

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 31st May 2015 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice-Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
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.) Registrar ... (Secretary)

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the honourable members that –

- (1) Government of Punjab at its cabinet meeting held recently has granted permission to give 5 acres land to the Panjab University for its Regional Centre at Sri Muktsar Sahib;
- (2) World renowned Science Journal 'Nature', published by Macmillan Publishers Ltd., London, has given top rank to Panjab University amongst the leading science institutions of India in its special issue on 'Science in India' dated May 14, 2015. This judgement is based on citation rates in Elsevier Scopus database for institutes that had produced more than 2000 papers between 2010 and 2014;
- (3) P.U. Alumna (Indian Theatre and Punjabi Department) Ms. Baljinder Kaur has won the National Award of Best Supporting Actress. President of India honoured her on May 3, 2015;
- (4) Professor Ajay K. Sood of Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore who graduated from Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh in 1972, has been elected as a fellow of the Royal Society (FGRS), London,

in 2015. Professor Sood is the first alumnus of Panjab University to receive this honour after Professor Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar. Dr. Bhatnagar had the distinction of being the first Chemist from India to receive this honour in 1943. Professor Sood was given Vigyan Rattan Award (2010) by Panjab University and Padma Shri by the Government of India in 2013;

- (5) Professor Gurmail Singh has been appointed as Vice-Chancellor of the Akal University, Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Punjab, by the Governing Body of the Kalgidhar Society, V.P.O. Baru Sahib, District Sirmour, HP.
- (6) Professor S.K. Mehta, Department of Chemistry, has received Haryana Vigyan Ratna Award which includes cash award Rs.2 lacs, a citation and a trophy, on May 22, 2015, for his scientific contributions in the field of Surfactant Chemistry and Nano-Chemistry. The award was given by the Chief Minister of Haryana.
- (7) Professor Upinder Sawhney of the Department of Economics has been awarded the prestigious DAAD Scientists Exchange Service. Under this programme, Professor Sawhney will carry out research work for 4-8 weeks in a leading German University.
- (8) Dr. Gaurav Gaur of Centre for Social Work along with his team has been honoured by Mrs. Poonam Sharma, Mayor, Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, with an appreciation certificate for running an Education Forever Project'. She appreciated the efforts made by the whole team of the centre for Social Work for making it possible to bring 64 slum children to school under this project.
- (9) Shri Pranav Jha, Senior Consultant, Media Lab Asia, under Department of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, New Delhi, has informed by email that the approval for execution of the project under "Visvesvaraya Ph.D. scheme for Electronics and IT" in 2015-16, has been granted to University Institute of Engineering & Technology. Under this project support of 5 full-time Ph.D. candidates at University Institute of Engineering & Technology will be given.
- (10) The University Grants Commission vide its letter received on 29.04.2015, has approved the upgradation of Department of Zoology from CAS -I to CAS-II Programme for a further period of 5 year from 01.04.2015 to 31.03.2020. The Department will receive Rs.161.55 lacs plus salary of two Project Fellows.
- (11) The University Grants Commission vide its letter received on 06.05.2015, has approved the upgradation of Department of Biochemistry from DRS-I to DRS-II Programme for a further period of 5 years from

01.04.2015 to 31.03.2020. The Department will receive Rs.125.00 lacs plus salary of two Project Fellows.

- (12) Patent Facilitating Centre (PFC) of Technology Information Forecasting and Assessment Council (TIFAC) has granted patent certificate for Indian Patent No.265132 on 09.02.2015 to the Inventor, Dr. Shishu, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, with the title 'Sustained Release Pharmaceutical Compositions Containing Curcumin and Beta-Cyclodextrin'.
- (13) The patent application entitled 'Formulation of Transition Metal Based Cationic Metalosomes' of Dr. Gurpreet Kaur, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, has been approved by Technology Information Forecasting & Assessment Council (TIFAC), DST, for filing a Patent in India.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is a good news that Panjab University has ultimately been allotted 5 acres of land for P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar, but he would like to request the University authorities to expedite the preparation of building plan and start at least construction of boundary wall.

The Vice-Chancellor said that money has already been allocated and they would not only do the construction in a phased manner, but would see that the academic activity also gets. The Registrar along with XEN would prepare the plan so that they could start the activities with pre-fabricated structure. The University is also pursuing the matter with the Punjab Government, for the released the promised amount, however the said amount would not be sufficient as they require a much larger amount for the construction. As such, they would also set aside some amount for construction purpose from their own sources and proceed with the initiation of the construction activity. The Hon'ble Chief Minister, Punjab, had told him (Vice-Chancellor) that he would be very happy to lay the foundation stone of the building for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, but before that the University must have a concrete plan to proceed with the project. Professor Naval Kishore has taken the responsibility that he would get the plan ready with the help of Registrar and the XEN.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath enquired has the land been allotted or transferred to the University by the Punjab Government? There is a lot of difference between allotted and transferred. Shri Ashok Goyal knows it that when earlier the Regional Centre was established at Sri Muktsar Sahib at the instance of the Punjab Government, the Punjab Government had assured that they will bear all the expenses to be incurred on it. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to dig out the said letter written by the Chief Minister, Punjab, and go through the contents of the letter himself. Nevertheless they were given only Rs.50 lac by the Punjab Government and that too, from the 'Rural Development Fund'. The University raised objection that this amount sanctioned from Rural Development Fund is not a part of the Budget of the Government and as such, either the Government should undertake that they would bear all the expenditure for the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib or else University ought to reject the offer. Thereafter, the Punjab Government issued a letter allotting about 12

acres of land to the University for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. Professor Naval Kishore knows about all these developments. Now, it is for the third time that this land of about 5 acres has been given by the Punjab Government to the University for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to ensure that this land of 5 acres is transferred to the University so that they did not face any problem in future.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Punjab Government has asked them (the University) to put their case and had assured that they would consider the same sympathetically.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that at one point of time the Punjab Government had promised that they would give a sum of Rs.5 crores, though they did not deny, but they did not give the same even. He presumed that since the allotment of 5 acres of land has been approved by the Cabinet for onward transfer in the name of the University, the same would be done now and that was why, he has suggested that they should construct the boundary wall because Shri Chatrath might be remembering that at the time of establishment of Regional Centre at Sri Muktsar Sahib, several promises were made by the Punjab Government, including releasing of Rs.5 crore and meeting of all the expenditure on it, but those were never fulfilled. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath is right that the title of the land should be transferred in the name of Panjab University and he did not know whether the land in the case of P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, has been transferred in the name of Panjab University or not. Now, they had taken over the Rural Centre, Kauni, which at one point of time was a Constituent College of Punjab Agricultural University (PAU). When the same was not found to be successful, the Government made several experiments and ultimately, the same was given to Panjab University on the promise that the right of the same would be transferred in the name of Panjab University. That was why, they agreed to take over it. But he was sorry to point out that the right of that land/building has not been transferred in the name of Panjab University so far. He further suggested that they should start filling up the vacant positions of teachers of the Regional Centres, especially P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, so that the students do not suffer for want of teachers.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that wall between the Government College, Sri Muktsar Sahib, and the proposed site of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, should be constructed so that they become owner.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that there is not a single teacher in the subject of Law at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. Secondly, even the electricity bill for Kauni Centre is still coming in the name of PAU and that meant the right has not been transferred in the name of Panjab University so far.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Ms. Baljinder Kaur, a P.U. Alumna (Indian Theatre and Punjabi Department) for winning National Award of Best Supporting Actress;

- (ii) Professor Ajay K. Sood of Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru, who graduated from Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh in 1972, for having been elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society (FRS), London, in 2015;
 - (iii) Professor Gurmail Singh on his having been appointed as Vice-Chancellor of the Akal University, Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Punjab;
 - (iv) Professor S.K. Mehta, Department of Chemistry, for having received Haryana Vigyan Ratna Award comprising cash award Rs.2 lacs, a citation and a trophy;
 - (v) Professor Upinder Sawhney of the Department of Economics for having been awarded the prestigious DAAD Scientists Exchange Service; and
 - (vi) Dr. Gaurav Gaur, Centre for Social Work and his team on being honoured by Mrs. Poonam Sharma, Mayor, Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, with an appreciation certificate for running an Education Forever Project'.
- (2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. Nos. (1), (2), (9), (10), (11), (12) and (13) be noted and approved; and
 - (3) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology

2(i). Considered minutes dated 23.04.2015 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Urvashi Gupta be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **24.12.2014**, 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 she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 23.04.2015 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sushil Kumar Kansal be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **24.12.2014**, 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 Physics, P.U. Chandigarh

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 23.04.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sandeep Sahijpal be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **03.01.2015**, 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 Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, P.U. Chandigarh

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 23.04.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kuldeep Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **22.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, 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 (Commerce) (Stage-4) to Professor (Commerce) (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University School of Open Learning, P.U. Chandigarh

2(v). Considered minutes dated 23.04.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) 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. Geeta Mangla Bansal be promoted from Associate Professor (Commerce) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Commerce) (**Stage-5**) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University,

Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **06.05.2014**, 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 she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UBS, P.U. Chandigarh

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 23.04.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Monica Bedi be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, 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.

Appointment of Professor at Institute of Educational Technology & Vocational Education, P.U., Chandigarh

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 04.05.2015 of the Selection Committee for appointment of Professor-1 (General) at Institute of Educational Technology & Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh (Advt. No.4/2014).

RESOLVED: That, since none was found suitable for appointment as Professor at Institute of Educational Technology & Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, the post be re-advertised .

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Education) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Education) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University School of Opening Learning, P.U. Chandigarh

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 04.05.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Education) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Education) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Education) (**Stage-3**) at University School of Opening Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. the dates mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+ AGP Rs.8000/- 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 the duties as assigned to them:

1. Dr. Ram Mehar : 14.10.2014
2. Dr. Supreet Kaur : 07.09.2014
3. Dr. Manju Gera : 07.09.2014.

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

Appointment of Assistant Professors in Computer Science & Engineering at U.I.E.T., P.U. Chandigarh

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 12/13.05.2015 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professors in Computer Science & Engineering-3 (General) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh (Advt. No.1/2014).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that for future, a possibility should be explored that only the candidates, who have done M.E./M.Tech. along with GATE should be made eligible for the posts of Assistant Professors in Engineering subjects. There are certain Institutions/Universities, which admit only those students, who qualified the GATE, to M.E./M.Tech Programmes, whereas certain others admit without GATE. However, the Panjab University has decided that they would follow both systems, i.e., their own Entrance Test as well as GATE. As such, there are some apprehensions that there are so many Universities, which say that GATE is not compulsory. Even if the minimum qualification prescribed by the UGC for the post of the Assistant Professor is Masters degree with 55% marks, nobody stopped them for prescribing higher qualification. He, therefore, suggested that a possibility should be explored that, in future, only M.E./M.Tech. and GATE qualified candidates are eligible for the posts of Assistant Professors in Engineering subjects.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Goyal) meant to say that they should prescribe GATE qualification along with M.E./M.Tech. for the posts of Assistant Professors in Engineering subjects.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that Panjab University has been holding the Entrance Test for admissions to M.E. and M.Tech. courses and if they impose the condition of GATE qualification for the posts of Assistant Professors, there would be a problem.

The Vice-Chancellor added that they are giving 10 extra marks to the GATE qualified candidates.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that M.E./M.Tech. is essential qualification for the posts of the Assistant Professors in Engineering subjects. So far as GATE is concerned, they permitted GATE qualified candidates to enrol/register for Ph.D. and the candidates, who have not qualified GATE, they are asked to qualify the University Entrance Test for admission to Ph.D. Programme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that many faculty members are working in an *ad hoc* way as earlier they did not have GATE.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that, in promotions, they are not following AICTE, but the UGC. Secondly, the AICTE had given some freedom to the Universities to frame the rules at their own level. Since the persons working in University Institute of Engineering & Technology, etc. wanted promotions, they are publishing papers. So far as placement of the students is concerned, it is almost negligible and only the single company is coming for the placement and recruits about 100 students. He, therefore, suggested that a Committee should be formed to examine the whole issue.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that legally UGC-NET qualification could not be prescribed for the post of Assistant

Professors in Engineering subjects. However, for improvement and facilitating appointment of academically good persons, a Committee should be formed and there is nothing wrong in it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee would be constituted to examine and explore the possibility of prescribing GATE qualification along with M.E./M.Tech. for the posts of Assistant Professors in Engineering subjects.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Assistant Professors in Computer Science & Engineering-3 (General) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Ms. Ravreet Kaur
2. Ms. Preeti Aggarwal
3. Ms. Deepti Gupta.

The pay of Ms. Ravreet Kaur and Ms. Preeti Aggarwal, be fixed after granting them two advance increments.

The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize their 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.

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

1. Mr. Nitin Kumar
2. Ms. Tarunpreet Bhatia
3. Ms. Harneet Kaur.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Political Science) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Political Science) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib

2(x). Considered minutes dated 12.05.2015 (**Appendix-X**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Nisha Jain be promoted from Assistant Professor (Political Science) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Political Science) (**Stage-3**) at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **27.03.2010**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Economics) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Economics) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 12.05.2015 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vinod Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (Economics) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Economics) (**Stage-3**) at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **27.02.2011**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, 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 Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 13.05.2015 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Maninder Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **07.09.2011**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/-, 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.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letters of appointments/promotions to the persons appointed/promoted under Item **C-2(i) to C-2(xii)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Recommendations of the Johl Committee dated 15.05.2015

3. Considered minutes dated 15.05.2015 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate dated 08.03.2015 (Para 16), to look into all issues with regard to representations sent to the Hon'ble Chancellor, Panjab University, directly by the faculty members.

NOTE: The relevant documents along with office note were supplied to the members in closed cover.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Committee was constituted and the Committee has given a thought to it, which is in the form of an algorithm to solve the grievances in an expeditious manner so that they did not have dissatisfied staff, which would be good for the University.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that, as a member of the Syndicate, he welcomed the internal mechanism framed by the Committee which is in accordance with the Panjab University Calendar. However, he wanted to make 2-3 suggestions – (i) the Dean of University Instruction/ Registrar, as suggested by the Committee, should also solve the grievance of the employees concerned within a stipulated period, say 15 days; and (ii) President, PUTA in the case of teaching staff and President of the concerned Association in the case of non-teaching staff, should also be associated with the proposed Committee, which would definitely strengthen the internal mechanism.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that so far as solving of grievances at the level of Chairperson/Head of the Department is concerned, again no timeframe has been suggested. He suggested that 15 days time should be given to resolve the grievances at the level of Chairperson/Head of Department and 1 month at the level of DUI/Registrar. So that grievances do not go on lingering for indefinite period.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that, in fact, it is not the decision of the University to constitute Standing Committee to settle the grievances of the employees because he remembered that when he joined, Professor B.S. Brar was the Dean of University Instruction of the University. In the general house, a suggestion was given that there should be Grievance Committee and at that time also suggestions were given that first they should try to resolve the grievance/s at the department level and thereafter Registrar/DUI and Vice-Chancellor level. So far as the mechanism suggested by the Committee is concerned, it is, by and large, in accordance with the existing provision. If the mechanism is already there, what is the need for it? Secondly, as far as he recalled, there are many cases which are pending since long and if they did not settle them, they might face problems at a later stage. He pleaded that the recommendations of the Brar Committee should be implemented as nothing new is there in the recommendations of the Committee under consideration.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that so far as grievances of the employees are concerned, they already had statutory rules governing the Punjab Service and Conduct and Punishment & Appeal Rules, 1971. He suggested that under those rules, they could allow the aggrieved person to seek the assistance of a non-professional, if he/she wished to.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that irrespective of whether it is available in the existing mechanism or in the mechanism suggested by the Committee, their first and foremost concern should be that justice should be given to the aggrieved person as early as possible so that there is minimum victimization and the complainant might not feel embarrassed. He, therefore, suggested that the recommendations of the Committee should be approved along with the changes/suggestions made by the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this issue was discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 8th March 2015, wherein the majority of the members were in favour of constituting a Committee comprising members of the Syndicate, which did not find favour with the Vice-Chancellor, who had said that he was not going to constitute a Committee of Syndics under any circumstances. The Vice-Chancellor was of the opinion that the Committee should comprise of some well meaning and eminent persons, to which he (Shri Goyal) had given a contrary opinion that the authority of the members of the Syndicate should not be undermined presuming that the members of the Syndicate are not well meaning and eminent. The way, the Committee has made recommendations, of course, he had reservations that the decision of the Syndicate was not acceptable to the Vice-Chancellor and he also find that none of the members is elected members of the Senate. So it speaks about the biasness against the elected members of the Senate as if the elected members have not the knowledge about the working of the University, they did not have the knowledge of law, they did not know the service rules, etc. Of course, it was said that no member of the Syndicate would be included in the Committee. Now, the constitution of the Committee gives a message that they were against the elected members. The Committee was constituted to look into all the issues with regard to representations sent to the Hon'ble Chancellor by the faculty members directly. The issue was related to four teachers, which in fact, the Committee was to look into in the light of the discussions held in the meeting of the Syndicate individually, i.e., case by case. As such, there could not be same recommendation/s for all the cases/representations. In some representations they might find that they have not been sent to the Chancellor directly, but through proper channel. He was not saying that it could be so. It could be so and it could not be so. As said by Professor Karamjeet Singh, the Committee has suggested minor changes in the mechanism, which is already there and probably the Committee has recommended that the same should be followed. In Para 9, the Committee had quoted Rule 1 appearing at page 68 and Rule 12(b) at pages 109-110 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, but Rule 12(b) did not say anything relating to communication to be addressed to the Chancellor. When the issue was referred qua four teachers in which the teachers have written letters directly to the Chancellor, he did not know wherefrom Rule 12(b) has come in. Secondly, it has been mentioned in recommendation 3 that "the Standing Committee will be constituted as per statutory provisions of P.U. Calendar". He had not come across any such Standing Committee, which could be constituted as per statutory provisions of Panjab University Calendar and would like to see those provisions, under which any Standing Committee is constituted in the University and, if found to be there, he would like to know which are those Committees, when they were constituted, when did they function, how many grievances/complaints they settled. To his knowledge, no such Committee has ever been constituted. "The Committee has written

