admissible under University rules, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University:

1. Ms. Mamta
2. Ms. Monika Rani.

The pay of in-service persons be protected as per Panjab University rules.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the following persons, in order of merit, be placed on the Waiting List:

1. Mr. Lal Bahadur
2. Mr. Ashok Kumar.

**NOTE:** It had been certified that the selected and waitlisted candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the posts.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the letter of appointment, be issued to the selected candidates, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

### Issue regarding re-employment of Professor Jagjit Singh (Retd.)

**48.** Considered the request of Professor Jagjit Singh (Retd.) dated 12.1.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVII**), for re-employment up to the age of 65 years at School of Punjabi Studies.

- NOTE:**
1. The Academic and Administrative Committee dated 13.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) in their joint meeting had strongly recommended the case of re-employment of Professor Jagjit Singh (Retd.) up to 65 years.
  2. Rule 4.2 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“A teacher who does not opt for re-employment under these rules may

be asked to continue till the end of the academic session in which he/she attains the age of superannuation i.e. given re-employment up to the end of the academic session. Such a teacher be allowed to retain the University accommodation and charged normal rent till the last date of re-employment plus 2 months to follow there from.”

**RESOLVED:** That, in pursuance of the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), Professor Jagjit Singh (Retd.), School of Punjabi Studies, be re-employed on contract basis w.e.f. the date he reports for duty up to the age of 65 years, i.e., 07.10.2016, the date of completion of 65 years of age, 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.

**Format of advertisement for filling up of posts of Assistant Professors in the aided affiliated Colleges**

**49.** Considered the following format of advertisement for filling up 1925 posts of Assistant Professors on contractual basis for initial period of three years, under 95% grant-in-aid scheme of Punjab Govt.:

“Name of College: \_\_\_\_\_

Application on the prescribed proforma available with the College, are invited for the posts of Assistant Professor **on contract basis for initial period of three years under 95% grant-in-aid scheme of Pb. Govt.** in the subjects of \_\_\_\_\_. Eligible candidates in accordance with the Qualifications/ conditions laid down by the UGC/Punjab Govt./ Panjab University may send their application to the College within 21 days from the date of publication of the advertisement through Registered Post or in person and a copy of the application be also sent to the Dean, College Development Council, Panjab University, Chandigarh. Reservation for S.C./S.T. candidates and person with disabilities will be followed as per the rules of P.U./Pb. Govt./Govt. of India as the case may be. Appointment will be made strictly as **per Pb. Govt. notification No.11/148/2013-3 Edu-1/248623/1 dated 20.06.2014 (Honorable Pb. & Haryana High Court CWP 10650 of 2013)**”.

President/Secretary/Principal

- NOTE:**
1. The issue of filling up 1925 posts of Assistant Professors in the aided Colleges was discussed in the CDC meeting dated 17.1.2015, wherein the above format of advertisement was approved.
  2. Notification No.P.A.N.11/148/ 13-3D.1/328576/5 dated 20.10.2014 issued by Department of Higher Education, Punjab Government enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVIII)**.

**RESOLVED:** That the appended notification of Punjab Government with agenda item along with the following format of advertisement for filling up 1925 posts of Assistant Professors on contractual basis for initial period of three years, under 95% grant-in-aid scheme of Punjab Government, be approved:

“Name of College:\_\_\_\_\_

Application on the prescribed *pro forma* available with the College, are invited for the posts of Assistant Professor **on contract basis for initial period of three years under 95% grant-in-aid scheme of Punjab Government** in the subjects of \_\_\_\_\_. Eligible candidates in accordance with the Qualifications/ conditions laid down by the UGC/Punjab Government/ Panjab University may send their application to the College within 21 days from the date of publication of the advertisement through Registered Post or in person and a copy of the application be also sent to the Dean, College Development Council, Panjab University, Chandigarh. Reservation for S.C./S.T. candidates and person with disabilities will be followed as per the rules of Panjab University/Punjab Government/Government of India as the case may be. Appointment will be made strictly as **per Punjab Government Notification No.11/148/2013-3 Edu-1/248623/1 dated 20.06.2014 (Honorable Punjab & Haryana High Court CWP 10650 of 2013)**”.

President/Secretary/Principal

**Increase in number of seats of M.Ed. (General), M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Education Technology) in view of Government of India notification dated 1.12.2014**

**50.** Item 50 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**50.** To –

- (i) Increase the number of seats as mentioned against each for M.Ed. two year programme running in the Department of Education from the session 2015-2016:

Sr. No.	Name of the Course	No. of seats allocated	No. of seats proposed as per Gazette for the session 2015-16
1.	M.Ed. (General)	35	50
2.	M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling)	35	50
3.	M.Ed. (Educational Technology)	35	50

- (ii) consider the following eligibility condition for seeking admission to the M.Ed. Programme is as under:

#### **4.2 Eligibility**

- (a) Candidates seeking admission to the M.Ed. programme should have obtained at least 50% marks or an equivalent grade in the following programmes:
- (i) B.Ed.
  - (ii) B.A. B.Ed., B.Sc. B.Ed.
  - (iii) B.El.Ed.
  - (iv) D.El.Ed with an undergraduate degree (with 50% marks in each)

- (b) Reservation and relaxation for SC/ST/OBC/PWD and other applicable categories shall be as per the rules.

**NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 20.01.2015 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has adopted the Gazette notification of Govt. of India dated 1.12.2014/AGRAHAYANA NO. 10, 1936, which are in supersession of the NCTE (Recognition Resources procedure) Regulations 2009 to implement the new Regulations w.r.t. recognition of the courses provisioned under this Act-B.Ed., M.Ed., B.P.Ed., D.P.Ed., and M.P. Ed. w.e.f. the session 2015-16, in toto. The Dean, Faculty of Education and Chairpersons/Coordinators of the respective Department be urged to take immediate steps with regard to the changes/modifications, if any in the existing Regulations.

A circular vide No.1314-20/GM dated 22.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) in this regard has been issued by the A.R.G. to the concerned quarters.

2. The minutes of Board of Control/Administrative and Academic joint Committee dated 14.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) has recommended the same and also requested to be incorporated in the Hand Book of Information 2015.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the number of seats for M.Ed. two year programmes offered in the Department of Education, be increased as mentioned against each, from the session 2015-2016:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Course</b>	<b>No. of seats allocated</b>	<b>No. of seats proposed as per Gazette for the session 2015-16</b>
1.	M.Ed. (General)	35	50
2.	M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling)	35	50
3.	M.Ed. (Educational Technology)	35	50

- (ii) since the matter related to change in eligibility condition, which could be recommended by the Board of Studies, Faculty concerned and Academic Council, the matter be referred to the Board of Studies for consideration in the first instance.

**Restoration of original 60 seats for M.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Semester w.e.f. 2015-16 in the Department of Political Science**

**51.** Considered the request of the Chairperson, Department of Political Science dated 26.12.2014 (**Appendix-XL**) that to restore the original number of 60 seats for admission to M.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Semester w.e.f. the session 2015-16 and to be got printed in the prospectus and Handbook of Information.

**NOTE:** The Board of Control meeting dated 19.5.2014 & 26.12.2014 has unanimously decided that the admission to M.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Semester in Political Science, the original number of 60 seats be restored, that eight additional seats were created to accommodate the OBC students when Panjab University was expected to meet the guidelines for Central University. These additional seats became in fructuous when Panjab University was not given the Central University status.

**RESOLVED:** That, w.e.f. the session 2015-16, original 60 seats for admission to M.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Semester in the Department of Political Science, be restored and the same be got printed in the prospectus and Handbook of Information of 2015.

**Routine and formal matters**

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

- (i) In terms of letter No. 1-2/2009 (EC/PS) Pt. VIII dated 07.12.2012 received from the UGC regarding extension in date for participation in Orientation /Refresher Course up to 31.12.2013, adopted by the University vide Senate decision dated 24.03.2013 (Para V), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has approved that the following Assistant Professors, be treated as promoted from Stage-1 to Stage-2, w.e.f. the actual date of his/her eligibility, as mentioned against each, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.7000/-, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme, as per UGC Regulation 2010, at a starting pay to be fixed under the Rules of the Panjab University. The post would

be personal to the incumbents and he/she would perform the duties as assigned to him/her:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the teacher</b>	<b>Department/ Institute</b>	<b>Date of promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2 i.e. original date of their eligibility</b>
1.	Dr. Dipti Sareen	Biochemistry	<b>14.11.2009</b> instead of 23.03.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 22.03.2010 vide order No. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011
2.	Dr. Kashmir Singh	Biotechnology	<b>01.07.2009</b> instead of 11.03.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Orientation Course, i.e. 10.03.2011 vide office order No.13092-95/Estt.-I, dated 11.10.2011