that it is already there and he was sure that the Committee must have been shown that these are the provisions for constituting the Standing Committee.” Probably, it is not only the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor and even they did not know whether they are talking about the Standing Committee or Grievance Committee or Standing Grievance Committee because according to his knowledge there is only one Standing Committee of which Professor Ronki Ram was the Chairman. If Shri Chatrath is referring to that Committee, then he would request Shri Chatrath to go through what that Committee is for. In fact, to his knowledge there is no such Committee which addresses the grievances of the teachers or non-teachers. He would like to remind Shri Chatrath that the Standing Committee was also formed when it was discussed in the meeting of the Senate that the issues relating to initiating disciplinary action against the University employees are not properly handled because of lack of knowledge on the part of the office and sometimes defective charge-sheets were framed, sometime charges were framed which are not sustainable. As such, the Standing Committee was constituted to process the serious charges against the employees. He did not know wherefrom the Standing Committee has come to function as Grievance Redressal Committee, but since this Committee of very eminent persons have referred in their report, there must be some Standing Committee for grievances also to which he has not come across so far. So he would like to know to which case they are referring to. Not only that, he was sure that the Committee must be there and he is trying to admit his fault as he has not been able to find the same. In the next Para 5, the Committee has written that “The Standing Committee will give recommendations on a grievance/complaint within a time frame of 2 months”. Thirdly, it says that the Standing Committee will be constituted as per statutory provisions of Panjab University Calendar. Obviously, there must have been something definite as to what would be the constitution of the Standing Committee and to add to that Professor Yog Raj Angrish has suggested that President, PUTA and in the case of grievance of non-teaching employees, the President of the Association concerned, be also made member of the Committee proposed to be constituted. He would like to know the constitution of that Standing Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that guidelines for processing of serious charges of allegations against the University and its officers and others are available at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could themselves see as to what for this Committee is and to what Committee they are referring to because he was surprised when he saw the proceedings of the Committee headed by Professor Ronki Ram wherein it had been mentioned “minutes of the meeting of Standing Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of guidelines for processing of serious charges of allegations against the University and its officers and others are available at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009”. In fact, that Committee is only to process the serious charges of allegations against the employees of the University and that is being used as Grievance Committee. The High Powered Committee has also given recommendation for the Standing Committee for which timeframe has also been given. Since it is a serious matter relating to the satisfaction of teachers and non-teachers, functioning of the University, office of the Chancellor and prestige of the Syndicate and Senate, that was why he suggested that thorough attention should be

given to the issue and should discuss the issue threadbare and at least know what decision they are taking. He could understand that the Committee headed by Professor Ronki Ram might be under some confusion, but he is not ready to believe that this Committee of eminent persons does not know of which Standing Committee they were talking about.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that presently, they are concerned about the redressal of the grievances of the employees and all the recommendations, which he had seen, refer to if some employee has grievance, to whom he should address in the first instance, second instance and finally to the Syndicate. There are two issues – (1) redressal of the grievance; and (2) to impose punishment. To impose punishment, there are set procedures and they cannot be intermixed with each other. Hence, they should read the recommendations of the Committee in the light of that. In fact, the Committee has formulated a procedure only and had not recommended any action or anything to be done in respect of a person who has directly approached the higher authorities. Rather by way of this procedure, the aggrieved person gets an opportunity to move via this procedure. Earlier, when the matter had come for consideration, the members were of the opinion that they should not take any action against these persons irrespective of whether they had directly approached the Chancellor or not. They should read it only in these lines and talk about the recommendation for imposing any punishment to anybody.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are two entirely different issues – (i) processing of serious charges against the employees; and (ii) redressal of grievances. Now, the issue before them was – (i) redressal of grievances; and (ii) violation of rule/s by writing directly to the Chancellor. The Committee has incorporated Rule 12(b) appearing at pages 109-110 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, which related to 'direct communication to or a personal interview with a higher authority and/or members of the Syndicate/Senate without permission of the Vice-Chancellor'. He had also said this in the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of March 2015. He did not know under what circumstances the afore-said rule has been quoted and would like to be enlightened by Shri Chatrath, who might be a party to the framing of this rule. Is it possible for some members of the Syndicate and Senate not to be approached by those who had elected them? A rule has been framed that the employees have been forbidden from approaching the members of the Syndicate and Senate. Is it possible? Could they say to their electorate, don't approach/telephone them? This Committee has mentioned a rule, which in fact, was not the issue under consideration of the Syndicate. Secondly, Shri Chatrath is right, but if they accept the recommendations of this Committee, how the Vice-Chancellor would be going to defend tomorrow that the Standing Committee has been constituted as per the statutory provisions of P.U. Calendar, especially when there is no provision for the Standing Committee. As such, they have to frame such a provision. When they frame the statutory provision about the constitution of the Standing Committee and who could be the members of the said Committee and the same could be discussed by the Syndicate, which is a rule making body, only then they could say that the Standing Committee has been constituted as per the provisions of P.U. Calendar. The Committee itself did not know whether it is a complaint or grievance. The Grievance Committee did not necessarily mean that somebody is demanding

action against someone. One could make request that this is his grievance, i.e., such and such increment or promotion is due to him, but the same is not being given to him on one pretext or the other, and the same should be redressed. As such, such an application could be called a grievance as it did not demand any action against anybody, the same could be looked into by the Grievance Committee. They have not to read the report of the Committee in the light that the Committee comprised very senior and eminent persons. They had specially mentioned that the Standing Committee be constituted as per the statutory provisions of P.U. Calendar. It was only in this light and not that he is biased against anybody as there is none other than Shri Chatrath, who knows better about the functioning of this University. That was why he was suggesting in spite of the well meaning intentions in the minds of all those, who are the members of this Committee, they might not be well conversant with the day-to-day functioning of this University, but might be conversant with the functioning of the University of which they were the Vice-Chancellors as the functioning of Panjab University is really different from other Universities. He did not have any problem in approving the recommendations of the Committee as they are as Shri Chatrath has said that the Committee has not recommended any action against anyone, but if they approved these, would it not be difficult for the Vice-Chancellor to constitute the Committee, which is not there in the P.U. Calendar, and the Committee, to which he is referring to, is not a Grievance Committee, but a Committee to process the serious charges against the employees of the University. Therefore, this needed to be relooked into in its entirety. Though he had said in the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of March 2015 and again repeating that the endeavour of all the members of the Syndicate is maximum satisfaction of maximum people and the same is their motive. They did not want to embarrass the position of anybody, including the dignity of Vice-Chancellor and the Chancellor. If still the Syndicate wanted to approve it, it is alright.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the whole issue was discussed in a most humble way and now it needed to be considered in a threadbare way. However, he would confine himself to the point made by Shri Ashok Goyal that there was confusion in the mind of Professor Ronki Ram about this Committee. He wanted to make it clear that he was assigned the duty as per the provisions of University Calendar. He would also like to inform that the Committee was formed as earlier told by Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction, that the Chairperson of the NAAC Committee and other members of the NAAC Committee were told as to how the University used to deal with such cases. As such, the Committee headed by him was not formed after receiving the applications/representations. So far as the very mandate and status of this Committee is concerned, none of them could presume because it is very much clear at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, and wherein the guidelines for processing serious charges of allegations against the University, its officers and others have been mentioned and they needed to read it in between the lines. Thereafter, it has further been made clear that the following guidelines will be followed in the processing of serious allegations against the University or individual Officer/Officials/teachers/students of the University pertaining to irregularities concerning finances, admissions, examinations, appointments, plagiarism or any other allegation which amounts to moral turpitude. If some allegations were levelled either pertaining to academics, administrative, finances or moral turpitude, this Committee is to be

constituted to see whether the allegations are true or false. It has further been made clear that the allegations must be made in the form of a complaint in writing and any anonymous complaint which does not contain the signatures, full name and address of the complainant, shall not be entertained and shall be summarily filed. It has also been made clear that any complaint duly signed with name and complete address of the complainant shall be referred to the Standing Committee for scrutiny and such Standing Committee shall be established and shall consist of a Chairman and two members to be nominated by the Vice-Chancellor. The Standing Committee may make such verifications as it finds necessary in the facts and the circumstances of the case and may take the necessary steps, including inviting both the complainant and the accused. After listening to them, the Committee would make recommendations to the authorities. The Committee has listened to the persons concerned with whatever understanding it had by working day in and day out. The Johl Committee had also recommended that the Standing Committee should be constituted as per provisions of P.U. Calendar. In fact, this Committee is not for taking or recommending any action, but for processing the cases of serious charges of allegations as rightly said by Shri Goyal. Therefore, there is no confusion at all as the Committee has neither taken any action nor recommended any action. They had put a system in place so that at least their employees both teaching and non-teaching should feel that their interests are being safeguarded. The Johl Committee had been constituted, they had received a lot of cases during the last few years and the Committee has suggested further revamping of the system by including representatives of PUTA, etc. He said that not only President, PUTA or else, but both the complainant as well as the accused should also be asked to suggest a person.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that so far as Standing Committee is concerned, its constitution is there. He would like to share with his friends that the controversy, which had arose much earlier, has been practically attempted to be solved that hereinafter anybody having a grievance should follow this procedure. He felt that if the matter comes to an end amicably without initiating any action or protest or anything against the person, they should forget the past and start afresh. The Committee instead of dealing with such cases/situation directly, has given the procedure to be followed in such cases. They should accept the procedure. If somebody is still aggrieved, he could move further.

Shri Ashok Goyal observed that the Grievance Committee and the Standing Committee referred to at page 143 could not be the same.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the Grievance Committee did not have any power to suggest or impose any punishment. The Grievance Committee could only report the matter to the Syndicate or the Senate, whichever is the competent authority. He, therefore, suggested that they should accept the procedure with the modification/s suggested by certain members, but the same should be time bound.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that the Johl Committee was supplied six cases for consideration saying that these persons went directly to the Chancellor. There is misrepresentation in that. Were they sure that all these persons went to the Chancellor directly or they

have to identify as to in which cases the persons went to the Chancellor through proper channel because in one case the office note says that the representation was sent to the Chancellor and a copy of the same was sent to the Vice-Chancellor, which is absolutely correct. Hence, they could not club all the cases. It seemed nobody went into the merit of the cases and the Committee in its wisdom did not go into the cases individually. In the cases, which were not sent directly, but through proper channel, why they were also being considered as if they had approached the Chancellor directly. Did they want to say that nobody should approach the Chancellor directly as per P.U. Calendar or nobody has any right to approach the Chancellor in any case? These are two entirely different cases. She humbly requested the members to address the issue. She further stated that in case the complaint or the grievance is against the Vice-Chancellor, according to the procedure suggested by Johl Committee, should the complainant go to the Chairperson/Head of the Department and thereafter to the Dean of University Instruction? Today it had happened to a person and tomorrow it could happen to anyone. Since they are the members of the Governing Body, they should evolve a system, under which everybody should work with dignity. At no stage, efforts have been made to address the problem/complaint according to the merit. In fact, the problem is not approaching the Chancellor directly, there are contents in every complaint. Why did they not address those complaints? They as members of the Syndicate and the Committees also did not address those complaints and sidelined the real issue. She pleaded that they should ensure a dignified environment for everybody, especially the women at work places.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that she (Professor Rajesh Gill) has referred to certain cases, which have been supplied to the members of the Syndicate as annexures to the report of the Committee, to which she has said that Johl Committee was misled by the office of the University saying that the particular person had directly sent the letter to the Chancellor. She has said that how a letter, which has been routed through proper channel, could also be equated at par with a letter which has been sent directly to the Chancellor. Why the issue could not be discussed. He was sure that there must have been some lapses on the part of the University office and understanding of the Hon'ble members of the Syndicate, but that needed to be clarified. That was why, he was saying in the last meeting of the Syndicate that their endeavour should be to redress the system as a whole, which plays a role for satisfaction of all. Now, they had come back to the same situation. As per the Johl Committee, the mechanism was already there, what new the Committee had suggested except two months time frame and in spite of the mechanism in place, why the letter has been sent to the Chancellor directly, and are quoting the rule, which related to not to approach the members of the Syndicate and Senate.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the complaint *ipso facto* did not become having been proved. In fact, it has to be looked into/examined. Unless the charges/allegations are established through a mechanism, they could not take note of them. So far as approaching the Chancellor by some of their friends and Colleagues is concerned, the Committee has tried to solve the issue, but has not recommended any action against them. It is provided that hereinafter if somebody has grievance/s, he/she should follow the laid down procedure. As such, it is only a procedure and as a trade unionist, he might know that if they have to impose a minor punishment, a

procedure has been given and if they have to impose a major punishment, then again a separate procedure has been given, which includes so many safeguards because it relates to imposition of punishment. The members of the Committee in their wisdom had thought of giving a procedure to get the grievance/s brought to notice and its solution. They have to weigh the recommendations and take decision accordingly.

Shri Naresh Gaur stated that according to him, it is not an issue that some of the persons had approached the Chancellor directly. There is a system that if one has to make a complaint about his/her seniors, they have to send the complaint through proper channel. In the case under consideration also, some of the letters have been written to the Chancellor and a copy of the same has been sent to the Vice-Chancellor. During the tenure of the present Vice-Chancellor, certain complaints were made to the Chancellor before these complaints, but at that time no hue and cry was made. Why the hue and cry has been made now, he wanted to know the reason/s.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that Committees are made of the members of the Syndicate and the Senate to resolve the issue amicably and not to harass/implicate anyone. Ultimately, the decision is taken by the Syndicate and the Senate. If they did not approve of the recommendations of their own Committees doubting the integrity of the members, where would they go.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Professor Ronki Ram has said that the Syndicate and the Senate of the University is supreme. Though the Syndicate and the Senate are supreme bodies of the University, they could not go beyond the regulations and the University Grants Commission. There are some friends who say that the Senate is the supreme body of the University and could do anything and what could not be done by the High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, could be done by the Senate. But probably those friends did not know that the Senate is also bound to function in terms of the regulations which are provided in the Calendar and the regulations of the UGC. So far as the role of Government of India is concerned, it has been made very much clear in the Act and that is why he was reminding to his friends that just because any decision taken even with majority in violation of the regulations, would not stand the scrutiny of law. Immediately, the Government could draw their attention that it is in violation of the regulations. It is always misconstrued as if he is challenging the authority of the Syndicate and the Senate. He still says that it is the provisions of the Act, regulations and rules which prevailed. Of course, they had right to change/amend the regulations with the prior approval of the Government but had no right to violate them. Unfortunately, it has been a practice here that they violate the regulations daily. Tomorrow, if somebody writes to the Government that they are violating the regulations frequently, how would they defend themselves except that the Vice-Chancellor would say that it is not his responsibility as the same has been done by the Syndicate and the Senate, but the fact remains that the regulations are being violated. In the end, he said that they did not have any power to dilute the regulations set by the UGC.

Professor Ronki Ram suggested that whatever is decided by the Syndicate and the Senate, the same must be sent to the UGC

because they are getting money from the UGC. Those who give money, had every right to control.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they are not having a general discussion. Let them do the things bit by bit so that they could keep making progress. The University as an institution is quite mature and even amongst the universities, which have been established after the independence, has completed 50 years at this campus and had grown from 15-20 faculty members to over 1000 faculty members. Wherever people of high intellectual work together, egos/clashes are bound to be there. It is not that grievances are there for the first time, they were there earlier also and the redressal mechanism was also there. In addition to that, the Johl Committee has suggested certain additional mechanism to redress the grievance. They had tried to resolve them in a formal structured way by referring to Chairperson, Chairpersons forum, Dean of University Instruction, Standing Committee, etc. Earlier, they had formed Committee to address the issues raised by the colleagues in a very *ad hoc* way, the purpose of which is to reduce the dissatisfaction level so that people can work efficiently as a satisfied lot for the purpose for which they all existed. It was pointed out that whatever they had done, it had no legality as the legal standing is that of the Statutory Committee. Professor A.K. Bhandari pointed out that the Statutory Committee formed comprised 4-5 persons, which as per Calendar should have comprised only 3 persons. Some people felt that a small Statutory Committee could be biased and may not give full chance to an aggrieved person. Sometimes, the aggrieved person is very emotional and might not be able to articulate his/her case properly. Therefore, his personal feeling is that a person should be added to the Statutory Committee, as recommended by the Johl Committee, who could assist the aggrieved person in articulating his/her case so that more satisfied outcome can be achieved. Fourth person is added so that if the statutory Committee is not able to give a conclusion satisfactory to the claimant, the fourth person can articulate the issue raised by the complainant via a dissent note. Ultimately, the recommendations of the Statutory Committee would come to the Government of the University, i.e., the Syndicate and thereafter to the Senate. So far as consulting of President, PUTA is concerned, no Dean of University Instruction is expected to consult the President, PUTA while deciding the case of a faculty member. The whole purpose is to redress the issue in a satisfied manner so that they as an institution seem to be performing their duties in a right manner. It was correctly recalled that the NAAC Committee had asked about the existence of a Grievance Committee. Whenever, the NAAC Committee would visit the campus again, it would ask whether the Grievance Committee exists to redress the grievances of the teachers. If they have the Grievance Committee, how many complaints had been received and what action had been taken by them. They have to correlate all these things and remain NAAC compliant. So he personally felt that Johl Committee had tried to give them an algorithm in a formal way. Johl Committee had given them a structured framework and they should by and large accept this structured framework. The mechanism has been given to address the grievance in a reasonable time frame.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he was trying to convey, as the Vice-Chancellor has referred to, the NAAC Committee had specifically asked whether there is any Grievance Committee, who are the members of that Committee, what are the complaints, which they had received and how they had addressed them. He just wanted to point

that nowhere the NAAC or the UGC expects the University to have this kind of grievance/s. The NAAC had asked the University under the Regulations of the UGC whether they had this Committee and to that they said they did not have this Committee and, in fact, they never had this Committee. That Committee did not exist even today. That Grievance Committee is required for the redressal of the grievances of the students, which the UGC Regulations say. As they are saying now that the Standing Committee was formed for a particular purpose, they first consider that Committee as per UGC Regulations, which was enquired by the NAAC. Now, they are saying that the Standing Committee, which was constituted for a different purpose, to be a Grievance Committee also. Professor Ronki Ram has read out the functions of the Standing Committee, including serious charges involving moral turpitude, which are available at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009. He had not been able to know till date as to what is the definition of moral turpitude. Even the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India had not been able to define what actually the moral turpitude is. According to him, theft and beating somebody is moral turpitude, but according to Supreme Court it might not be. That was why they had mentioned the functions of the Committee qua which they would process the serious charges. Citing an example, he said that if one is not given his annual increment, would that be covered in the purview of this Committee? In fact, as the students wanted redressal mechanism as per the UGC Regulations, wherein they felt victimized by the teachers or fellow students or administrative staff of the University, similarly the teaching and non-teaching staff working also wanted grievance redressal system, which of course, is not provided by the UGC or MHRD or any other authority, but the University should form keeping in view so many complaints coming in. As such, they should make a grievance procedure, which he (Shri Goyal) expected Johl Committee to suggest. This Committee, probably not on their own, has been given to understand by the University office, which was assisting it, that they already have in place the grievance mechanism. They say, if they already have the grievance mechanism, what was the need of sending these letters to the Chancellor directly. If they already have this kind of mechanism they said, then Chairperson, Dean of University Instruction, this Committee and if the matter is still not resolved, the Vice-Chancellor and if it is still not resolved, then Syndicate and Senate and only after exhausting all these channels, one could approach the higher authorities, presuming that such a Committee is already there in the University, and he is saying that no such Committee is in place in this University. Therefore, what is wrong if he was suggesting that if they had started experiencing that such grievances are there on the part of the teaching and non-teaching staff of the University, they could make another Committee/another system, which works to entire satisfaction of all instead of saying that the Committee has made very good recommendations? How do they know as they have not mentioned anywhere; otherwise, they might have quoted as quoted in Para 9, they might have quoted the provision of constitution of Standing Committee. They did not need to do it because they were made to understand that the provision for constitution of Standing Committee existed as the Vice-Chancellor was also saying that they told to the NAAC that the Grievance Committee existed. Now they are saying that when the NAAC visit the University next time, they would tell them that they had tabulated the information regarding grievances of the staff members and action taken thereon in a formal manner, but they are forgetting that the

Grievance Committee is only meant for the redressal of the grievances of the students as per regulation of the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the NAAC representative had formally asked whether they had Grievance Committee for the teachers and they were told that such issues were also discussed at the Chairpersons' forum. On hindsight, the Chairpersons' forum had helped them for preparing for the NAAC. The issue was discussed and it was decided that they would form a Committee comprising representative of a given department and Chairperson concerned, Dean of the Faculty, President, PUTA and the Committee would try to satisfy the complainant. So, in a formal way they had tried to redress the grievance. Everything has been recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the Chairpersons. If there is any grievance, the Dean of University Instruction would try to address. How the Dean of University Instruction would address, no algorithm has been given.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the provision for constitution of Standing Committee existed at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009. In fact, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 contained instructions and rules, which are framed by the Syndicate under Section 20(5). As such, this Standing Committee is provided under the existing rules and it is not for students as for students, the Standing Committee is different which deals with the unfair means cases of the students. In the case under consideration, the provision says that 'the following guidelines will be followed in the processing of serious allegations against the University or individual officer/officials/teachers/students of the University pertaining to irregularities concerning finances, admissions, examinations, appointments, plagiarism or any other allegation which amounts to moral turpitude'. It has provided the procedure whereby the complaint directly goes to the Grievance Committee or whatever Committee is provided there. The Syndicate could adopt and say look gentleman instead of burdening the Committee which has already been constituted under this, there are certain alternatives/remedies which they are making available to him/her so that his/her grievance/s is/are addressed much earlier. Johl Committee has suggested that the matter should be placed before the Chairperson of the Department concerned, thereafter Dean of University Instruction, Vice-Chancellor, etc. before it go to higher authorities, which is ranked higher in order of hierarchy of the University system. He did not understand why they had taken more than 1½ hours to supplement the instructions/mechanism suggested by the Committee. They have to incorporate these in this very chapter that before approaching the Grievance Committee or the Vice-Chancellor, one has to follow the alternative remedy which is made available to him/her. He did not think that they could have any grievance/objection to these because they (the Syndicate) are competent to frame rules/instructions under the Act. Therefore, they should accept this mechanism with the modification. So far as the concern shown by his learned friend is concerned, it is unfortunate that the amendments were not made in the rules with the consent of the Syndicate and Senate previously. He did remember that earlier if a staff member approached the Syndics or Fellows, it was considered a misconduct. The Senate says, no, if somebody has a grievance, he/she could represent his/her case through a member, who is a representative on the Governing body. It is a welcome step that the Committee has provided alternative remedy before the matter goes to the Grievance Committee and if somebody is not satisfied with the Grievance

Committee, the matter could go to the Syndicate and Senate. The Committee has suggested the procedure to be adopted for redressal of the grievance of the employees and as such it is not substantive matter for which they are objecting to. He, therefore, suggested that they should accept the recommendations of the Committee

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that in Colleges they had two types of Committees, i.e., (i) Grievance Committee and (ii) Sexual Harassment Committee as recommended by the UGC. The UGC has been repeatedly writing to them that they should form a Sexual Harassment Committee. As per guidelines in the case of Vishakha, they have to bring in transparency in such cases and include one social worker as a member in the Committee. So to bring transparency here also, they could add one social worker in the Committee.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that the Committee has scrutinized all the relevant documents and made recommendations. As said by Principal Gurdip Sharma, the Grievance Committee of the Colleges comprised Head of the Department and Principal of the College. Even if the Committee as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal is constituted, both the Head of the Department and the Dean of University Instruction would be members of the same. The Committee has suggested stepwise mechanism, i.e., first the matter should be referred to the Head of the Department and thereafter, if need be, to the Dean of University Instruction and so on, whereas Shri Ashok Goyal is pleading that there should be a Committee to deal with the grievances of the employees. She suggested that at every step the time limit for redressal of the complaint should be specified.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Committee has suggested algorithm to strengthen the existing system. Though at one stage, a time frame of 2 months has been given, the timeframe for redressal of the complaint at the level of Head of the Department and the Dean of University Instruction needed to be given. The Committee has recommended that the complainant could suggest 3 names of his choice. Similarly, the person against whom the complaint has been made should also have a right to suggest 2-3 names of his choice to defend him (accused).

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that the recommendations of Johl Committee should be accepted with the addition that a timeframe of 15 days and 1 month should be incorporated to redress the grievance by the Head of the Department and Dean of University Instruction, respectively.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he had strong apprehension so far as recommendation 4 of the Committee is concerned, according to which the complainant could suggest 3 names of his/her choice (Professors in the case of teaching staff/Deputy Registrars in the case of non-teaching staff). He enquired why only the Professors could be suggested and not the Associate Professors and Assistant Professors. He, therefore, suggested that the word Professors should be substituted with faculty member. Secondly, he agreed with Professor Ronki Ram that the person against whom the complaint is/has been made should also be given the right to suggest 3 names of his/her choice to defend him/her. Thirdly, in case the complaint has nothing to do with the department, he did not think that firstly the complaint should be referred to the Chairperson of the Department because it

would only delay the matter. Fourthly, since the University is a big one and has good number of students, teaching and non-teaching staff members, it would be better, if they constitute 3 Committees – one for redressing the grievances of the students, second for teachers and third for non-teaching staff members.

Shri Naresh Gaur stated that the Committee must have been given some term of reference to work. Referring to recommendation 6 of the Committee, he said that rule 12(b) at page 110 says that 'direct communication to or a personal interview with a higher authority and/or members of the Syndicate/Senate without permission of the Vice-Chancellor shall be treated a contravention of the discipline of the University', whereas recommendation 6 of the Committee says the recommendations of the Committee will go to Vice-Chancellor and in rare cases if the matter is not settled at the Vice-Chancellor's level, it will be referred to the Syndicate with a note from the Vice-Chancellor, for final decision. According to him, this recommendation of the Committee is creating a hurdle from moving the matter ahead. Since as per Calendar, one could approach the higher authorities, including the Chancellor, with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor, the recommendation of the Committee is wrong. Secondly, since it is not allowing the case to move forward, which is against the natural justice, he has a strong objection to it. He added that in every institution, one has right to approach the higher authorities, but through proper channel.

Summarizing the discussion held so far, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the whole purpose is to redress the grievances of the employees so that nobody is dissatisfied and everyone works efficiently. The central issue is whether one should approach the office of the Chancellor every day? The Chancellor has entrusted the responsibility on the Vice-Chancellor to look after the day-to-day affairs of the University with the help of the Governing body, i.e., Syndicate. In future, whenever a complaint would reach the Vice-Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor using wisdom shall decide to seek input as per the algorithm suggested by the Johl Committee. If the matter is referred to the Chairperson, he/she should not hold on to it for more than 15 days and similarly the Dean of University Instruction should not take more than 1 month. If the both the Chairperson of the Department and the Dean of University Instruction are not able to resolve the issue, the Vice-Chancellor would refer the matter to the Statutory Committee which ought to address the grievance within a stipulated period of two months. Thereafter, the report would be submitted to the Vice-Chancellor who would try to resolve the issue. If the Vice-Chancellor is unable to resolve the issue, he would place the issue before the Syndicate in its subsequent meeting so that the matter is not delayed. He thought that the people can have microscopic reservations, but he gets a sense that this mechanism should be approved as it addresses the concerns which most of the people have expressed. He, therefore, recommended that these should be approved and see how it works.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though he did not remember correctly, perhaps this Committee was constituted in the year 2003 and named as Standing Committee. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to dig out the said file and see as to what was the purpose of this Standing Committee. Secondly, they did not have any power that they could stop anybody approaching anybody except that the procedure has to be followed, i.e., the Chancellor has to be approached through

proper channel. Similarly, the Registrar, Vice-Chancellor and the members of the Syndicate and Senate are to be approached through proper channel. To say that unless and until one exhausted all these channels, probably is not right. Similarly, to say that nobody could approach the Chancellor, is not only against the spirit of the Constitution of India, but also against the Panjab University Act. They are talking about the rules, regulations and Section 20 of the Panjab University Act, wherein the Syndicate is the rule making body. It is provided in the Act only that in some of the cases the matter has to be referred to the Chancellor only. As such, they could not deny anybody a chance to approach the Chancellor and say that Chancellor could be approached only through proper channel.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that only in two situations the Chancellor could be approached, i.e., removal from the Senate and removal of one's name from the voters list.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal requested Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath to go through Section 38 and see himself whether these two possibilities have been mentioned in it or not. He stated that these words 'through proper channel' have been mentioned in all institutions not throughout India, but in the entire world. The purpose what he (the Vice-Chancellor) was saying is that if a person sends his letter directly, he (the Vice-Chancellor) has no option but to get input from his Chairperson. The purpose of routing the application/ representation through proper channel is that whatever the input the Head of the Department would like to give before forwarding the same to the Vice-Chancellor, he had the opportunity for the same so that matter could be taken to the logical ends expeditiously. Through proper channel did not mean that one is denied of the opportunity of approaching the higher authorities directly. Now, if the aggrieved person is to approach even the Chancellor and the proper channel in this case would be through Head of the Department, Registrar, Dean of University Instruction and the Vice-Chancellor, so that requisite input is there for consideration by the Chancellor, but proper channel did not mean that the person is denied to approach the Chancellor. Provision of sending advance copy is also there so that the issues which are of urgent nature and required immediate attention are taken care of by the highest authority without any delay in case the lower authorities, e.g., Registrar, Dean of University Instruction and Vice-Chancellor did not have sufficient time to handle such issues.

Professor Ronki Ram said that nowhere in their understanding they are saying that the Chancellor should not be approached. In case a representation comes to the Vice-Chancellor, nothing barred him from giving a strong note that the representation, which he is forwarding to him (Chancellor), has not come to him through proper channel. The Chancellor would take the decision on the representation accordingly.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that Sections 36, 37 and 38 of the Panjab University Act do talk of sending the matter to the Chancellor. Under Section 36, the Government, may on the recommendation of the Senate supported by at least 2/3rd of the whole of number of Fellows, cancel the appointment of any person appointed or elected as a Fellow of the University and in the case of nominated member, the Chancellor is empowered. Under Section 37, the Chancellor, with the concurrence of not less than 2/3rd of the

members of the Senate has power to remove the name of any person from the register of Registered Graduates. Similarly, Section 38 says that if any question arises as to whether any person has been duly elected or appointed as, or is entitled to be a member of any authority or other body of the University, the matter will be referred to the Chancellor, whose decision thereon will be final.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he thinks that they should now move to Item 4.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what decision they had taken so far Item 3 is concerned.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that no, her dissent should be recorded as there is an appropriate provision in the Panjab University Calendar for approaching the Chancellor through proper channel. The question is, she would like to be informed what did they mean by 'through proper channel'? Is it a channel which they are devising through this Committee by creating so many obstacles as through proper channel has already been defined in the Calendar. If it is already defined, why did they need the recommendations of this Committee? According to her, the provision of the Calendar is very clear. As such, the recommendations of the Committee are violative of the Calendar in the sense that the Committee has given no chance to the persons to approach the Chancellor through proper channel because it ends up with the Syndicate which is violative of the Calendar. Secondly, the question as to which forum one has to choose to file a complaint would depend on the nature of the complaint, who is the complainant and against whom the complaint is made. If a teacher has made a complaint against another teacher, the complaint would go to the Head of the Department, Dean of University Instruction and then to the Vice-Chancellor, but if the complaint is of some other nature, what is the fun of sending the same to the Head of the Department. As such, they could not club all the cases together. Since through proper channel has a definition, they could not make another definition of it. Keeping so many channels before reaching the matter at the top is nothing but victimization as it is exhaustive and therefore, it is a penalty in itself. Even the Constitution of India allowed its citizens to approach the Hon'ble Supreme Court in terms of violation of fundamental rights. What kind of society and democracy they are living in?

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the decision is that if there is an issue and for that issue, before the Chancellor is approached, the issue must be attempted to be addressed within the University system. The University system meant, if the issue could be addressed at the department level, the Head of the Department should be given 15 days time for the purpose and if the issue could be addressed at the Dean of University Instruction level, the DUI should be given 1 months time to address the same. If the matter required consideration by the Standing Committee, the upper limit of the time to be given is 2 months and if the matter still did not get addressed, the Syndicate has to take a call on the same. However, if somebody has a grievance and he wanted his grievance to be addressed by the Chancellor, the letter/representation at least should go through the Vice-Chancellor on which the Vice-Chancellor would write, as per the evolved procedure, he is referring this to him (Chancellor). If the Chancellor wishes to give any direction to the Vice-Chancellor, it is

the duty of the given Vice-Chancellor to follow the direction of the Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they are not debarring anybody from approaching the Chancellor, but one is to approach the Chancellor through proper channel, which is already provided in the Calendar. In order to discourage people from approaching the Chancellor every now and then, they are strengthening their grievance redressal system so that they are able to sort out the issue. He enquired is there any difference between what was said by the members in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 8th March 2015 and what is being expressed by the members now. Why could they not make a specific Committee for this particular purpose? In the end, he once again requested the Vice-Chancellor to go through the file pertaining to constitution of Standing Committee which was constituted between the years 2000 and 2003.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that partially everybody is right. In fact, there are two types of grievances. Firstly, grievance involving serious charges against somebody, e.g., a student might say that this teacher is harming him or a colleague may say that this person is harming him. This Committee comes into picture and it has been taking into consideration such things where it involved charges. Secondly, there are other types of grievances which have been mentioned here, wherein somebody else might not have been charged, e.g., somebody might not have got his increment, seniority, etc. Those grievances should not come to this Committee. What they have been doing is that they had been constituting separate Committees for such type of grievances. Here also, they could constitute a Grievance Committee, which could consider such grievances, in addition to the Standing Committee. Therefore, that is what has been pointed out that they could make that Committee together with this Committee and the algorithm given along with the suggested modifications would complete the process. As such, they should not insist that this is the only Standing Committee.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that it did not bar the Vice-Chancellor to form one Committee or two Committees.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Johl Committee dated 15.5.2015, be approved, as per **Appendix-XIII**, with the following additions/modifications to strengthen the internal grievance redressal mechanism to the satisfaction of all:

1. Before the Chancellor is approached, the issue must be attempted to be addressed within the University system. Firstly, the issue be addressed at the department level and the Head of the Department should try to resolve the issue within 15 days time. If the issue could not be addressed at the Departmental level, it be referred to the Dean of University Instruction, who should resolved the issue within 1 months time. In case the issue is still not resolved, the matter be referred to the Standing Committee, for which the upper limit of the time is 2 months. However, if the matter still did not get addressed, the Syndicate has to take a call on the same in its subsequent meeting.

2. However, if somebody has a grievance and he/she wanted his/her grievance to be addressed by the Chancellor, the letter/representation at least must be routed through the Vice-Chancellor. Referring to Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor would write that as per the evolved procedure he is referring the case for redressal within the University system. If the Chancellor wishes to give any direction to the Vice-Chancellor, it is the duty of the given Vice-Chancellor to follow the direction of the Chancellor.
3. Recommendation 4 of the Committee be modified as "Standing Committee be constituted as per statutory provisions of P.U. Calendar. Both the complainant and the accused may suggest three names of their choice Committee, two of whom (1 from the complainant side and one from accused side) be co-opted as members by the Chairperson of the standing Committee for individual case/s".
4. While processing the complaints, the President, PUTA in case of teachers and the President of concerned Associations in case of non-teaching employees be involved.

**Recommendations of the
Committee dated
18.12.2014 regarding
Sabbatical leave**

4. Considered the minutes dated 18.12.2014 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the existing P.U. rules regarding Sabbatical leave and suggest changes keeping in view to promote research.

NOTE 1.The relevant Regulations/Rules be amended as per office note (**Appendix-XIV**).

2. The effective date for implementation of amendment is required to be decided.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that in the existing Regulations there is a condition that Professors of the University, who have completed three years' of service may be granted Sabbatical Leave to undertake study or research or other academic pursuit solely for the object of increasing their proficiency and usefulness to the University, whereas no such condition has been prescribed in the proposed regulations. He enquired could a person, who joins as Professor at the age of 59 years under the CAS, be granted Sabbatical leave?

The Vice-Chancellor said yes, he could go on Sabbatical Leave because he has past service at his credit as Associate Professor, which he had not taken as Associate Professor.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar observed that as per regulation, only Professors could be granted Sabbatical Leave.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the benefit of Sabbatical Leave should be given to maximum number of teachers.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the Sabbatical Leave is granted only to the Professors and up to the level of Reader's/Associate Professor's level study leave is being granted

under almost similar regulations. Now, they could make changes in the nomenclature.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that as was prevalent earlier, some minimum service should be prescribed to be eligible for grant of Sabbatical Leave by the Professors. If a person becomes Professor at the age of 59½ years under the Career Advancement Scheme and is granted Sabbatical Leave for six month, how would he fulfil the condition “...study or research or other academic pursuit solely for the object of increasing their proficiency and usefulness to the University” and if one retires how could he be useful to the University? So they should give the benefit of Sabbatical Leave to maximum number of teachers, but at the same time they have to be little bit rational as to what kind of regulation/rule they are framing. He also read out the existing Regulation 1(i) at page 11 of the Appendix, which reads “Professors of the University who have completed three years’ of service may be granted Sabbatical Leave to undertake study or research or other academic pursuit solely for the object of increasing their proficiency and usefulness to the University. This leave shall not be granted to a Professor who has less than three years of service in the University before the age of superannuation”. As such, the intention of the Committee was only to remove this clause so that even if one has less than three years of service, he/she could be granted Sabbatical Leave for six months. Because under Regulation 1, Professors in the University not being eligible for study leave shall be eligible for grant of Sabbatical Leave for a period of one year at the end of every six years of continuous service in the Professor’s grade in the University for undertaking study research and writing purposes within the country or abroad. The new regulation is being framed to encourage the teachers who are bound to retire.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that as per existing Regulations, a Professor for not being eligible for study leave shall be eligible for grant of Sabbatical Leave for a period of one year at the end of every six years of continuous service in the Professor’s grade in the University for undertaking study research and writing purposes within the country or abroad. Now, they have amended the regulation in such a manner so that even if a Professor has less than three years’ service at his credit, he could apply for Sabbatical Leave. Regulation 1(i) says that ‘Professors of the University who have completed three years’ of service may be granted Sabbatical Leave to undertake study or research, which is wrong. This mean, a person, who has become Professor, would have to work as such for six years for becoming eligible for Sabbatical Leave.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that some inconsistencies have occurred while incorporating the proposed regulations. So far as the recommendations of the Committee were concerned, those were very clear and the same were as being said by Dr. Dinesh Kumar. As such, it needed to be relooked into.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That Professor A.K. Bhandari and Professor Karamjeet Singh be requested to re-look into the proposed regulations for grant of Sabbatical Leave to the Professors and make recommendations. The Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of Professor A.K. Bhandari and Professor Karamjeet Singh, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Minutes of the Committee dated 31.03.2015 regarding leave cases of teaching staff

5. Considered the minutes dated 31.03.2015 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) has resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to appoint a Committee to look into the leave cases of members of the teaching staff before, these were put up to him for consideration.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 31.3.2015, as per **Appendix-XV**, be approved.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 30.01.2015 regarding pay protection of P.U. employees

6. Considered minutes dated 30.01.2015 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider/frame the Rules for pay protection of the P.U. employees in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court dated 06.10.2014 (C.W.P. No.1450 of 2013).