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XLI)**.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has allowed to remove the difference of Rs.4 (24930-24926=4) to be paid to Dr. Rupinder Bir Kaur, Assistant Professor, University Business School, as basic pay of Rs.24930/- in view of her LPC (revised) instead of Rs.24926/- already fixed vide Endst. No.603-604/Estt.I dated 17.01.2013 **(Appendix-XLII)**.
- (iii) In partial modification to letter issued vide No.EST/14/9343/Estt.-I dated 26.09.2014 **(Appendix-XLIII)**, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/ Senate, has allowed to re-fix the pay of Dr.(Ms.) Simrit Kahlon, Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, at basic pay of Rs.27070/- + AGP of Rs.8000/- in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.8000/- w.e.f. the date of her joining i.e. 22.03. 2013, with next date of increment i.e. 01.07.2013.
- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has fixed the pay of Dr. Vishwa Bandhu Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, at Rs.22010/- + G.P. of Rs.6000/- in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + G.P. of Rs.6000/-, after adding one increment, w.e.f. the date of his joining as Assistant Professor i.e. 19.03.2013 with next date of increment as usual.
- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the DCDC to use the following facilities to manage the affairs of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan:
1. To open an account with the State Bank of India, Panjab University, Chandigarh in the

name of Dean, College Development Council, RGCB (Account No. 34377238477).

2. To meet day to day/emergent expenses, an imprest money of Rs.15000/- out of the budget Head "CDC Revolving Fund" Sub Head 'Furnishing of College Bhawan Building' as an permanent advance in the name of Dean, College Development Council, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**(vi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Puneet Raina, Assistant Professor (temporary), Department of Zoology, w.e.f. 25.11.2014 with the condition that he has to deposit the one month salary in lieu of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**NOTE:** Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009, reads as under:

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

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Programmers for further period of 89 days after giving them one day break as noted against each or till the posts of Foremen (against which they are appointed) are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions:

Sr. No.	Name of Employee/ Department	Designation	Term Up to	Date of break	Period of further extension
1	Ms. Cheshta Arora Computer Unit	Programmer	9.12.2014	10.12.2014	11.12.2014 to 09.03.2015
2	Ms. Charleen Kaur Computer Unit	Programmer	30.11.2014	01.12.2014	2.12.2014 to 26.2.2015
3	Mr. Neeraj Rohila, Computer Unit	Programmer	14.12.2014	15.12.2014	16.12.2014 to 12.03.2015

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Mrs. Shruti Sahdev, Medical Officer (Homoeopathic), S.S.G. P.U.R.C., Bajwara (Hoshiarpur) for further period of three months i.e. w.e.f. 29.11.2014 to 25.2.2015 with one day break on 28.11.2014, on the previous terms and conditions.

**(ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the panel of Legal

Retainer/Advocates to be engaged for University Court cases for the period from 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014.

**NOTE:** Panel of Legal Retainer/Advocates for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014 enclosed (**Appendix-XLIV**).

**(x)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Dr. Surinder Singh, Professor, Department of History, P.U., who is retiring voluntarily from the Panjab University services w.e.f. 31.12.2014:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183, 186 respectively of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, weightage of upto five years be given as an addition to the qualifying service actually rendered by him for calculating gratuity in view of Regulation 17.8 at page 133 P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009. In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days, Earned Leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

**(xi)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council/ Syndicate/ Senate, has approved the following recommendations dated 16.12.2014 (Item 8) (**Appendix-XLV**) of Faculty of Business Management & Commerce, that:

- (a) Master of Business Administration for Executives (MBAfEX) programme, be restructured/restarted w.e.f. the session 2015-16.
- (b) Name of the programme will be "Master of Business Administration for Executives".
- (c) The Programme will be spread over a period of two years comprising of four semesters.
- (d) Tuition fee of each semester: Rs.40,000/-.
- (e) Number of seats: 30
- (f) The classes of the Programme will be held from Monday to Saturday. The timings of the classes will be 6.15 p.m. to 9.15 p.m.