NOTE: The Resident Audit Officer vide Endst. No.766/ RAO/2014 dated 30.10.2014 (**Appendix-XVI**) has requested that necessary action on the points enlisted at serial No.1 to 5 as mentioned in memo No.RAO/2014/352 dated 13.05.2014 (**Appendix-XVI**) may be taken after taking into consideration the judgement of Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.1450 of 2013.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar drew the attention of Professor A.K. Bhandari towards the request of the Resident Audit Officer (RAO) that necessary action might be taken after taking into consideration the judgment of Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1450 of 2013 which is available at pages 37-42 of the Appendix. He has gone through this judgment wherein the High Court has denied the benefit of pay protection to the petitioner. Unfortunately, the Committee in its meeting dated 30.1.2015 has noted that 'the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in its order dated 06.10.2014 (CWP No. 1450 of 2013) has interpreted the pay protection rules of Punjab Government. As per the orders of the Hon'ble Court, the pay protection circular of Punjab Govt. covers the employees who were working in the various Departments/Autonomous Bodies etc. of Govt. of Punjab only. Therefore, the employees who are coming from other Govt. Institutions/Organizational Bodies etc. not under the Punjab Govt. (e.g. Central or other State Govt., Institution or Bodies) would not be covered under the instructions of the Punjab Govt. for pay protection'. He urged that this paragraph should be deleted from the minutes of the meeting for the reason that if they go through the circulars/notifications of Punjab Government, they would find that Punjab Government has protected the pay, where the judgement of the High Court says that 'this argument is fallacious. The judgment of the Supreme Court has not decided the issue of pay protection raised in this petition and is wide off the mark and of no help to the petitioner. Consequently, the view of the Finance Department is found justified and is endorsed and the petition is dismissed. No

costs'. He, therefore, reiterated that first paragraph should be removed from the minutes.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that, in fact, the audit has quoted this judgment, but they are saying that they are going against the judgment arguing that the judgment is one sided which says that if the person came from Punjab Government, only then pay would be protected, whereas they are arguing that since the Panjab University has national character, they had to protect pay of persons irrespective from where they came. Though the Committee has rightly decided, if there is some harshness, the same could be corrected.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that they should quote the circular number of the Punjab Government instead of judgment of High Court.

To this, Professor A.K. Bhandari gave his consent.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that though in the judgment a case of Punjab has been referred to, the case is between Haryana Government and U.T. Administration. He drew the attention of the House towards pages 25-26 of the appendix wherein the objections raised by the RAO had been mentioned. Serial No.3 at page 25 explicitly says that "Syndicate vide Para No. 6 dated 4/8/2012 has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to approve the cases of protection of pay/fixation of pay in future on behalf of the Syndicate". Similarly, at page 26 (Sr.No.3) it has *inter alia* been mentioned that "this decision be reviewed keeping in view the pay protection rules already framed by the Panjab University and the date of retrospective effect be also got decided from the competent authority". In fact, the RAO is not ready to accept the decision of the Syndicate that the Syndicate has authorized the Vice-Chancellor and the argument of the RAO is that the competent authority for protection of pay is Senate and, thus, only Senate could protect the pay of teachers and not the Vice-Chancellor. The question is how to clinch the issue, which is their main objective. Even if they accepted all the recommendations of the Committee, the issue would remain the same as he would again say that it should be routed through the Senate. He has seen during the last five months as member of the Syndicate that every time there are always 2-3 cases on the agenda of the Syndicate regarding protection of pay of teachers. The RAO is saying that if 2-3 cases could be routed through the Syndicate and Senate, why not all. Because what they are doing is that they are asking that the pending cases should be considered as per the above-quoted Syndicate decision and at the same time routing certain other cases through the Syndicate and Senate. Why are they adopting two different norms? Either they should not route any case of protection of pay of teachers through the Syndicate and Senate or all such cases should be routed through the Syndicate and Senate.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that Dr. Dinesh is right because there were no clear-cut algorithm and cases were being placed before the Syndicate. Then the Syndicate decided that similar cases should be dealt with in accordance with this decision. However, the Senate never resolved this issue. Now, what they could do is that these cases should be placed before the Senate and the Senate could resolve that these are the guidelines and the Vice-Chancellor is authorized to protect the pay of the teachers in accordance with these guidelines, on behalf of the Senate, which would definitely satisfy the

RAO. There might be a case, which might not be covered under those guidelines, and the same would again go through the Syndicate and Senate. He, therefore, suggested that they should approve the guidelines recommended by the Committee.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that these are the rules, which they are going to frame and the rules remained within the purview of the Syndicate only. If they read the UGC Para 10(4), it talked about the promotions as well as direct recruitments, wherein they had written that the service rendered in any affiliating Institution or University or an Institution or regulatory body, shall be counted for determining his/her eligibility for promotion as well as for direct selection. As such, the UGC is prepared to count that period for making his/her eligible both for promotion as well as selection. Thereafter, they make reference to the statutory body as they are governed by them. Secondly, the Senate has decided two times that instead of bringing it again and again to the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor is authorized to decide all similar cases. It has been decided even in the meeting of the Senate held recently. He is sorry to point out that there is a judgement wherein a mention of the circulars of Government of India as well Government of Punjab itself has been made stating that in order to promote the mobility of the teachers and the employees, they should give full benefit of the service rendered by them either in the State or Centre. He himself has one case namely Mohinder Pratap Chopra, who has now retired from Audit Department of Government of India. He had got the benefit of service and his pay was also protected and had also got the pension accordingly. Secondly, they are the masters of their situation and the Syndicate is the Governing body of the University and under Section 8 of Panjab University Act, the entire power is vested in the Senate. The Senate has not decided once but twice that such cases should not be brought to it again and again as the Senate has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take decision, on behalf of the Senate. The Senate for the first time took the decision to protect the pay of Mrs. Gurbax Kaur of University School of Open Learning. Now, the Committee has rightly said that they are not bound by the service rules of Punjab Government as they are masters of their own rules because the power to frame rules vests with the Syndicate.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that something similar was formulated by the Syndicate on 24.08.2013 and thereafter, they decided to protect the pay of the teachers case by case. Although it is true that the Syndicate is empowered to frame rules, the RAO is saying that the protection of pay should be done by the Senate. Therefore, if the rules framed by the Syndicate regarding protection of pay of teachers are got approved by the Senate, then there would not be any problem.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the Senate has decided twice/thrice that the teachers who have done M.Tech., LL.M., Ph.D., etc. should be given some advance increments, still the RAO says that he does not accept it. He suggested that the copy of the decision of the Senate (2014), wherein they decided that instead of bringing the pay protection cases of the teachers again and again to the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the same, on behalf of the Senate, should be supplied to the RAO. They could also say that they had also framed the rules for the purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that Professor A.K. Bhandari is right that even though they had authorized the Vice-Chancellor not once but twice to decide pay protection cases of the teachers, there is no harm in getting the rules/guidelines suggested by the Committee approved by the Senate and the same would also remove the objection of the RAO.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the problem is that most of the times, the members authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take decision on certain cases, but that particular line remained part of discussion only. Why the Registrar is not bringing an item for consideration that for such and such the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision and the same be got approved by the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he thought that this issued related to a particular teacher. In fact, it was discussed in the Senate, wherein he had asked how this issue has been hanging in fire till date. If the authority has been given to the Vice-Chancellor at par with other cases and in some cases the Vice-Chancellor has protected the pay and the same had been cleared by the RAO and in some other cases, he is writing that the Establishment Branch is seeking orders from the Vice-Chancellor as per authorization given by the Syndicate dated 04.08.2012 in respect of all cases of Panjab University without referring the pay protection rules framed by the Syndicate and Senate mentioned above. How this case is being singled out? As per this objection of the RAO, it seemed as if no case has been cleared by him, whereas Dr. Dinesh is saying that some of the cases have been cleared by the RAO. Why only this particular case is being pointed out is a matter of concern. It has to be seen whether some cases of pay protection have been accepted by the RAO. Even if he has cleared a single case, he has no business to reject any other case.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the recommendations of the Committee should be approved; however, a line should be added that the Syndicate authorized the Vice-Chancellor to allow protection of pay in terms of the rules framed by the Syndicate/Senate. Thereafter, this should be brought to the notice of the RAO and it should be referred that this decision they had already taken in such and such meeting of the Senate. He added that he could give them the instructions of Punjab Government as well as Central Government and also a judgement of first by the Tribunal and thereafter by the High Court on the issue. If the advocate of the University did not bring the same to the notice of the High Court, what could he do?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar remarked that whenever the issue related to Assistant Professors, the University did not take it seriously. The meeting of the Committee held on 30th January 2015 and today is 31st May 2015. As such, it took full four months for placing the recommendations of the Committee before the Syndicate. Secondly, even if these rules are approved by the Syndicate and Senate, these would be applicable prospectively and not retrospectively. So the cases which are already pending in the Establishment Branch would not be covered under these rules. The RAO would definitely accept the rules approved by Syndicate and Senate, but would say that these rules are applicable for future cases and for past cases.

It was clarified that it is true that the Syndicate has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to allow protection of pay of teachers, on behalf of

the Syndicate, but that authorization has been given by the Syndicate. The RAO says that this authorization is not on behalf of the Senate, which is the appointing authority of class 'A' employees. This is the technical objection, which the RAO has raised. Secondly, he says that either there should not be any rule/s for protection of pay and the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to allow protection of pay alone or if the rules are there, the Vice-Chancellor could be authorized to allow protection of pay in accordance with those rules only. There are certain ambiguities in the existing rules as they had adopted the Punjab Government Rules in the year 2007, but Punjab Government Rules could not be *ipso facto* application to the University employees because of the peculiar nature of Panjab University. Therefore, keeping in view those situations and ambiguities, these rules have been framed, which would cover all the cases, including pending cases. If these rules are approved by the Syndicate and the Senate with authorization to the Vice-Chancellor that all the cases, including pending cases, provided they fulfilled the conditions, there would not be any problem.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Finance & Development Officer to make a list of all pending cases, before the matter is placed before the Senate.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the recommendations of the Committee dated 30.01.2015, as per Appendix, be approved with the modification that these rules be made applicable even in the pending cases and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to protect the pay of the teachers in accordance with these rules, on behalf of the Syndicate and the Senate.

Arising out of the above, during zero hour, Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that there is another problem. The Establishment Branch is saying that either one could be granted increment for LL.M./M.Phil. or for Ph.D., whereas the UGC notification clearly says that one could be granted increments for both LL.M. as well as Ph.D. and two separate clauses existed in the UGC Regulations/Rules. He has been provided a list of 108 cases by the Registrar's Office out of which 35 cases are in accordance with new UGC Regulations 2009, which include pre-Ph.D. course work, but still they are not getting increments for Ph.D.

It was clarified that now the Establishment Branch has started issuing office orders stating specifically that in this case/these cases, the Ph.D. has been done in accordance with the new UGC Regulations 2009 and all those cases are being admitted by the RAO and increments were being granted.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Ph.D. increments have to be given to all, including those, who have done Ph.D. prior to notification of UGC Regulations 2009. The spirit of Ph.D. increments is: one could join as Assistant Professor without Ph.D. and those who had joined as Assistant Professor after doing Ph.D. meant that they had spent more than 5 years doing continuous work, the Government of India wishes to recognize those people. Therefore, in that spirit the five advance increments have been/are to be given. They should not go into the technicalities that one has done Ph.D. before notification of new UGC Regulations 2009 as this is not the spirit in which the five increments for Ph.D. have been given.

It was clarified that to resolve the issue a Committee was constituted and the recommendations of the Committee were placed before the Syndicate, the same were not approved. Now, the Committee has recommended that only those cases should be cleared for grant of five Ph.D. increments, wherein the persons had done Ph.D. in accordance with new UGC Regulations 2009.

When Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that nowhere it has been mentioned that the persons who had done Ph.D. before the notification of new UGC Regulations 2009, would not be granted increments for Ph.D., Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it has been in the UGC Regulations 2010 that increments for Ph.D. would be given only to those, who had done Ph.D. under new UGC Regulations 2009.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that, in fact, the UGC has given exemption from NET to those, who had done Ph.D. before notification of new UGC Regulations 2009, but the Government of India under Section 20 gave a direction that they could not do it and only those persons are exempted from UGC-NET, who have/had done Ph.D. under new UGC Regulations 2009. It related to appointment and for grant of increment, it has no connection.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to suggest as to how they could give maximum benefit of Ph.D. to maximum number of teachers.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that those, who have done Ph.D. comprising Pre-Ph.D. Course Work, etc. under new UGC Regulations 2009, have to be granted five increments for Ph.D.

On a point of order, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that new UGC Regulations 2009 are not applicable in the case under consideration as those are only for selection purposes.

Professor A.K. Bhandari, reading out the relevant provision, stated that 5 non-compounded advance increments could be admissible at the entry level of recruitment as Assistant Professor to the persons possessing the degree of Ph.D. awarded in a relevant discipline by the University following the process of admission, registration, course work and external evaluation as prescribed by the UGC. Though they did not make any mention of the new UGC Regulations 2009, these conditions have been laid down by them.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that there is no problem in granting five non-compounded advance increments to those, who have done Ph.D. under the new UGC Regulations 2009 and also to those who have done Ph.D. before 2006 are entitled to three non-compounded advance increments. The problem is only for those who have done Ph.D. between the year 2006 and July 2009. Therefore, they are suggesting that the persons, who have done Ph.D. between the year 2006 and July 2009, should be granted three non-compounded advance increments in accordance with old regulations. To this, even the Resident Audit Officer (RAO) would also agree.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that nowhere it has been mentioned that five non-compounded advance increments would not be given to the persons holding the Ph.D. degrees. The provision of the UGC says that incentive for Ph.D., M.Phil. and other higher qualifications to take effect from 01.09.2008. It meant that after 01.09.2008, the benefit of

Ph.D. would be given to those who have done Ph.D. comprising Course Work, External Evaluation, etc., but it did not mean that the benefit of Ph.D. would not be given to those who have done Ph.D. between 01.01.2006 and 01.09.2008.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that when the revised UGC pay-scales were implemented by the UGC w.e.f. 01.01.2006, instructions were issued by the UGC to all the concerned quarters that the incumbents holding the Ph.D. degree should be granted five non-compounded advance increments. Since the problem for grant of increments for Ph.D. is going on in the University for the last some years, no one has been granted increments for Ph.D. Now, an interpretation is being given by the RAO that a letter has come that only that Ph.Ds. are to be considered for grant of non-compounded advance increments, which have been done under new UGC Regulations 2009 and the persons who have done Ph.Ds. between 1996 and 2006 are entitled for 3 non-compounded advance increments as per 1996 regulations. However, as per revised UGC pay-scales, five non-compounded advance increments are to be given. He added that even the Director, Higher Education, Punjab had also cleared certain cases of the teachers having Ph.D. degrees regarding grant of five non-compounded advance increments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should take a practical view and the practical view is that in the interim way, they should accept what Professor Karamjeet Singh has suggested, i.e., grant three increments to those, who have done Ph.D. between 01.01.2006 to July 2009, and in the meanwhile, they should generate/obtain letters from Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University on the issue as to whatever they have done.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that even if they obtained letters from the Universities all over the country, nothing would happen and this he had also stated in the meeting of the Committee as well. He pleaded that they should try to go through the five objections raised by the RAO. The RAO is himself agreeing that if the five non-compounded advance increments for Ph.D. are to be given to even those who have done Ph.D. without pre-Ph.D. course work, etc., that should be got approved by the Board of Finance, Syndicate and the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment they should decide to give three increments to those, who have done Ph.D. between 01.01.2006 to July 2009, and in the meanwhile, they should obtain information from other Universities on the issue.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that the only solution to the problem is that they should classify each and every case. If they see the letter of the UGC, they would find separate heads, .e.g., 9.1, 9.4 and 9.6. There are three types of cases – (i) there are cases which are covered under the new UGC Regulations 2009, but the University did not forward the same owing to unknown reasons and the RAO is saying bring those cases for clearance; (ii) if they read 9.4 and 9.6 together, they would find that if the persons have done Ph.D. during the service, they are also eligible for grant of five non-compounded advance increments even if they have not done Pre-Ph.D. course work; and (iii) the problem persist only and only in one type of cases, i.e., the persons, who have done Ph.D. before joining Panjab University; rather, joined the University with Ph.D. and are claiming five non-

compounded advance increments, but their Ph.D. is before 2009. He suggested that it should be find out as to why those cases have been kept pending for the last more than 2 years.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that whoever has joined the University after 01.01.2006 is eligible for five non-compounded advance increments.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar read out the following provisions of UGC –

- 9.4(i) Teachers who have completed their Ph.D. while in service shall be entitled to 3 non-compounded advance increments if such Ph.Ds. are in the relevant discipline and has been awarded by a University complying with the process prescribed for enrolment, course work, evaluation.
- 9.4(ii) However, teachers in service, who have already been awarded Ph.D. by the time of coming into force these Regulations or having been enrolled for Ph.D., have already undergone course work as well as evaluation, if any, and only notification in regard to award of Ph.D. is awaited, shall also be entitled for 3 non-compounded advance increments. Now, the question is – if a person has enrolled himself/herself in the year 2008 and submitted Ph.D. in 2013 or 2014 without course work, are also covered under the above provisions.

To substantiate the same argument, 9.6 also says that the teachers in service, who have not yet enrolled for Ph.D. (meaning thereby 18th September 2010 when these guidelines were notified) shall therefore derive the benefit of three increments on award of Ph.D. while in service only if such enrolment is with the University which complied with the entire process, including that of enrolment, as prescribed by the UGC. As such, these two paragraphs are very explicit itself. And the problem persists only and only with one type of cases to which the RAO has raised five objections. One objection is that the University has said that increments would be given from 01.01.2006, whereas here it is written that the increments would be given from 01.09.2008. He (RAO) enquired how they could change the date determined by the Government of India and the same point was raised by Professor Karamjeet Singh in the Syndicate meeting dated 22nd December 2014. At that time, the Vice-Chancellor had said that the matter would be looked into.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the notification in this regard came on 31st December 2008 and according to him, the conditions imposed/prescribed in that notification would be applicable to those who have done/would do Ph.D. thereafter.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the last line of his objections, the RAO has suggested that if they wanted to give five increments, then they have to get the same approved from the Board of Finance, Syndicate and the Senate. Now, their efforts should be to convince the members of the Board of Finance on the basis of arguments given by Dr. I.S. Sandhu.