- (g) Each full subject will be devoted 3 hours class room teaching and seminar courses will be devoted 1.5 hours of class room interaction.
- (h) The admission will be made on the basis of the Entrance Test (85% weightage) to be conducted by Panjab University, Group Discussion (7.5% weightage) and Personal Interview (7.5% weightage).
- (i) Regulations/Rules as per **(Appendix-XLV)** for the course i.e. MBA for Executives (MBAfEX), w.e.f. the academic session 2015-2016.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 05.03.2013 (Para 24) **(Appendix-XLV)** has resolved that with effect from the session 2013-2014, the admissions to MBA (Executive) course, be suspended.

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

**(xii)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Faculty of Languages dated 16.12.2014 (Item 14) **(Appendix-XLVI)** that the students who have passed their graduation in any stream from Panjab University or any other Indian University, be allowed to appear in Hindi, English and Sanskrit (Elective) as an additional subject:

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Committee dated 05.08.2014 to consider the request of President, PUCSC are enclosed **(Appendix-XLVI)**.

2. The Senate at its meeting held on 29.03.2008 (Para XVII) has approved that a student who has passed his/her graduation from Panjab University or any other Indian University can appear/clear subject of Punjabi (Elective) as an additional subject.

3. The above provision is required to be made a part of Regulations concerned in P.U. Calendar, Vol.-II.

**(xiii)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 18.07.2014 **(Appendix-XLVII)** and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the pay of Dr. Jasleen Kewlani, former Assistant Professor in Sociology, P.U. Regional Centre, (P.U. Extn. Library), Ludhiana, be protected as under as on 30.11.2011 (A.N.) i.e. date of her joining in the Panjab University, on the basis of

the last pay certificate (No. 1197/RGNUL/Estt.-I Dated 24.05.2012) (**Appendix-XLVII**) as a special case on notional basis not to be quoted as precedent:

Basic Pay	Rs.15,600
Increments for service @ Rs.600/- per academic session + 5 Non-compounded advance Increments on account of acquiring Ph.D. degree before joining in P.U. (already issued vide orders No. 3476-82/Estt.-1 dated 24.04.2014)	Rs.2,400/-
Grade Pay	Rs.6,000/-
D.A. @ 58%	Rs.13,920/-

**NOTE:** 1. The pay of Dr. Jasleen Kewlani, former Assistant Professor in Sociology, P.U. Regional Centre, (P.U. Extension Library), Ludhiana, has been protected vide Endst. No. 8856-57/Estt-I dated 11.09.2014 (**Appendix-XLVII**).

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

(xiv)

The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 20.01.2015 (**Appendix-XLVIII**), and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has adopted the Gazette notification of Govt. of India dated 1.12.2014/ AGRAHAYANA NO. 10, 1936 which are in supersession of the NCTE (Recognition Resources procedure) Regulations 2009 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) to implement the new Regulations w.r.t. recognition of the courses provisioned under this Act- B.Ed., M.Ed., B.P. Ed., D.P. Ed., and M.P. Ed. w.e.f. the session 2015-16, in toto.

**NOTE:** 1. The Committee dated 20.01.2015 has further resolved that the Dean, Faculty of Education and Chairpersons/ Coordinators of the respective Department be urged to urgently go through the Gazette notification of Government of India dated 1.12.2014/AGRAHAYANA/ No.10, 1936 and prepare modalities with regard to the suggestions/ modification/changes, if any, in the existing Regulations accordingly so that the same be got approved from the appropriate bodies of the University and to be implemented from the session 2015-16.

2. A circular vide No. 1314-20/GM dated 22.01.2015 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) has been issued

by the A.R.G. to the concerned quarters.

3. A circular vide No. Misc.57455-57655 dated 2.01.2015 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) has been issued by the D.R. (Colleges) to all the Principals of the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-(vi)**, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Dr. Puneet Raina, who was Assistant Professor in the Department of Zoology, P.U., on temporary basis, has joined D.A.V. College on regular basis. He suggested that his resignation should be accepted and the condition that he has to deposit the one month's salary in lieu of one month notice period, should be waived off.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no problem in waiving off the condition of deposition of one month's salary in lieu of notice period.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-(xiii)**, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since it had been found (Item C-3) at the pre-Screening Committee level that Dr. Jasleen Kewlani had done plagiarism and her work is not original, they should not protect her pay, that too, by going out of the way. In fact, she is not covered for protection of pay as she was appointed on fixed salary. Since the Panjab University had also appointed several persons on fixed salary, numerous representations would pour in protection of pay on similar ground.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Jasleen Kewlani was appointed on fixed pay under special circumstances.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in their University several cases regarding protection of pay, including the case of Dr. Ajay Ranga, is pending and at the same time they are protecting the pay of Dr. Kewlani by outing out of the way and it is also being mentioned that it is 'not to be quoted as precedent'. In this way, discrimination is being meted out to their teachers. He pleaded that even if the pay of Dr. Kewlani is to be protected, the wording 'not to be quoted as precedent' should be deleted. He suggested that consideration of the item should be deferred and all the pending cases along with this case should be brought to the Syndicate in its next meeting.

It was clarified that there is a specific decision of the Syndicate that the pay of only those teachers be protected, whose previous was either Government or College/s affiliated to Panjab University and Dr. Ajay Ranga's case did not fall in this decision.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that another Committee had been formed to look into the issue, but the Syndicate decision could only be modified by the Syndicate itself.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that, in fact, Dr. Jasleen Kewlani was appointed on regular basis, but the Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court had said that all the persons appointed along with Dr. Kewlani be appointed on fixed salary. Thereafter, the Chief Justice himself took a decision to grant regular grades all such persons. Though all the persons, who were selected/ appointed along

with her, got regular grades, she could not as she had joined the service of Panjab University.

Referring to the clarification made regarding the decision of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor said that the point is well taken that the Syndicate decision could only be modified by the Syndicate itself. Therefore, they had to get a proposal for which the matter had been referred to a Committee. He thought that they should not seem to be protecting the pay of somebody in an affiliated College of Panjab University or Punjabi University or Guru Nanak Dev University. So long as they are part of Punjab, they have to deal all the Universities equally even though the others might not be doing it because they are paying full salary to the teachers working in Panjab University Constituent Colleges, even though the Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are not doing it. Professor Bhandari has rightly said that the recommendations of the Committee should be brought to the Syndicate as early as possible. In the meanwhile, they should find out/identify all those cases, wherein the persons could be given such a benefit. Though they had not given any benefit to Dr. Kewlani, they should not shy for giving benefit/s to their own people.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that after protecting the pay of Dr. Kewlani, they have to issue her the last pay drawn Certificate.

It was clarified that last pay drawn Certificate had already been issued to her stating that her pay had been fixed notionally.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the recommendations of the Committee, to which Professor A.K. Bhandari had referred to, should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting (February 2015), if possible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had no problem in bringing the recommendations of the Committee to Syndicate, provided the Committee make its recommendations well in time, i.e., before the issuance of agenda of the next Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the information contained in **Item 52 – R-(i) to R-(v) and R-(vii) to R-(xiv)** on the agenda, be ratified; and
- (2) the information contained in Item **52-R-(vi)** be ratified, with the modification that the condition that of deposition of one month's salary in lieu of one month notice period, be waived off.

Mr. Ashok Goyal enquired about the date of the next meeting and after some discussion, the Vice-Chancellor proposed to hold the meeting on February 28, 2015, notwithstanding the observation of few members that Union Budget would be presented on that day.

## **Routine and formal matters**

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

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, has protected the pay of Dr. Harminder Singh Bains, Director Professor, P.U. S.S. Giri

Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, at Rs.47920/- + AGP Rs.10,000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining in the Panjab University i.e. 23.01.2014 (in the pay scale of Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs.10000), as per LPC issued by his previous employer i.e. Punjab Technical University, Jalandhar, with next date of increment of 01.07.2014.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate dated 04.08.2012 (Para 6) and Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para IX) has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to approve the cases of protection of pay/fixation of pay, in future, on behalf of the Syndicate.

2. RAO opined that the PTU is not a Govt. owned institution. It is advised that the P.U. should get decided from the competent authority i.e. Senate regarding which institutions/ University organizations shall cover under pay protection rules in view of Punjab Govt. letter dated 15.11.2000. It is pointed out that the P.U. has adopted the Punjab Govt. letter dated 15.11.2000 in toto which provide for protection of pay in respect of Punjab Govt. employees.