It was informed that a transitory provision is already there in the UGC Pay Revision Notification and not in 2010 Notification, but that provision speaks only about the teachers who are already in

service. So the problem is about the teachers who have been appointed with Ph.D. degrees and this issue has not been addressed in the UGC Pay Revision Notification. Taking into consideration all these provisions, a Committee was constituted and a point-wise reply to the objections raised by the RAO was prepared quoting relevant UGC provisions and Pay Revision Notification. So far as 01.09.2008 date is concerned, this date has financial effect. He had discussed this issue with the concerned section of the UGC also. Though they (UGC Section) is not ready to give any written clarification, they said 01.09.2008 only meant financial effect and these enhanced increments would accrue from that date, but it would be applicable from 01.01.2006 notionally. As in the case of allowances, allowances are enhanced, but no arrear is admissible for the allowances. In the same manner, the financial benefit of Ph.D. increments would accrue from 01.01.2006, but it has to be given effect from 01.01.2008 because it is a part of pay revision notification. So far as in-service teachers are concerned, there is specifically written that course work, if any.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they cannot have this situation go on and on for years together. It is lingering on for five years because there is some problem in the way their system works. Though he did not want to go into the history, his only concern is that the 7th Pay Commission is about to come and he did not want these anomalies to linger on and stretch beyond 2015. Since the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission would be effective from 01.01.2016, he only wanted that the basic pay of everyone should get fixed properly by that time; otherwise, they would get into trouble. Therefore, this matter requires absolutely urgent attention and it ought to get resolved in the year 2015 itself. He proposed that a meeting of the following Committee should be held within 5-6 days to resolve the issue –

1. Dean of University Instruction ... (Chairman)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor Ronki Ram
4. Professor Karamjeet Singh
5. Dr. Dinsh Kumar
6. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
7. President, PUTA
8. Registrar
9. Finance & Development Officer
10. Deputy Registrar (Estt.) ... (Convener)

RAO be also invited in the meeting of the Committee and the issue be resolved without any acrimony and the meeting be not adjourned until the issue is resolved. In the mean time, Dr. Dinesh Kumar, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Professor Rajat Sandhir (whom he (Vice-Chancellor) would make a personal request) should collect as much information as they could from Punjabi University, Patiala, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar or any other University within 2-3 days so that the Committee could study the entire information and take appropriate decision.

This was agreed to.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Finance & Development Officer to put the documents relating to objections raised by the RAO and other relevant documents to him so that he could also study the same.

Confirmation of certain faculty members 7. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following faculty members be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

I. DIRECTOR-PROFESSOR

P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur

Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
Dr. Harminder Singh Bains	Director-Professor	11.05.1963	23.01.2014 (F.N.)	23.01.2015

II. PROFESSOR

Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital

Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
Dr. Shefali Singla nee Shefali Goyal	Professor in Prosthodontics	21.04.1976	29.10.2013 (A.N.)	30.10.2014

III. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Chemistry

Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
Dr. Ramesh Kataria	Assistant Professor	02.07.1979	13.06.2013 (A.N.)	14.06.2014

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

RESOLVED: That the following faculty members be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

I. DIRECTOR-PROFESSOR

P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur

Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
Dr. Harminder Singh Bains	Director-Professor	11.05.1963	23.01.2014 (F.N.)	23.01.2015

II. PROFESSOR

Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital

Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
Dr. Shefali Singla nee Shefali Goyal	Professor in Prosthodontics	21.04.1976	29.10.2013 (A.N.)	30.10.2014

III. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**Chemistry**

Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
Dr. Ramesh Kataria	Assistant Professor	02.07.1979	13.06.2013 (A.N.)	14.06.2014

Confirmation of certain Laboratory and Technical Staff of Group-I

8. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following persons working in the Group-I of the Laboratory and Technical Staff (Pay-Scale Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/-), be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation and Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Shri Ajay Sharma Sr. Scientific Assistant (G-I) DCSA	14.06.2013	14.06.2014
2.	Shri Sudershan Kumar Lab. Supt.(G-I), Anthropology	25.06.2013 (A.N.)	26.06.2014
3.	Shri Kishori Lal Kaundal Sr. Technical Assistant (G-I) Chemistry	25.09.2013	25.09.2014
4.	Shri Rajinder Singh Sr. Scientific Assistant (G-I) CIL	10.03.2014	10.03.2015
5.	Shri Baljinder Singh Technical Officer (Production) (G-I) University School of Open Learning	11.03.2014	11.03.2015

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**)

RESOLVED: That the following persons working in the Group-I of the Laboratory and Technical Staff (Pay Scale Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/-), be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation and Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Shri Ajay Sharma Sr. Scientific Assistant (G-I) DCSA	14.06.2013	14.06.2014
2.	Shri Sudershan Kumar Lab. Supt.(G-I), Anthropology	25.06.2013 (A.N.)	26.06.2014
3.	Shri Kishori Lal Kaundal Sr. Technical Assistant (G-I) Chemistry	25.09.2013	25.09.2014
4.	Shri Rajinder Singh Sr. Scientific Assistant (G-I) CIL	10.03.2014	10.03.2015
5.	Shri Baljinder Singh Technical Officer (Production) (G-I) University School of Open Learning	11.03.2014	11.03.2015

Confirmation of certain persons working against the Ex-Cadre Class 'A' posts

9. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following persons working against the Ex-Cadre Class 'A' posts (Pay Scale Rs.10300-34800+GP 5000/-), be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation and Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Sh. Jai Kumar Technical Officer (ECE) University Institute of Engineering & Technology	17.10.2013 (A.N.)	18.10.2014
2.	Shri Arun Raina Technical Officer (Bio Tech.) University Institute of Engineering & Technology	17.10.2013 (A.N.)	19.10.2014
3.	Shri Ravneet Kumar Technical Officer (Mech. Engineering) University Institute of Engineering & Technology	23.10.2013	23.10.2014
4.	Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Technical Officer (EEE) University Institute of Engineering & Technology	04.03.2014	04.03.2015

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

RESOLVED: That the following persons working against the Ex-Cadre Class 'A' posts (Pay Scale Rs.10300-34800+GP 5000/-), be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation and Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Sh. Jai Kumar Technical Officer (ECE) University Institute of Engineering & Technology	17.10.2013 (A.N.)	18.10.2014
2.	Shri Arun Raina Technical Officer (Bio Tech.) UIET	17.10.2013 (A.N.)	19.10.2014
3.	Shri Ravneet Kumar Technical Officer (Mech. Engineering) UIET	23.10.2013	23.10.2014
4.	Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Technical Officer (EEE) UIET	04.03.2014	04.03.2015

Recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 02.12.2014

10. Considered the following recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 02.12.2014 (**Appendix-XX**) (except Item Nos. 5, 32 and 34).

ITEM 1

That Regulation 18 appearing at page 134 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 (effective from 20.09.2013), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of various University

bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>18. Except where otherwise expressly provided, nothing contained in the foregoing Regulations shall apply to-</p> <p>(a) Part-time employees of the University including part-time teachers in the Law College.</p> <p>(b) and (c) xxx xxx xxx</p>	<p>18. No Change</p> <p>(a) Part-time employees of the University including part-time teachers.</p> <p>(b) and (c) No Change</p>

ITEM 2

That Regulation 2.1 for Special Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged persons (effective from the session 2014-15), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>2.1 The minimum qualifications for admission to the course shall be pass in the four years Special Diploma in fine Arts for Deaf and Dump/Mentally challenged persons or an examination recognized as its equivalent in relevant discipline by the Syndicate.</p>	<p>2.1 No Change</p> <p><u>A candidate will be required to be present for interview as per admission calendar with a portfolio of their works before a Committee headed by the Principal/HoD. The decision of this Committee will be final. The selection will be strictly in order of merit in the following manner:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>weightage of 60% marks will be given for portfolio of works and programme of study submitted by the candidate.</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>weightage of 40% marks will be given for marks secured by the candidates in the last qualifying examination.</u></p>

NOTE: The page of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II has not been mentioned as the Regulations for above said course have been sent to the Govt. of India for approval.

ITEM 6

That Regulation 2 for M.Sc. Bioinformatics (effective from the session 2013-14), be amended as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
2. Bachelor's degree in Science (General or Honours with Biochemistry, Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Electronics, Genetics, Life Sciences, Mathematics, Mathematics & Computing, Microbiology, Physics, Statistics and Zoology), Agriculture, Computer Science, Engineering, Medicine, Pharmacy, Technology & Veterinary Science with at least 50% marks (45% for candidates belonging to SC/ST category).	2. Bachelor's degree in Science (General or Hons.) with Bioinformatics, Biotechnology , Biochemistry, Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Electronics, Genetics, Life Sciences, Mathematics, Mathematics & Computing, Microbiology, Physics, Statistics, Zoology, Agriculture, Computer Science, Engineering, Medicine, Pharmacy and Veterinary Science with at least 50% marks (45% for candidates belonging to SC/ST category). The admission will be based on Entrance Test CET (PG).

NOTE: The page of the Calendar Volume-II has not been mentioned, as present Regulation sent to Govt. of India for approval, which is still awaited.

ITEM 7

That change in nomenclature of B.Sc. (Home Science) Interior Design Management to **B.Sc. (Home Science) Interior Design & Resource Management** (effective from the session 2013-14), be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT NOMENCLATURE	PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE
B.Sc. (Home Science) Interior Design Management	B.Sc. (Home Science) Interior Design & Resource Management

ITEM 8

That an addition to Regulation 2.2 for Bachelor of Science in Home Science (Pass) examination (Revised) at page 57 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 (effective from the session 2013-14), be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

2.2(iii) A candidate who has obtained 50% marks in 10+2 examination and 50% marks in B.Sc. Home Science 1st Year examination is also eligible to opt. choice of streams of Composite, Dietetics, Apparel and Textile Design, Human Development and Family Relation and Interior Design & Resource Management, during B.Sc. (Home Science) 2nd year.

ITEM 9

That an addition to Regulation 7 at page 91 of the Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 for Master of Arts/Science Examination (Semester System) (effective from the session 2013-14), be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>7. To qualify for the grant of credits for a particular course, a candidate must get at least the pass marks. If he fails in the course, he will not get credit for it. He may repeat the course as a regular student in which he has failed when it is offered next. He may also be allowed to take the examination for such a course without attending the classes.</p> <p>If at the end of the second semester the successfully completed courses remain less than 16 credits, he will not be allowed to join the third semester. At the end of the third semester he must have successfully completed 24 credits to enable him to join fourth semester.</p>	<p>7. <u>No Change</u></p> <p><u>For M.A. (History)</u></p> <p><u>A student shall require 24 credits to get admission to Semester III and 36 credits for admission to Semester IV.</u></p>

ITEM 10

That an addition to Regulation 7 at page 91 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-15), be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>7. To qualify for the grant of credits for a particular course, a candidate must get at least the pass marks. If he fails in the course, he will not get credit for it. He may repeat the course as a regular student in which he has failed when it is offered next. He may also be allowed to take the examination for such a course without attending the classes.</p>	<p>7. <u>No Change</u></p>

<p>If at the end of the second semester, the successfully completed courses remain less than 16 credits, he will not be allowed to join the third semester. At the end of the third semester, he must have successfully completed 24 credits to enable him to join fourth semester.</p>	<p><u>For M.Sc. (Mathematics), a person securing a minimum of 24 credits out of 40 (total number of credits in the 1st & 2nd semesters) will be eligible to get admission from 2nd to 3rd semester.</u></p> <p><u>However, admission from 1st to 2nd semester and 3rd to 4th semester will be automatic, without any condition.</u></p>
---	---

ITEM 11

That Regulation 2 for B. Pharmacy (effective from the session 2013-14), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>50% marks in 10+2 (45% marks in case of SC/ST candidate) with English, Physics, Chemistry and one of the following subjects:</p> <p><u>Biology/Biotechnology/Mathematics/Computer Science</u></p> <p>The admission to B.Pharm. I is made on the basis of combined merit calculated from marks obtained in the 12th class (25% Weightage) and Common Entrance Test (CET) (75% Weightage conducted by the Panjab University).</p>	<p>50% marks in 10+2 (45% marks in case of SC/ST candidate) with English, Physics, Chemistry and one of the following subjects:</p> <p><u>Biology/Biotechnology/Mathematics</u></p> <p>No Change</p>

NOTE: The page of the Calendar, Volume-II has not been mentioned, as present Regulation sent to Govt. of India for approval, which is still awaited.

ITEM 12

That an addition to Regulation 12.7 for Master of Arts/Science examination (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12) at page 93 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

12.7. A candidate who having passed the second semester examination, discontinues his/her studies, shall be permitted to complete their third and fourth semester within five years from the date of passing of second semester examination.

ITEM 13

That Regulation 1.2 for M.Sc. System Biology and Bioinformatics (effective from the session 2013-14), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1.2 Admission will be based on performance in entrance test (OCET) and merit at graduation level with equal weightage for both i.e. 50% for entrance test and 50% for merit in graduation (session 2009-10).</p> <p>Eligibility for Entrance Test:</p> <p>B.Sc. (Honours School) in Biochemistry/ Biophysics/Biotechnology/Zoology or B.Sc./B.Sc. (Hons.) in Bioinformatics/ Biotechnology or B.Sc. with Bioinformatics/Biotechnology as one of the subjects.</p>	<p>1.2 Admission will be based on Entrance Test CET (PG) (50%) plus academic merit at graduation level.</p> <p>Eligibility for Entrance Test:</p> <p><u>Bachelor's degree in Science (General or Hons.) with Bioinformatics, Biotechnology, Biochemistry, Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Electronics, Genetics, Life Sciences, Mathematics, Mathematics & Computing, Microbiology, Physics, Statistics, Zoology, Agriculture, Computer Science, Engineering, Medicine, Pharmacy and Veterinary Science with at least 50% marks (45% for candidates belonging to SC/ST category).</u></p>

NOTE: The page of the Calendar, Volume-II has not been mentioned, as the Regulations have been sent to Govt. of India for approval, which is still awaited.

ITEM 14

That an addition to Regulation 3.1 for Bachelor of Computer Application (B.C.A.) at page 52 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>3.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join the first year class of B.C.A. course:-</p> <p>(i) +2 examination in any discipline with at least 50% marks and passed Mathematics as one of the subject at Matriculation level;</p>	<p>3.1 No Change</p> <p>(i) to (iii) No Change</p>

<p>OR</p> <p>(ii) Any other examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (i).</p> <p>(iii) The students who are placed under compartment at +2 examinations in the Annual examination and cleared the compartment examination up to the last date of admission of B.C.A. course in the Colleges be allowed admission as per merit and other conditions for admission to B.C.A. course.</p>	<p>NOTE:</p> <p>1. 10% weightage be given to those students who studied Mathematics or Statistics at +2 level; and</p> <p>2. 5% weightage be given to those students who studied Computer Science or Computer Applications or Information Technology or Information System at +2 level.</p>
--	--

ITEM 15

That Regulation 2(a) for P.G. Diploma in Guidance & Counselling (effective from the session 2013-14), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>2. The minimum qualification for admission to first semester of the course shall be –</p> <p>(a) A Bachelor's or Postgraduate degree in any discipline of the University or a degree of any other University which has been recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto with not less than 50% marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>Provided that in case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the University through Modern Indian Languages (Hindi/Urdu/Punjabi (Gurmukhi Script)) and/or in a Classical Languages (Sanskrit/Persian/ Arabic) or degree of any other University obtained in the same manner recognized by the Syndicate. 50% marks in the aggregate shall be calculated by taking into account full percentage of marks in all the papers in language excluding the</p>	<p>2. The minimum qualification for admission to first semester of the course shall be –</p> <p>(a) A Bachelor's or Postgraduate degree in any discipline of the University or a degree of any other University which has been recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto with not less than 45% marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>Provided that in case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the University through Modern Indian Languages (Hindi/Urdu/Punjabi (Gurmukhi Script)) and/or in a Classical Languages (Sanskrit/Persian/ Arabic) or degree of any other University obtained in the same manner recognized by the Syndicate. 45% marks in the aggregate shall be calculated by taking into account full percentage of marks in all the papers in language excluding the</p>

additional optional paper, English and the elective subject taken together.	additional optional paper, English and the elective subject taken together.
---	---

NOTE: The page of the Calendar, Volume-II has not been mentioned, as present Regulation sent to Govt. of India for approval, which is still awaited.

ITEM 16

That an addition of Regulation 13 for M.B.A. (Off Campus) (effective from the session 2010-11), be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

13. A candidate who has qualified for the award of M.B.A. (Off-Campus) degree from Panjab University shall be allowed to re-appear as a private candidate in the paper/s in which he/she wants to improve his/her previous performance. For this purpose, two chances shall be given within a period of five years from the date of his/her passing the M.B.A. (Off-Campus) examination. The candidate will be charged the prescribed fee. Improvement will not, however, be allowed in assignment/ dissertation/thesis and viva-voce.
 - *(i) A person who is allowed to re-appear in the M.B.A. (Off-Campus) examination under this Regulation may re-appear in both Part-I and Part-II examination simultaneously or Part-I or Part-II or both the parts separately.
 - (ii) Marks already obtained in other papers (except the paper of improvement) of that part shall be carried forward and combined with the other Part for purposes of improving the previous performance.
 - (iii) A person who chooses to appear in both the parts separately, but finds that he/she has improved the previous performance even with the marks of one part, may not re-appear in the other part.
 - (iv) The result of the candidate shall be declared only if he/she improves his/her performance provided further that such a person shall not be eligible for the award of any medal/prize for standing first in the examination.

*The candidate shall appear in 1st and 3rd Semester in November/December Examinations and for the 2nd and 4th Semester in April/May Examinations.

ITEM 17

That eligibility conditions for M.Sc. Nuclear Medicine (effective from the session 2011-12 and 2013-14), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

Eligibility criteria (effective from the session 2009-10)	Proposed eligibility criteria (effective from the session 2011-12)	Proposed eligibility criteria (effective from the session 2013-14)
<p>A candidate who has passed B.Sc. with 50% marks from a recognized University with Physics, Chemistry or Chemistry & Biology as core subjects. Candidates having B.Sc. in Biophysics, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Biotechnology, Pharmacy and Nuclear Medicine shall also be eligible for admission to the course.</p>	<p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. 1st year in Nuclear Medicine will be B.Sc. from a recognized University with Physics and Chemistry or Chemistry & Biology as core subjects. Candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine/Radiation Sciences, Biophysics and Pharmacy shall also be eligible for admission to the course.</p> <p>Admission to M.Sc. course in Nuclear Medicine will be through Joint Entrance Test, to be conducted by the Panjab University. The candidates should have passed the graduation (B.Sc.) from a recognized University/Institute with at least 50% marks. While deciding the final merit of the entrance test, a weightage shall also be given to the B.Sc. marks obtained by the candidate, as per the University rules. The cut off percentage marks secured in the entrance test will also be as per the University Rules.</p>	<p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. 1st year in Nuclear Medicine will be B.Sc. from a recognized University with Physics and Chemistry (Non-medical stream) or Chemistry and Biology (Medical stream) as core subjects. Candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine and Biophysics shall also be eligible for admission to the course.</p> <p>Admission to M.Sc. course in Nuclear Medicine will be through Entrance Test, to be conducted by the Panjab University. The candidates should have passed the graduation (B.Sc.) from a recognized University/ Institute with at least 50% marks. While deciding the final merit of the entrance test, a weightage shall also be given to the B.Sc. marks obtained by the candidate, as per the University rules. The cut off percentage marks secured in the entrance test will also be as per the University Rules.</p>

NOTE: The page of the Calendar, Volume-II has not been mentioned, as the Regulations are yet to be approved by the Regulations Committee.