3. As per Regulation 4.1 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Senate is the competent authority for the fixation of salary, accelerated increment, grant of allowance, etc., in the case of employees holding permanent posts.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor has approved the recommendations of the Selection Committee dated 27.12.2014 (**Appendix-XLIX**) regarding appointment of the following persons as Part-Time Assistant Professor in Law, Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh for the academic session 2014-2015 w.e.f. the date they start/started work, on the same terms and conditions as applicable in all such other appointment of Assistant Professors, already working in the department:

1. Gurpreet Singh
2. Neetu Gupta
3. Lakhwinder Singh

**Waiting List**

1. Priyanka Bedi
2. Seema Gupta
3. Harpreet Kaur

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, has allowed to fix the pay of Dr. Ramesh Kataria, Assistant Professor (Reserved for PH Locomotor Disability), Department of Chemistry, P.U., at Rs.21150/- in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.6000/- w.e.f. 13.06.2013 (A.N.) i.e. the date of his joining in

the Department of Chemistry, with next date of increment i.e. 01.07.2013.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 26/05/2007 (Para No.15) has resolved that the rules regarding protection/ fixation of pay of non-teaching employees of Class (A&B) already approved by the Syndicate dated 29.09.2004 (Para No.16) be implemented in the case of both teaching and non-teaching employees of the University with the modification as under:

<b>Existing Rule as per Syndicate dated 29.9.2004</b>	<b>Modified Rule as per Syndicate decision dated 26.05.2007</b>
1. Circular letter No.6/75-95-IFPH/10993 dated 15.11.2000, issued by the Punjab Government, Department of Finance in regard to protection/ fixation of pay of Government employees appointed by transfer or open selection etc. from one service to another be adopted; and	No Change
2. In the case of persons who join Panjab University from private organizations/private concern/private educational institutions, the pay drawn by them in their previous employment be not protected. However, if the Selection Committee and the Syndicate recommended protection of pay in a case, same be allowed.	In the case of persons who join Panjab University from private organization/private concern/private educational institution, the pay drawn by them in their previous employment be not protected. However, the Selection Committee, keeping in view various issues like experience, higher qualification, research work, existing status and salary structure of the department concerned, should make specific recommendations with regard to the protection/ fixation of pay of the candidate.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 24.08.2013 has resolved that the following additions be made in the Syndicate decision dated 26.05.2007 (Para 15) regarding rules for protection/fixation of pay of class (A&B) employees of the University.

“That the persons who join the Panjab University from

either Govt. or Govt. aided Colleges affiliated to any of the Universities or from an affiliated College of Panjab University and are drawing UGC pay scales, their pay be also protected in order to avoid audit objections”.

3. Dr. Ramesh Kataria, prior to join in the Panjab University, was working as Assistant Professor in Department of Chemistry at Bhaskaracharya College of applied sciences, University of Delhi.

As per LPC issued by the Principal of the Bhaskaracharya College of applied sciences. Dr. Ramesh Kataria was drawing basic of Rs.21150/- in the Pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.6000/- (**Appendix-L**). The Principal vide letter dated 13.06.2014 has also written that the said College is a constituent College and 100% funded/aided by the Govt. of National capital Territory Delhi (**Appendix-L**).

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor, after considering the request of the President/Chairman, Governing Body, Satyam Cultural Social Educational Society, Village Sayadwala, Tehsil-Abohar, District Fazilka (Pb.), has passed the following orders that:

1. since the College has admitted 24 students in B.Com-I without getting prior affiliation from this University, the admission of the admitted students could not be approved.
2. taking sympathetic consideration of the admitted 24 student's academic career, it is advised to transfer the 24 students admitted in B.Com. 1<sup>st</sup> year along with the admission fees and other charges, if any, to Maharaja Ranjit Singh College, Malout, Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab).

President/Chairman, Governing Body, Satyam Cultural Social Educational Society has further been advised to do the needful in the matter and report the compliance to the University immediately.