ITEM 18

That Regulations 2.1 and 5 for M.A. (Community Education and Development) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2012-13), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>2.1 A person who possesses the following qualifications shall be eligible to join the course:-</p> <p>Minimum of 50% (45% in case of SC/ST) marks in B.A./B.Com./B.Sc. or an equivalent degree at graduation level from a recognized University.</p> <p>Admission will be made as per reservation policy of the University.</p> <p>5. A candidate must have obtained 40% marks in each theory paper, internal assessment and Project Work/Community Work/ Field Work separately for passing in a semester examination.</p>	<p>2.1 A person who possesses the following qualifications shall be eligible to join the course:-</p> <p><u>Minimum of 45% (40% in case of SC/ST) marks in B.A./B.Com./B.Sc./B.B.A./B.C.A.</u> or an equivalent degree at graduation level from a recognized University.</p> <p>Admission will be made as per reservation policy of the University.</p> <p>5. A candidate must have obtained <u>35% marks</u> in each theory paper, internal assessment and Project Work/Community Work/ Field Work <u>separately and jointly</u> for passing in a semester examination.</p>

NOTE: The present Regulations are yet to be approved by the Govt. of India.

ITEM 19

That Regulation 1.2 for Five year Integrated B.E. (Chemical) with M.B.A. (effective from the session 2013), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1.2 The duration of the course of instruction for Integrated B.E. M.B.A. in all disciplines being offered by the Panjab University shall be Five years. The teaching period will be divided in ten semesters. Each semester shall be at least of fourteen weeks duration.</p>	<p>1.2 No Change</p> <p>For Integrated B.E. (Chemical) with M.B.A.</p> <p>The duration of the course of instruction for Integrated B.E. (Chemical) with M.B.A. being offered by the Panjab University <u>shall be Five and half years.</u></p>

NOTE: The page of the Calendar, Volume-II has not been mentioned, as present Regulation sent to Govt. of India for approval, which is still awaited.

ITEM 20

That an addition of Regulation 11 for Five-Year Integrated Programme in Economics (effective from the session 2012-13), be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

11. "A candidate who has passed B.A. (Honours School) in Economics and/or M.A. (Honours School) in Economics examination from the Panjab University under the Semester System may reappear as a private candidate in a course/courses he/she wishes to, with a view to improving his/her performance as per the current syllabi/courses being offered. For this purpose, he/she shall be given two chances, within a period of 5 years from the date of his/her passing the degree course. The candidate in the first instance shall be required to intimate all the courses in which he/she would like to improve his/her performance. He/she will then appear in the respective course/s at the main semester examination, i.e., for the course offered for First, Third and Fifth semesters of B.A. (Honours School) and First and Third semester of M.A. (Honours School) in the November/December examination and for the Second, Fourth and Sixth semesters of B.A. (Honours School) and only Second semester of M.A. (Honours School) in April/May examination. Improvement will not, however, be allowed in 'On the Job Training' which is offered in M.A. (Honours School) Semester IV. If he/she does not improve his/her performance in any course/s, he/she shall be eligible to do so in the following year in the semester examination concerned which would be treated as a second chance. The candidate shall be charged fee as prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time for each course, subject to the maximum admission fee prescribed for the semester concerned."

ITEM 21

That an addition of Regulation 7.4 for improvement in performance for Master in Public Health Course (effective from the session 2011-12), be made, as under in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

"A candidate who has passed the Master in Public Health examination from the Panjab University under the Semester System may reappear as a private candidate in a course/courses he/she wishes to, with a view to improving his/her performance. For this

purpose, he/she may be given two chances, within a period of 5 years from the date of his/her passing the degree course. The candidate in the first instance shall be required to intimate all the courses in which he/she would like to improve his/her performance. He/she will then appear in the respective course/s at the main semester examination, i.e. for the course offered for First and Third semesters in the November/ December examination and for the Second and Fourth semesters in April/May examination. If he/she does not improve his/her performance in any course/s, he/she shall be eligible to do so in the following year in the semester examination concerned which would be treated as a second chance. The candidate shall be charged fee as prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time for each course, subject to the maximum admission fee prescribed for the semester concerned.”

ITEM 22

That Regulation 9 for Master of Laws (Annual System) at Page 398 Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 and Regulation 8 the said course under Semester System of examination (effective from the session 2009-10), be amended, as under in anticipation of the approval of various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

Present Regulation 9 LL.M. (Annual System) at page 398 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007	Proposed Regulation
<p>9. LL.M. students who got/get less than 55% marks in aggregate shall be given chance for improvement from the date of passing the LL.M. degree examination.</p> <p>Provided that improvement in performance by a candidate shall not affect the <i>inter-se</i> merit position determined on the basis of original examination and those who have passed LL.M. would be allowed improvement chance within two years from the date of gazette notification by the Government of India i.e. 6.5.2006.</p>	<p>9. LL.M. students who got/get less than 60% marks in aggregate shall be given one chance for improvement.</p> <p>Provided that improvement in performance by a candidate shall not affect the <i>inter-se</i> merit position determined on the basis of original examination and those who have passed LL.M. would be allowed improvement chance within two years from the date of approval of this decision by the competent authority.</p>
Present Regulation 8 LL.M. (Semester System) (sent to GOI)	Proposed Regulation 8 LL.M. (Semester System)
<p>8. LL.M. students who get less than 55 per cent marks in the aggregate of all the four semester examination shall be given one chance for improvement within two years from the date of passing the LL.M. examination.</p> <p>Provided that improvement in performance by a candidate shall not affect his <i>inter-se</i> merit position</p>	<p>8. LL.M. students who get less than 60 percent marks in the aggregate of all the four semester examination shall be given one chance for improvement within two years from the date of passing the LL.M. examination.</p> <p>No Change</p>

determined on the basis of original examination.	
--	--

ITEM 23

That the nomenclature and eligibility conditions for M.A. (Buddhist and Tibetan Studies) (for Private candidates), be added at pages 90 to 94, **as per Appendix**, Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, (effective from the session 2012-13), in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 24

That the amendment in Regulation 2.1 for Bachelor of Physical Education (B.P.Ed.) (One-Year Course) (Annual System) at page 295 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 and Regulation 2.1 for Bachelor of Physical Education (B.P.Ed.) (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2013-14), be approved, **as per Appendix A and B respectively**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 25

That the Regulations for Diploma in Forensic Science & Criminology (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), **as per Appendix**, be approved in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 26

That the nomenclature and the eligibility conditions for B.Com. LL.B. (Honours) 5-Year Integrated Course (effective from the session 2011-12 and 2014-15), be added, **as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

NOTE: As per decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012, the Regulations/Rules for B.Com. LL.B. (Honours) 5-Year Integrated Course would be the same except the eligibility conditions.

ITEM 27

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Yoga Therapy (Annual System) (effective from the session 2010-11), **as per Appendix**, be approved, in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 28

That Regulations for Advance Practical Training in Indian Classical Music (effective from the session 2009-10), be approved, **as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 29

That (i) Change in nomenclature of B.Sc. Ophthalmic-Techniques to Bachelor of Clinical Optometry (B.Optom.) effective from the admissions of 2011 and (ii) Regulations for Bachelor of Clinical Optometry (B.Optom.) (effective from the session 2011), **as per Appendix**, be approved in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 30

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Research Methodology & Statistics (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 31

That Regulations for B.Sc. (Honours) in Bio-Technology (Three-Year Course) (effective from the session 2004-05), **as per Appendix**, be approved, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 32**xxx****xxx****xxx****xxx****ITEM 33**

That Regulations for the following courses on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-2015), be approved, **as per Appendices**, in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

- (i) Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation & Networking (Semester System)
- (ii) Postgraduate Diploma in Health, Family Welfare & Population Education (Semester System)
- (iii) Postgraduate Diploma in Human Rights & Duties (Semester System)
- (iv) Postgraduate Diploma in Mass Communication (Semester System)
- (v) Postgraduate Diploma in Computer Applications (Semester System)

ITEM 34**xxx****xxx****xxx****xxx**

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the entire procedure for framing/amendment of regulations has been prescribed under Section 31 of Panjab University Act. The regulations are approved by the Regulations Committee, Syndicate, Senate and then by the Government of India. Firstly, the regulations are approved by the Board of Studies in the subject concerned, then the Faculty concerned and the Academic Council and thereafter by the Syndicate and Senate. Thereafter, the regulations are considered by the Regulations Committee and then again by the Syndicate and Senate. He suggested that after the approval of the regulations by the Board of Studies, Faculty and the Academic Council, the regulations should be placed before the Regulations Committee and thereafter before the Syndicate and Senate, which would save a lot of time.

Referring to Sub-Item 14 (Regulation 3.1(iii)), Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that this regulation says that the students who are placed under compartment at +2 examinations in the Annual Examination and cleared the compartment examination up to the last date of admission of B.C.A. course in the Colleges be allowed admission as per merit and other conditions for admission to B.C.A. course. He said that it is contrary to the provision according to which they used to make admissions of candidates placed under compartment. The result of the compartment examination normally came in the month of September. He, therefore, pleaded that the candidates, who are placed under compartment, should be allowed admissions within 10 days from the date of declaration of their first compartment examination result, especially of Punjab School Education Board.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the admissions of the students, who are placed under compartment at +2 examination in the Annual Examination and cleared the compartment examination, could be admitted only up to the last date of admission to the course.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that when they are already giving some time for admission of such candidates, there is no harm in giving some more time to them.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that every year a decision is taken that the candidates, who are placed under compartment at +2 examination, be allowed admissions up to the last date of admission. He suggested that an undertaking should be sought from such candidates that if they did not clear the compartment, their admissions be cancelled.

Referring to Sub-Item 15, Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that earlier, the candidates with not less than 50% marks in the aggregate were eligible for admission to P.G. Diploma in Guidance & Counselling and now, the same has been reduced to 45%. Similar is the position in Sub-Item 18. On the one side, they are lowering down the eligibility conditions and on the other side, the number of students securing higher percentage of marks is on the rise.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the minimum eligibility for all the courses should be same.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that since the seats were not being filled up, the minimum eligibility has been lowered down.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to check that if the notification has been sent, from next year the minimum pass percentage for each theory paper under Regulation 5 for M.A. (Community Education and Development (Semester System) (Item 18) should be raised to 40%.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that if these regulations have not been sent to the Government of India for approval, the amended Regulation 5 should read as "A candidate must have obtained 40% marks in each theory paper, internal assessment and Project Work/Community Work/Field Work **separately and jointly** for passing in a Semester examination".

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the proposed regulations are effective from the session 2012-2013, it meant they are already implementing them. However, from next year, the pass percentage for M.A. (Community Education and Development) (Semester System) would be raised to 40% again.

RESOLVED: That the above recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 02.12.2014, as per **Appendix-XX**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (1) in future, the recommendations of the Board of Studies, Faculties and the Academic Council pertaining to regulations, be directly placed before the Regulations Committee and thereafter, before the Syndicate and Senate; and
- (2) the students, who are placed under compartment at +2 examinations in the Annual Examination, be allowed admissions within 10 days from the declaration of their compartment examination result. However, an undertaking be obtained from them that in case they did not clear their compartment with the first attempt, their admissions would be cancelled.

Amendment of Regulation

11. Considered if, the following amendment in Regulation 2 for M.Sc. Home Science examination (Semester System) at page 104 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 (effective from the session 2012-13), in implementation of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012/20.01.2013 and in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette, be approved:

Existing Regulation	Proposed Regulation
2. A person who has passed B.Sc. Home Science examination with at least 50% marks in the aggregate from the Panjab University or an examination from any other University recognized as equivalent thereto shall be eligible to join M.Sc. Home Science.	2. A person who has passed B.Sc. (Home Science) in any of these streams i.e. Apparel and Textile Design, Composite, Dietetics, Human Development and Family Relations, Interior Design Management from the Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate or an

	<p>examination from any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with at least 50% marks in the aggregate shall be eligible to join M.Sc. Home Science.</p> <p>In addition to above, a student who has passed B.Sc. Fashion and Lifestyle Technology from Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate shall be eligible for admission to M.Sc. Clothing and Textiles only.</p> <p>Food admission to M.Sc. (Home Science) Food and Nutrition:</p> <p>A candidate who has passed B.Sc. (Home Science) in all streams i.e. Apparel and Textile Design, Composite, Dietetics, Human Development and Family Relations, Interior Design Management from the Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate or B.Sc. (Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics)/ B.Sc. (Nutrition and Dietetics) from any other University with atleast 50% marks in aggregate or an examination from any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with atleast 50% marks in aggregate shall be eligible to join M.Sc. (Home Science) Food and Nutrition.</p>
--	--

- NOTE:**
1. The Senate at its meeting held on 22.12.2012/ 20.01.2013 has approved that “the admission to M.Sc. (Home Science) be made open to the Students of all the streams from the session 2012-13.”
 2. The Principal vide letter dated 22.07.2014 has pointed out that all streams may not be interpreted as graduation in any stream but it should be interpreted all stream of B.Sc. (Home Science) i.e. Apparel and Textile Design, Composite, Dietetics, Human Development and Family Relations, Interior Design Management with at least 50% marks is eligible to join M.Sc. (Home Science). She has further written that B.Sc. Fashion & Life Style Technology with at least 50% marks may also be considered for admission to M.Sc. (Clothing and Textiles). Further she has bifurcated the eligibility conditions for admission to M.Sc. (Food and Nutrition).
 3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).

RESOLVED: That Regulation 2 for M.Sc. Home Science examination (Semester System) appearing at page 104 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, be amended, as under and given effect to from the session 2012-13, in anticipation of approval of

the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

Existing Regulation	Proposed Regulation
<p>2. A person who has passed B.Sc. Home Science examination with at least 50% marks in the aggregate from the Panjab University or an examination from any other University recognized as equivalent thereto shall be eligible to join M.Sc. Home Science.</p>	<p>2. A person who has passed B.Sc. (Home Science) in any of these streams i.e. Apparel and Textile Design, Composite, Dietetics, Human Development and Family Relations, Interior Design Management from the Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate or an examination from any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with at least 50% marks in the aggregate shall be eligible to join M.Sc. Home Science.</p> <p>In addition to above, a student who has passed B.Sc. Fashion and Lifestyle Technology from Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate shall be eligible for admission to M.Sc. Clothing and Textiles only.</p> <p>Food admission to M.Sc. (Home Science) Food and Nutrition:</p> <p>A candidate who has passed B.Sc. (Home Science) in all streams i.e. Apparel and Textile Design, Composite, Dietetics, Human Development and Family Relations, Interior Design Management from the Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate or B.Sc. (Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics)/ B.Sc. (Nutrition and Dietetics) from any other University with atleast 50% marks in aggregate or an examination from any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with atleast 50% marks in aggregate shall be eligible to join M.Sc. (Home Science) Food and Nutrition.</p>

Recommendation of the Faculty of Arts dated 27.03.2015

12. Considered the recommendation of Faculty of Arts dated 27.03.2015 (Para 8) (**Appendix-XXII**) in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council that the Regulations and Rules for M.A. Women & Gender Studies (Semester System) w.e.f. the admissions of 2015 be the same as are for other M.A. (Semester System). Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XXII**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That, w.e.f. the admissions of 2015, the Regulations and Rules for M.A. Women & Gender Studies (Semester System) course, be the same as are for other M.A. (Semester System) courses.

Recommendation dated 13.18.02.2015 of the Pension Committee

13. Considered minutes (Item No. 6) dated 18.02.2015 of the Pension Committee (**Appendix-XXIII**) with regard to introduction of New Pension Scheme of the Government of India in place of Old Pension Scheme. Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XXIII**) was also taken into consideration.

It was clarified that this is a proposal for implementation of new Pension Scheme of Government of India for all the employees, who have entered/would be entering into the University service on or after 1st July 2014. Since the University has already a Contributory Provident Fund Scheme, the existing employees either continuing with the existing Contributory Provident Fund Scheme or opt for the new Pension Scheme. New Pension Scheme is defined contribution of Government, which in fact meant that the 10% of the employer's contribution and the 10% contribution of the employees, which they earlier were managing, and the employees had the liberty to withdraw the same from the Fund Corpus as per the University rules, now the same would be managed by the Mutual Fund as in the case of Central Government employees. Now, they had no option, but implement the new Pension Scheme of the Government as the Government has made it compulsory for the Government employees as well.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as per existing scheme of Contributory Provident Fund, the 10% is deducted from the employees' salary, which includes basic pay, dearness allowance, certain other allowances, etc. and similar amount is contributed by the University, but as per the new Pension Scheme of the Government, 10% is to be deducted from the basic pay only and same amount is to be contributed by the employer concerned.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the new Pension Scheme had been implemented by the Government w.e.f. the year 2004, but the nationalized Banks had implemented the same w.e.f. 1st April 2010.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he would like to make aware them of the small information, which he received from some of the candidates and the same is relevant as they are recruiting people as Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors. If one had service somewhere and one is coming over to join Panjab University, and if one had better service conditions, including pension, at one's previous employer, which PU cannot accommodate, to overcome such a difficulty, the Government has come up with a very nice scheme/proposal in the context of Central Institutions, e.g., IISERS, IITs, etc. under which if one has more than 10/15 years of service at one's credit, one could come over to join another Institution and continue there for 10 years so that he could cross the barrier of 20/25 years of service for becoming eligible for the Pension with the previous employer. But for that the provision for sending one's contribution from new employer to the old employer should be there. He thought that at some stage, an appropriate proposal could be brought to the Syndicate for its consideration so that if some of PU's senior people joined other Central Institutions, they could also take advantage of such provisions. He would appoint a small Committee to examine and explore possibility for such a proposal.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the University has proposed the new Pension Scheme and the proposal is that those, who have joined the University between 01.01.2004 and 30.06.2014, would have the option either to continue to be governed by the Contributory Provident

Fund Rules/Regulations or opt for the new Pension Scheme. He had been expressing time and again that they are still not sure as per the regulations relating to the Pension, is it true that those who have joined the University after 01.01.2004 are not entitled to Pension. He had already given in writing that this contention is wrong. The date has to be taken at least to the notification of Pension Regulations. If the regulations have been notified in the year 2008, how could they put some persons to a disadvantageous position, especially those who have joined the University service in the year 2006?

Professor Ronki Ram stated that there is no confusion at all. While the Panjab University has a unique status and it also had its Syndicate and Senate, which approve various things, still one need to go to Government of India for pension related issues. The Government of India explicitly says that any employee, who has joined Government service on or after 01.01.2004, such an employee has no pension at all, since 31st December 2003 was the last date for becoming eligible for the Pension. Thus, how anybody who joined the service after 01.01.2004 could be eligible for the Pension!

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he understood the spirited views of Professor Ronki Ram, but in spite of that he (Professor Ronki Ram) is one of those, who had been able to achieve the Pension for PU. His simple contention is that if any of the regulations is beneficial to PU employee/s, they should work in that direction. It is written in Regulation 1.2(a) that all employees who joined service under the University before 01.01.2004 and this regulation had been approved by the Government. Under the same Chapter, the same Government has approved the regulation that the employees who joined the service of the University before the date of notification of these Regulations shall have the option – (i) either to continue to be governed by the Contributory Provident Fund-cum-Gratuity Scheme contained in Chapter VI “Conditions of Service of University Employees” of the Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 1994 or (ii) to elect to be governed by the Pensionary Scheme contained in these Regulations. He did not understand why they are sticking to 01.01.2004 only. If they say that they would not allow anybody, who has joined after 01.01.2004, irrespective of that fact whether the regulations permitted them to do so, that probably is not right spirit. Probably, Professor Ronki Ram is under the impression that it is the mandate of the Government of India that after 01.01.2004, no Pension Scheme is applicable anywhere, wherever it was applicable, it discontinued before 01.01.2004. In this contention Professor Ronki Ram has told, but it is a wrong notion as there are certain Institutions which are still giving pension to their employees as told by Shri Naresh Gaur that pension was made applicable to the employees in State Bank of Patiala up to 2010. Professor Ronki Ram has referred to Regulation 1.2 wherein it has been written that the provisions of these Regulations shall apply to all employees who joined service under the University before 01.01.2004. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) stated that there is another Regulation in these very Regulations (Regulation 1.9), which says that “An employee who is recruited at the age of thirty five years or more, may within a period of three months from the date of his appointment elect not to be governed by the Regulations of the Pensionary Scheme, where-upon he shall be eligible to be governed by the Contributory Provident Fund and Gratuity Scheme contained in the Regulations “Conditions of Service of University Employees”, Calendar Volume I, 1994 and the rules framed thereunder” and these Regulations were notified on 23rd February 2006. It meant, if

somebody, who is above the age of 35, on whatever date he has joined the service of the University, if he did not opt for non-acceptance of this Pension Scheme, he would be bound to be governed by this Pension Scheme. These regulations have been approved by the Government of India. If because of this mistake, should they try to exclude, those employees, who could be included by way of this regulation or they should try to exclude all by way of Regulation 1.2(a). Secondly, at that time, there were certain employees both teaching and non-teaching, who had withdrawn major portion from their Provident Fund and they were asked to remit the entire amount within a stipulated period, enabling themselves to be entitled to Pension, but they have not to remit the amount along with the interest. However, they would not be paid the arrears of pension. Meaning thereby, the day they remit the amount, pension would start to them and the regulations are open handed. If somebody, who was in service on 01.01.2004 and has retired say in 2006, remit the amount of Contributory Provident Fund, he is to get the Pension as per the regulations. But they say that since the Pension Corpus would be finished, they did not want anybody to enter into the Pension Scheme. Pension Corpus is otherwise also going to be finished, but Pension is one thing, where even the Government also could not back out or wash its hands off.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that he would like to make few clarifications. In fact, PU got the Pension in the year 1991 and at that time employees of PU were getting interest on the Contributory Provident Fund @ 14%, and some of their senior colleagues, who are still alive, did not opt for the Pension. However, when the rate of interest on Provident Fund came down, certain persons started asking for the Pension. However, if somebody did not opt for the Pension, how he/she could be the beneficiary? He added that when he became President, PUTA, he dug out all the old records/files and was able to make a fresh proposal for the Pension. He got support from various quarters, including Ministries at the Government of India level. He had also a meeting with Finance Secretary, who at that time, sat with them in the office of Ministry of Human Resource Development, and he (the Finance Secretary) told him the Pension Scheme which the Government had earlier approved for Panjab University, was no more there. After long discussions and argument, ultimately the Government people asked them that the Pension Scheme is only possible, if they (the University) tell them as to how many of the employees would like to opt for the Pension Scheme. Thereafter, they made the exercise of inviting the options and a significant number of employees opted for the Pension. However, some of the employees did not opt for the pension, for which one of the reasons might be that they did not have the requisite money, which they needed to refund to the University as they had withdrawn major portion of their Provident Fund from their accounts. Some of the employees opted for the Pension and deposited the University share later on, but they were given pension only after they deposited the University share. Ultimately, a Pension Corpus of Rs.230 crore was created. Now, those who did not opt for the Pension at that time, had no right to join/opt for the Pension. Each and every employee of the University was given time to exercise his/her option and after the expiry of the stipulated date, no one could be allowed to opt for the Pension later. Since everybody had been given opportunity to opt for the Pension, how anybody could be allowed to opt for the Pension at this stage.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since it pertains to a decision on the part of the employees in the past, they (the Syndicate) do not have any option at this stage. They should not be seen to increase the liability of the University now.

When a couple of the members said that the Regulations of Pension Scheme have been approved by the Government of India itself, the Vice-Chancellor said that right now the item for consideration is only the introduction of New Pension Scheme of the Government of India.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it has been clarified that the New Pension Scheme would be compulsory for those, who would join the service of the University on or after 1st July 2014, whereas the Committee has recommended that the new Pension Scheme would be compulsory to those, who would join the service of the University on or after 1st July 2015. He urged that this point should be clarified.

It was clarified that the new Pension Scheme would be compulsory to those, who would be joining the service of the University on or after 1st July 2015.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Pension Committee dated 18.02.2015, as per **Appendix-XXIII**, be approved.

Reply to Ministry of Human Resource Development, DHE, Government of India regarding overpayment of interest on GPF/CPF

14. Considered the reply sent vide No.671/VC/DS/ dated 26.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXIV**) to the Under Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi, in response to letter No. F2-2/2015-U-II dated 25.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXIV**), with regard to overpayment of interest of Rs.4.49 crore to GPF/CPF credited to the Provident Fund Accounts of Panjab University employees. Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XXIV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.08.2013 vide Para 10, while approving the recommendation of the Committee, has resolved that:

- (i) the employees be paid interest on Provident Fund and General Provident Fund @ 9.25% p.a. compoundable quarterly for the period 1.4.2013 to 31.3.2014; and
- (ii) observations made by the Director General of Audit (Central), Chandigarh (AX-I) and reply submitted by University (AX-III) be noted and University may continue with the existing policy for determination of interest rates as per existing rules and regulations framed, under Panjab University Act 1947.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that since it is a very important issue, the members should go through the related papers very carefully. He had written so many letters in this regard to the Government and the Officers of the Government of India understand the problem while sitting across the table, but in the end ask him to write once more. At the moment, he did not know how to handle the situation.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the Government of India Scheme of Provident Fund provides that the employees should be paid this much interest, which is the minimum but not the upper limit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, every year the Government of India fixed the rate of interest to be paid on the Provident Fund of the employees saying that they could not pay more than this interest, but they had been doing this keeping in view the interest earned on the deposits. He enquired had they ever given the interest at a rate lesser than the rate fixed by the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had given lesser rate than the rate fixed by the Government.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the reply, which has been given by the Vice-Chancellor, is the right reply.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that it has been mentioned in the letter written by the Vice-Chancellor to the Under Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, that 'the University never received any instructions from the Government stating that the interest on Provident Fund is to be allowed based upon the rate notified by the Central Government from time to time' and the same would not be accepted by the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a reply could be given that the issue was placed before the Syndicate and the Syndicate decided that notwithstanding the practices followed in the past, from now onwards the rate of interest on the Provident Fund of the employees shall be as decided by the Government of India from time to time.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that he is still of the opinion that the Government has fixed the minimum interest and not the upper limit. Citing an example, he said that the Government of India had provided that 15% reservation should be given to Scheduled Castes and the same is minimum guarantee and not the upper limit and sometimes, they give reservation more than 15%. What the Government has said in 9.25 that the employer should pay this much rate of interest and the same is minimum and not the upper limit. He should be shown where it has been written forbidding the employers not to give interest on Provident Fund more than the rate prescribed by the Government of India though the employer had earned more interest on their deposits. If the Government of India has to pay and bear the expenditure, only then they could object. If the Panjab University make investment/s of the amount of Provident Fund of the employees and earned more, why could it not distribute the earned interest amongst the employees concerned?

After some further discussion, it was unanimously –

RESOLVED: That a reply be given to the Government of India that after due consideration, the Syndicate reiterated the submissions already made by the University in the above referred letter dated 26.3.2015 and resolved that the following request be submitted to the Government:

1. that the Syndicate had approved the rate of Interest to the subscribers of the University Provident Fund, on the basis of the interest earned on the investments of Provident Fund itself, in pursuance of Regulation 14.9 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and it involves no loss to the Government exchequer.
2. that the Government may ratify the rate of Interest already allowed in the past as one-time exception. However, in future, i.e., from 2015-16 onwards, the University shall adhere to the rate of interest to be notified by the Government from time to time.

Recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committee of the Department of Laws dated 13.02.2015, 19.2.2015 and 25.2.2015

15. Considered the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department of Laws made in their joint meetings held on 13.02.2015 (Item 1), 19.02.2015 (Item 1) & 25.02.2015 (Item 9) (**Appendix-XXV**) that:

- (i) fresh/final fee structure of LL.M. 1 year course be approved for the session 2015-16 **as per Annexure-**, supplied by the Chairperson of Law in pursuance of the recommendation of the Committee dated 19.2.2015.

OR

- (ii) fee structure as per **Appendix-XXV** for LL.M. 1 year course for the session 2014-15, already approved by the Syndicate & Senate vide Para 29 dated 18.05.2014 and vide Para XLVI dated 25.05.2014 respectively, be applicable for the session 2015-16.
- (iii) the revised department fee structure of LL.B. (3 year course) for the next academic session 2015-16 as per **Annexure-** supplied by the Chairperson of Law in pursuance of the recommendation of the Committee dated 25.2.2015.
- (iv) the honorarium for evaluation of term paper and dissertation from the external examiner i.e. Rs. 150/- for term paper and Rs.200/- for dissertation be allowed (Committee dated 13.2.2015).

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.3.2014/25.5.2014 had approved the fee structure for LL.M. one year course. However, at the time of implementation of the said fee structure, representation received from the students as in the minutes

it was not clear whether the other charges as referred in the approved fee structure of LL.M. one year course were as suggested by the Committee in its meeting dated 9.5.2014 or it was as per the charges being recovered from the students of other departments at the University level. To resolve this issue, a Committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor which in its meeting dated 6.2.2015 recommended that fee structure may be reviewed to remove such ambiguity. The minutes of the Committee duly approved by the Vice-Chancellor placed at **(Appendix-XXV)**.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that a comparative chart relating to this item has been provided to them, which needed to be carefully looked into.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the problem is that though the Syndicate and Senate had approved the revised fee structure for the courses being offered by the Department of Laws, but the Department did not charge the revised fees. Now, the Department has recommended further reduction in those fees. He suggested that a Committee should be constituted to look into the whole issue and the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that even though the approved fee for LL.M. for the year 2014-15 was Rs.49,652/-, the Department charged a fee of Rs.20,277/-, which meant that the Department took about Rs.29000/- less from each student. Now, the Department in order to hide their mistake has proposed entirely new fee structure for the year 2015-16, i.e., Rs.34,877/-, which is about Rs.15,000/- less than the fee approved by the Senate on 25th May 2014 for the year 2014-15. Since the Department has 42 seats, it meant that the loss would be about Rs.6-7 lacs per year.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Department of Laws has recommended abolition of Rs.2,000/- (visit to other Educational Institutions), Rs.8,000/- (Dissertation fee), Rs.5,000/- (Term Paper fee), etc. The Department should be asked to give reason as to why these charges/fees have been recommended for abolition.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that no justification has been given by the Department for reducing the fees so drastically.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the Department should be asked to charge the fees from the students, which has been approved by the Syndicate and Senate. On the one side, the Department committed the mistake of not charging the fees

prescribed/approved by the Syndicate and Senate and on the other side, they recommended reduction in the approved fees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, earlier also when the fee structure was approved by the Syndicate and Senate, the fees were proposed/recommended by the Department itself and they had believed whatever they had recommended at that time. Now, they had recommended reduction in fees, without advancing any reason.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that since the admissions would be made in a couple of months and there would not be any meeting of the Syndicate in the month of June 2015, the fee structure already approved by the Syndicate and Senate, should be reiterated for the year 2015-16. So far as the reduction in fee structure recommended by the Department is concerned, a Committee should be constituted to examine the whole issue and the Department be asked to justify the proposed reduction in fees. Secondly, for the LL.M. 1-Year course, which the Department would be starting this year, its fee structure would be around Rs.1 lac reason being that the Punjabi University is charging Rs.1.25 lacs and Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law is charging around Rs.2 lac. Now, since LL.M. 1-Year is a new course whatever fee would be prescribed by the Panjab University, the students would pay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how could they charge more fee from the students of University Institute of Legal Studies than the Department of Laws for the same course.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since University Institute of Legal Studies is a self-financing Institute, they could charge more fee than the traditional/normal Department/s/Institutes. He, therefore, suggested that they should reiterate the already approved fee structure for the year 2014-15 and the Department should be sent a note that their proposal regarding reduction in fees has been rejected. He had discussed the issue with the Finance & Development Officer and they could make certain minor amendments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that don't touch that at all. They should reiterate the already approved fee structure. So far as reduction in fees is concerned, it should be considered again concurrently with fee structure for LL.M. 1-Year course.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since the proposal has come from the Department, instead of straightaway rejecting the same, they should listen to the Department as to why they had recommended reduction in fees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the fee structure already approved by the Syndicate and Senate should be reiterated. So far as reduction in fees proposed by the Department is concerned, the consideration of the same is deferred and the same would be considered along with the fixation of fee for the fee structure for the newly introduced LL.M. 1-Year course.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that LL.M. 1-Year course is being started at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana and they are confused as to which fee structure they would charge. As such, they have to constitute a Committee to suggest/propose fee structure for LL.M. 1-Year course to be offered at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana. He,

therefore, suggested that the Committee should be constituted and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendation/s of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the fee structure for LL.M. 1-Year course already approved by the Syndicate and Senate in their meetings held on 22.03.2014 and 25.05.2014, respectively, be reiterated.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the following Committee be constituted to consider, examine the reduced fee structure proposed by the Department of Laws and recommend a fresh fee structure for the LL.M. 1-Year course for the year 2015-16, including for LL.M. 1-Year course to be offered at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana:

1. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor Navdeep Goyal
4. Professor Karamjeet Singh
5. Professor A.K. Bhandari
6. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
7. Director, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana
8. Chairperson (both former and present)
Department of Laws
9. Chairperson (both former and present)
University Institute of Legal Studies

Recommendation of the Committee dated 25.03.2015 regarding revision of fee structure for the Degree Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce)

16. Considered minutes dated 25.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for revision of fee structure for the Degree Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce) affiliated to Panjab University for the session 2015-16.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora stated that he would like to bring to their kind notice certain deficiencies in the fee structure proposed by the Committee. The Committee has made one of the recommendations that the fee/fund/charges for Self-Financing Courses be the same as for the session 2014-15. However so far as grant-in-aid courses are concerned, the Committee has recommended 2.5% hike in fees/funds/charges (to be rounded off to nearest hundred) plus Rs.1500/- per annum as practical charges. In the courses (grant-in-aid) for which the Colleges received grants from the Government, the Committee has recommended 2.5% hike in fees/funds/charges, whereas in the courses (Self-Financing) which are to be run by the Colleges at their own where they needed funds, no increase has been recommended by the Committee. In fact, the self-financing courses depended 100% on the fees to be charged from the students. The Committee has ignored this fact and has not recommended any hike in the fees/funds/charges for the self-financing course. Further, the Committee has recommended Rs.125/- per month (Rs.1500/- per annum) as practical charges for M.Sc. (Physics, Chemistry, Zoology and Mathematics). If five practicals are held, then the expenditure would be Rs.30/- per month. There are 40 seats in M.Sc., is it possible to conduct CRO and Spectro Photo Meter Practical with just Rs.30/- per month? Rs.30/- per month is not even the fee charged by the Government schools. Thirdly, the Committee has not made any difference between the practical charges for M.A. and M.Sc. charges even though there are 60 seats in M.A.

Courses and only 40 seats in M.Sc. Courses. No institute could conduct practical of the students with a just a fee of Rs.30/-. In view of the foregoing, he pleaded that either the M.Sc. Courses should be converted into simple M.A. as done by Punjab Technical University (PTU) or the Board of Studies should be informed that the practical fee is only Rs.30/- per month and asked to include only those practical in the contents of the syllabi, which could be conducted with a meagre sum of Rs.30/-. Further, the Committee has recommended charges of Rs.630/-for unaided per subject course UG Courses, whereas majority of the undergraduate courses are aided and almost all the PG Courses being offered in the Colleges are self-financing. He enquired whether these charges were meant for undergraduate courses alone and not for postgraduate courses. There is another blunder. Is it possible that the fee for undergraduate courses could be more than postgraduate courses? The fee of Rs.19,500/- has been recommended for B.Com. course where 4 teachers are covered under grant-in-aid scheme of the Government and the unit also comprised of 70 seats, but for M.Com., which is self-financing course and the seats are also 40, the fee has been reduced to Rs.18,450/-. How could it be possible? Similarly, the fee for Honours subject is Rs.50/- per month and the parking fee has also been suggested to be Rs.50/- per month. The student is supposed to study a full-fledged paper in the 2nd and 3rd years, for which the fee has been prescribed only Rs.50/- per month. If 10 students opted for Honours in a particular subject, there would be an income of Rs.6,000/- per annum. With a sum of Rs.6,000/- per annum, none of the teachers would be ready to teach the subject. Similarly, in Table C, the charges for Certificate/Diploma/Advanced Diploma courses (Arts & Commerce) have been recommended Rs.1,300/- per annum, but in the second row, the charges have been recommended Rs.1940+645 = Rs.2,585/- for the same courses. In the end, he pleaded that for specialized courses, e.g., M.Sc. and M.Com., the reasonable and genuine fee structure should be there; otherwise, the quality of education would definitely be affected.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that it seemed that the Committee has not kept in view the fee structures for last 4-5 years while proposing fee structure for postgraduate courses and even if the Committee has, it has kept in view the fee structure of only those postgraduate courses, which are offered by the affiliated Colleges under grant-in-aid scheme. Further, the Committee has recommended different College running and Maintenance charges for various courses, e.g., Rs.3,624/-, Rs.12,364/- and Rs.3,664/- (for B.A., B.Com. and B.Sc. for affiliated Colleges situated in Punjab), Rs.3,835/-, Rs.10,085/- and Rs.3,835/- (for B.A., B.Com. and B.Sc. for affiliated Colleges situated in U.T., Chandigarh), Rs.8,100/-, Rs.10,791/- and Rs.7,879/- (for M.A., M.Com. and M.Sc. for affiliated Colleges situated in Punjab), and Rs.4,755/-, Rs.8,385/- and Rs.4,635/- (for M.A., M.Com. and M.Sc. for affiliated Colleges situated in U.T., Chandigarh). He did not know on what criteria, these charges have been determined. He pleaded that the fees for the courses being offered in the affiliated Colleges should be comparable with the University courses being offered by the University itself. Secondly, the fee structure proposed by the Committee is in order for the courses being offered under the grant-in-aid scheme. However, the courses which are being offered under Self-Financing Scheme, especially at the postgraduate level, there is definitely need to increase the fees/funds/charges.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that in a College where two units are going on, i.e., one covered under grant-in-aid scheme and another self-financing, how would they justify the fee?