**(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.	Ms. Sukhjot Kaur Sandhu Senior Assistant Examination Branch-II	01.01.1985	31.01.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations
2.	Shri Badri Parshad Head Mali Construction Office	20.09.1973	31.01.2015	

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

(vi) The Vice- Chancellor has sanctioned terminal benefits to the members of the family of the following employee who passed away while in service:

Name of the deceased employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of death (while in service)	Name of the family member/s to whom the terminal benefits are to be given	Benefits
Late Shri Karnail Singh Beldar Construction Office	16.01.1986	21.11.2013	Mrs. Shinder Kaur (wife)	Gratuity and ex-gratia grant admissible under the University Regulation and Rule.

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

(1) It was pointed out that one more item, which is very important, is needed to be considered and approved because Inspection Committees to 4-5 Colleges of Education are to be sent.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this item would not be considered by them. He further stated that he was sorry to point out that the decision, which was taken in the last meeting of the Syndicate, wherein it was resolved, in the presence of the Dean, College Development Council, that without waiting for the relevant paragraph of the Syndicate meeting, the Dean, College Development Council, would prepare the case and get the same approved from the Vice-Chancellor, but till date nothing, had been done in this regard.

The other members were of the view that since it is an urgent matter, it should be approved.

It was clarified that the NCTE Regulations 2014 had already been approved. Now, the Inspection Committees would visit three-four Colleges of Education and the *pro forma* had to be devised for them.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired in which meeting of the Syndicate/Senate the NCTE Regulations 2014 were approved. He stated that they did not know what these are. When it was said that it was in pursuance of NCTE Regulations 2014, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the NCTE Regulations were earlier also and now too. Similarly, qualifications for the post of Assistant Professors were laid down earlier also and now too. Though earlier nowhere it was mentioned in the NCTE Regulations, that to be eligible, the candidate must have qualified UGC-NET, the University had laid down that the candidate must be Ph.D. as had been laid down by the U.G.C. Now, the people of education are saying that keeping in view the NCTE Regulations 2014, UGC-NET is not required in their case.

It was clarified that the NCTE in its earlier Regulations had written that the University could put any other condition.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University could impose any condition even otherwise.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that UGC-NET condition should not be removed.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that, earlier, even though persons with 10 years' experience were not found for the post of Principal and the condition was imposed that to be eligible for the post of Principal, the person must have 15 years' experience. However, the Principal would retire on attaining the age of 70 years.

It was said that the Inspection *Pro forma* is to be prepared/devised keeping in view the new NCTE Regulations 2014. It was suggested that a Committee comprising 2-3 members of the Syndicate should be constituted for the purpose and the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to take decision on the recommendation/s of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since it would have far reaching consequences and people might raise questions later on, while constituting the Committee it should be ensured that the revised NCTE Regulations 2014 are taken into consideration keeping in view the standard of the University and the Colleges are not able to exploit. It needed to be examined whether the revised NCTE Regulations 2014 are to be adopted as such and whether there would UGC-NET condition for becoming eligible for the post of Assistant Professor.

It was clarified that for M.Ed. D.P.Ed. M.P.Ed., etc., the NCTE had said that the affiliating University could impose any

other condition, but for B.Ed., the NCTE is silent. As such, the University could not impose any condition for B.Ed.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Committee, as proposed above, should be constituted and the UGC Regulations relating to minimum qualifications for appointment of teachers in the Colleges of Education, which were prevalent earlier and proposed now, both be studied by the Committee and recommendations made because so far as he remembered, even in the old NCTE Regulations, UGC-NET was not prescribed.

It was said that, earlier, it was written in the NCTE Regulations that the affiliated University could impose any other condition.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could go beyond the minimum conditions imposed by the regulatory body, but could not go below the minimum.

Professor A.K. Bhandari observed that the regulatory body had prescribed the minimum, but the University could always prescribe above the minimum.

It was informed that the University had received a letter from UGC stating that since they did not have some courses of NCTE, the Regulations of the NCTE would prevail. The said letter would be placed before the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee comprising 2-3 Syndics, be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the old as well as new NCTE Regulations 2014 and make recommendations. The Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate

- (2) Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that there is a dispute of 2-3 marlas in the land acquired by the University from Government College, Muktsar and presently the relevant file is in the Revenue Department, Jalandhar. He urged that the said file should be pursued.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Dinesh Kumar should give him a note in this regard.

- (3) Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that though there is already a decision of the Syndicate, the University is still entertaining the anonymous complaints. He suggested that, in future, no anonymous complaint should be entertained.

G.S. Chadha  
**Registrar**

Confirmed

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