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that though there are 9 posts of Assistant Professors in his College (all covered under grant-in-aid scheme), only one person is in position at this time and two persons have already retired and remaining positions could not be filled as the Punjab Government has imposed ban on recruitments. Though the course (B.Com.) would be counted under grant-in-aid scheme, only one teacher is there under grant-in-aid scheme. Such a position is prevailing in almost all the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that both types of courses, i.e., covered under grant-in-aid scheme and self-financing are being offered in the affiliated Colleges situated in the State of Punjab and majority of the teachers, who were covered under grant-in-aid scheme, have retired and their post are lying vacant as the Punjab Government has imposed ban on recruitment. As such, it could not be said that B.Com. is a self-financing course. Similar is the position of M.Com. course. If they treat B.Com. and M.Com. as self-financing courses, M.Sc. courses suffered and if they did not consider B.Com. and M.Com. as self-financing courses, how could M.Sc. courses be considered self-financing.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that when the posts covered under grant-in-aid scheme were declared in the year 1982, Commerce courses were not there. In the Colleges situated in the entire State of Punjab only few incumbents are covered under the grant-in-aid scheme of the Government.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired would the fee be reduced after the filling up of proposed 1925 posts of teachers in various affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora said that the 1925 posts are only for undergraduate courses.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that several Colleges are offering courses like B.Sc. (Agriculture) and B.C.A. and charging huge fee from the students, but they never made known the expenditure on them.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla stated that the Punjab Government has given direction to all the Colleges that no fee should be charged from the students belonging to Scheduled Caste categories and the Colleges did not charge fee from those students. Three-Four years had elapsed, but the Government has not refunded the amount to the Colleges.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that, in fact, they have not done a comprehensive study. Comparatively the fees of Panjab University are much less than of Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU), Amritsar. GNDU has raised its fee for undergraduate courses from Rs.17,000/- to Rs.19,000/-, whereas the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University are charging just Rs.11,000/-. He suggested that the fee structure of Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, should be obtained and thereafter another

exercise should be done. He also suggested that the Committee should be expanded.

It was clarified that for self-financing M.Sc. courses (Bioinformatics and Biotechnology), the fee is about Rs.50,000/-. They had kept the fee structure at the low level for traditional M.Sc. courses (Rs.17,650/-). Though the Colleges where these courses are being offered are grant-in-aid, the courses are self-financing because after the introduction of M.Sc. courses in the Colleges, the Punjab Government has not given grant to the colleges for these courses.

Principal Gurdip Sharma clarified that in no College affiliated with Panjab University except the Colleges situated in Chandigarh, M.Sc. courses are covered under grant-in-aid scheme of the Government.

It was further clarified that though the Colleges are covered under the grant-in-aid scheme of the Government, the M.Sc. courses are not. They prescribed a fee of Rs.50,000/- for the newly introduced self-financing courses, but the fee for the traditional courses, remained at low level even though the courses became self-financing. So far as B.Com. course is concerned, it is true that no comparison could be made between grant-in-aid and self-financing courses. They had increased the fee @ 2.5%, but the B.Com. fee has been enhanced by Rs.1500/-. So far as variation in College running and maintenance charges are concerned, it has been done to give some flexibility/freehand to the Colleges. A sum of Rs.1800/-, which is being collected from the College students, it remained with College concerned for payment of retiral benefits to the teachers.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu, referring to the amount of Rs.1,800/- for payment of retiral benefits to the teachers, said that under such a situation the Colleges would be compelled to appoint teachers on a consolidate pay of Rs.21,600/- p.m. He pleaded that the fees for the course/s should be such that salaries are paid to the teachers.

It was clarified that the proposal was to enhance the fees by 5%, but after discussion, 2.5% hike in fees was recommended by the Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a few days ago it had appeared in the newspapers that the Punjab Government has increased the fee of Medical Colleges by three times (from Rs.49,000/- to Rs.1.25 lac), and none objected to that. However, when the fees for the courses being offer by the Panjab University or its affiliated Colleges are enhanced a lot of hue and cry is made. If they did not allow hike in fees, both the University as well as the Colleges would not be able to pay salaries to the staff. On the one hand, they had sympathy with the students and on the other hand, they wanted to impart quality education. As such, they are in a dilemma and they have to find a via media. If they say that they are the Governing body of the University, then they also have to find solution to the problem. Since the problem is genuine, they have to find practical solution to it instead of showing sympathy alone.

On a point of order, Shri Naresh Gaur said that several highly qualified persons are working on a salary of just Rs.9,500/- p.m. There are Colleges, which took back major portion of the salary, from the teachers.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that they have also kept in mind that they are giving new courses to the Colleges and even when the course is in the second year, postgraduate course/s is/are also given. Professional courses like B.Sc. (Agriculture) are being given, even though there is no single regular teacher in the subject concerned in the entire College. No more than Rs.6,000/- p.m. salary is being given to the teachers. If they did not protect the interests of those Colleges, which are working properly, they would also join those Colleges, which are paying salary of Rs.6,000/- only to the teachers.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that they should enhance the fees/funds/charges by 5%. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to form a Committee to review the recommendations the fee structure of the Colleges comprehensively at least for the next academic session after obtaining fee structure from Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. This year also, the fees should be increased @ of 5%.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that, in principle, he is not against fee hike. Fees should be increased by having cost value analysis. Dr. Sanjeev Arora has pointed out that the fee for M.Com. is less than B.Com. Where it has been written that the fee for M.Com., could not be less than B.Com.? If they analyze, the Government portion in the M.Com. fee is less in comparison to B.Com. There are 70 students in a unit for B.Com. course and with a fee of Rs.19,560/-, the income from the fee would be about Rs.13.65 (Rs.40.95 lac say Rs.41 lac for three years). As per requirement, if five teachers are appointed, the expenditure would be around Rs.8.19 lac per teacher. As such, the Colleges are earning from the B.Com. course.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Karamjeet Singh) is assuming that the income from the fees is being spent by the Colleges just for payment to salaries to the teachers.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he had already set aside 30% income. In fact, 3 years ago, a Committee was constituted, which recommended two types of fee structure for B.Com. course, i.e., one for aided and another for self-financing. He is right that since there is only one teacher for aided course covered in grant-in-aid scheme of the Government, the rest of the teachers have to be managed from the self-financing side. A lot of hue and cry was made that such and such College is charging more fee than prescribed. Ultimately, it was decided that the fee for B.Com. course be kept in the middle of the two fee structure (figure between aided course and self-financing course).

Shri Naresh Gaur remarked that the B.Com. fee has been raised from Rs.13,000/- to Rs.19,500/- within just two years.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that earlier, the fee for B.Com. aided course was Rs.13,000/- and for self-financing course was Rs.32,000/-. Later on, the fee was raised to Rs.18,000/-. Though course is being offered in the grant-in-aid College, since majority of the teachers covered under grant-in-aid scheme have retired, the course is not covered under the said scheme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the situation is that the composition of faculty is almost self-financing and not grant-in-aid. As such, they have to take the decision keeping in view this fact.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that anomalies have been pointed out and the anomalies have been there because of 2-3 reasons. One of the reasons is that earlier there were two types of fee structures for B.Com. course, and the same was later on unified into one due to which fee for B.Com. is little bit more than M.Com. The constraint was also there that they have to increase the fees between 2.5% and 5%. Thirdly, the Committee was also told that the Colleges which are situated in the remote areas have conveyed that whenever the fee is increased, their enrolment falls down. He, therefore, suggested that this year, the proposed fee structure should be approved. However, for future, a possibility should be explored whether they could have differential fee structure based on geographical situations of the Colleges. Citing an example, he said that a College in Ludhiana might be able to charge more fee, but a College in Dhudike might not be.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that a fee for B.Com. course (e.g. Rs.16,000/- to Rs.23,000/- or Rs.24,000/- should be approved so that the Colleges could fill up the requisite number of seats by any fee between Rs.16,000/- and Rs.24,000/-.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there could be a problem in differential fee structure/fee slabs, e.g., in Law courses the private Colleges took higher fees from the students, who sought admission in the beginning, but later on they gave admissions to the students on less fees. He is in favour of fee slabs as the Colleges which provide better facilities could charge more fees, but this particular factor should be kept in view.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they have to take a decision now, they could take a practical view and fix the minimum fee hike at Rs.500/- and maximum wherever it comes at by enhancing @ 2.5%, but it is for the courses other than B.Com. and M.Com. However, for future, a Committee of Syndics should be constituted, which could recommend fee structure as per its wisdom.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that since Committee has made unanimous recommendations as per its wisdom, the same should be approved as they are. However, for future, they could constitute a Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the discussion is being held as if it is for the first time the fee structure for the affiliated Colleges is being defined, which is not as it is a continuous process. If today they are calculating, how do they expect that the practical could be conducted with a fee of Rs.30/- per month? He wondered how they were conducting the practical with this meagre amount during the last years. The Committee has applied its mind and made recommendations, to which some of the members are saying that there should be more hike in the fees/funds/charges because it is very easy to enhance the fees, but it is very difficult to say that they did not want any increase because he knew the practical difficulties being faced by the affiliated Colleges. But he wanted to remind that for the last more than 15 years, the emphasis was only and only on B.Com. course because most of the affiliated Colleges were running on

the strength of B.Com. course. The Committee comprising Principals of affiliated Colleges calculated everything and it was also undertaken that the Colleges would pay salary to the teachers as per UGC norms irrespective of the fact whether the College/course is covered under the grant-in-aid scheme of the Government or not. After taking into consideration each and every aspect (doing cost and benefit analysis), the Committee at that time recommended manifold hike in the fee structure for B.Com. course. Though manifold hike in fee was effected, whether salary to the teachers was/is being paid as per the UGC norms, he did not want to comment. Thereafter, they had increased the fees in a phased manner. For 2-3 years, heated discussions were held when it was pointed out that one of the Colleges is charging more fee than prescribed by the University. As the Vice-Chancellor was saying that how could it be possible that there are two different fee structures for LL.M. course one for Department of Laws and another for University Institute of Legal Studies? It was also pointed out in Colleges though same teachers were imparting instructions to a course, but students were used to be charged different fees and sometime even half fee was refunded later on. However, they did not know how they were able to waive off half of the fee. Later on, they came to know that there were two sections, one aided and another self-financing. Thereafter, they started charging the fees prescribed for self-financing classes even for the aided classes. Thereafter, last to last year perhaps, they decided to have only one fee structure so that nobody could be able to exploit. They claimed/pleaded that the Colleges are being run only on the strength of B.Com. course and have to subsidize other courses. In fact, B.Com. was considered to be a source for financing other courses and, that is why every year, the emphasis is only on the B.Com. course. For B.Com. the increase is recommended Rs.1,500/- and for the rest of the courses, the increased is only 2.5%. Coming to query that how the fee for M.Com. could be lesser than B.Com., he said that he just wanted to ask as to what was the fee during the years 2013-14 and 2014-15. Was it not less at that time also? In fact, it was lesser at that time also. If they see that chart, the tuition fee for M.Com. is Rs.3,600/- and for B.Com. it is Rs.2,700/-. The only major difference is that the College running and maintenance charges for B.Com. are Rs.10,085/- and M.Com. these charges are Rs.8,385/-. They have to see as to what was the difference between the B.Com. and M.Com. so far as College running and maintenance charges are concerned during the last year. The Committee has only recommended hike in fee @ 2.5%. As the Vice-Chancellor was commenting in the meeting of the Senate that they have to take into consideration the cost benefit analysis also and if they allowed minimum of Rs.500/- instead of Rs.250/-, what would be the quantum of income, which the Colleges would be able to generate. The major quantum of income, which would be generated by the Colleges, would be from the B.Com. course. They could themselves understand as to how much damage they would be making by increasing the minimum fee by Rs.500/-. They should see as to what was the fee structure for the last year and what has been recommended by the Committee this year. If it was viable to run the course/s last year, this year also, the course/s could be run. Therefore, according to him, this needed to be looked into thoroughly. They are not against the Colleges as they have to ensure that salaries are paid to the teachers keeping in view the ground realities that the Governments are withdrawing from financing the Colleges. He, therefore, suggested that the proposed fee structure should be approved for this year and heavens are not going to fall if they did not enhance the minimum of Rs.250/- to Rs.500/- for other courses also

keeping in view the strength of those courses. It has been rightly pointed out that those courses are mainly running in the Colleges, which say do not increase the fees. In fact, they had received representations in writing also stating that by increasing the fees, they are discouraging the people of rural areas from coming to the Colleges, but they did not realize that they are increasing the fees keeping in view the Colleges of Chandigarh, Ludhiana, etc. Though they could prescribe differential fee structure, for that they have to do an extensive exercise.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla, to the point that why the fee for M.Com. is less than B.Com., said that earlier two types of fees (aided and self-financing) were there, but when they unified the two into one, the fee for M.Com. became less.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora said that, in the beginning, he had said that to enhance or not to enhance the fees is to be decided by the Syndicate, but he has brought certain point to their knowledge. Secondly, if the Colleges could run a course with less fee for one year and met the expenses from other sources, it did not mean that they should not increase the fees at all.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that since the strength of even rural areas Colleges is also going down and the Colleges are finding it difficult to meet their expenses, the fees should be enhanced at least by 5% for B.A. courses also. He added that they should see the practical problems of the Colleges and take decision accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they, at the moment, are not a Fee Committee; rather they are considering the recommendations of the Fee Committee. It has clearly emerged that this issue needed a relook, but they should not keep this issue of relooking to next year. So far as enhancement in fees for affiliated Colleges for the year 2015-16 is concerned, the Senate in its meeting held on 26.04.2015 has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take decision on the recommendation/s of the Committee. Now, they would form a Committee comprising member of this Syndicate and Principal Gurdip Sharma, Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh and Dr. Kuldeep Singh.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.03.2015, as per **Appendix-XXVI**, be approved, with the modification that the increase in fee/s be 2.5% for all courses other than B.Com. and M.Com. courses, subject to the stipulation that the minimum increase be Rs.500/- and maximum Rs.1,000/- as is also inclusive of self-financing courses.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the following members be added to the Committee already constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for revision of fee structure for the degree Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce) affiliated to Panjab University for the session 2015-16, which would take practical view and make recommendations for the next year (2016-17):

1. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
2. Principal Gurdip Sharma
3. Shri Ashok Goyal
4. Dr. I.S. Sandhu.

Recommendation of the Hostel Committee dated 19.02.2015 regarding revision of rates of Handbook of Hostel Rule and Electricity Bill at P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur

17. Considered and

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations of the Hostel Committee dated 19.02.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) with regard to revision of Rates of Handbook of Hostel Rule and Electricity Bill at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, for the session 2015-16, be approved:

1. Rates of Handbook of Hostel Rules for PUSSGRC, be revised from Rs.50/- to Rs.55/-.
2. Since the Laptops are essential for students for performing day-to-day activities, no extra charges be taken from student. In order to compensate for this, the electricity bill be revised from Rs.450/- to Rs.500/- p.m.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 07.04.2015 regarding enhancement of Rent/License Fee, Water Charges of Campus houses at Chandigarh as well as Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana

18. Considered minutes dated 07.04.2015 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to enhancement of Rent/License Fee, Water Charges of Campus houses at Chandigarh as well as houses of Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 07.04.2015, as per **Appendix-XXVIII**, be approved.

Benefit of service rendered by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, FDO (Retd.) as Probationary Officer, United Commercial Bank w.e.f. 14.11.1969 to 25.07.1980 as qualifying service for pension purpose

19. Considered if the service rendered by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, F.D.O. (Retd.) as Probationary Officer, United Commercial Bank w.e.f. 14.11.1969 to 25.07.1980 be treated as qualifying service for pension purpose. Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XXIX**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 3.9 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I at page 184-185 reads as under:

“An employee appointed to a service or post shall be eligible to add to his service, qualifying for Superannuation Pension (but not for any other pension), the actual period, not exceeding one fourth of the length of his service or the actual period by which his age at the time of retirement exceeded twenty five years, or a period of five years, whichever is less if the service or post to which he is appointed is one-

- (a) For which postgraduate research of specified qualifications or experience in Scientific, technological or “Professional field” is essential, and

(b) To which candidate of more than twenty five years of age are normally recruited.

2. Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari joined as Administrative Officer w.e.f. 26.7.1980 in the P.U. Keeping in view the qualifications and experience prescribed and advertised for the said post, the Committee in its meeting held on 18.09.2014 (Item 23) (**Appendix-XXIX**) chaired by the Vice-Chancellor has observed that apart from the post-graduate degree, at least five years experience in academic administration or in business house at Executive Level was essential requirement. The members further observed that before joining Panjab University as Administrative Officer, Shri Bhandari had worked with United Commercial Bank as Probationary Officer from 14.11.1969 to 25.07.1980 and therefore, had the requisite experience.

In view of this, the members were of the unanimous opinion that Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari fulfills the requirement of regulation 3.9 for grant of benefit of addition of qualifying service for pension.

3. The Audit has observed/objected that the service rendered by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari as Probationary Officer in UCO Bank is not a professional experience.
4. Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari possessed about eleven (11) years of professional experience, working as Banking Professional, starting his career as a Probationary Officer in the officer cadre, undergoing about eighteen (18) months extensive training in various activities of Banking Operations, and reached the level of Bank Manager in a senior position. During his stint of service at UCO Bank, he occupied the following senior level positions in the Bank, such as:
 - (a) An Accountant (2nd senior most position in the Branch)
 - (b) Branch Manager (1st/topmost position in the Branch)
 - (c) Cell Incharge in Divisional Office (Punjab), Chandigarh (As head of Section/Wing/Division)
5. Senior Law Officer has legally examined his case in detail on the basis of facts and figures and opined that banking service at

the Executive/ Officer's level is universally considered and accepted as professional service. This fact has been agreed and accepted the world over globally. Therefore, Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari is legally correct for grant of service benefit to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari joined the University service in 1980 and perhaps had retired about 10 years ago.

When Professor Ronki Ram read out the information provided in the Notes to the item, some of the members suggested that a Committee should be constituted to examine the issue thoroughly and thereafter, make recommendation.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in case the service render by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari in a bank is counted for the purpose of pension, several such requests might follow.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no background has been provided as to why Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari has made the request so late and why he did not apply earlier.

Shri Jarnail Singh remarked that the Bank Officer might not have academic experience.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Bank Officers are professionals and why did they say that the experience of Bank Officers could not be counted.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since the case is pending for the last so many years, there must have some reasons.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari joined United Commercial Bank as Probationary Officer in 1969 and at that time there was a tough competition for entering into the service of Banks.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that after the nationalization of Banks, the competition for Probationary Officers in the Banks became very tough. Since the Engineers at that time were not getting jobs, majority of them became Officers in the Banks. Even the University toppers, especially of Science subjects, also became Officers in the Banks. As such, it is not true that the Bank Officers of that time were not well qualified/good.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that nobody is saying that the Bank Officers of that time were not good/well qualified, but so far as the competition is concerned, it is more tough now than at that time. Immediately after the nationalization of Banks in 1969, the Bank Industry expanded so fast and the people preferred to join Banks instead of teaching profession or bureaucracy as the Banks were giving handsome salary, and there were no jobs in any other field, but the competition was not so hard as it is now. However, his question was as to why this case was kept pending for so many years. So far as he could collect from the Audit objection, opinion of the Vice-Chancellor, office note, Syndicate, is that whether the experience gained by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari could be considered professional experience or not. Had the relevant point/s been touched, the issue would have been clinched immediately. He did not know whether he

(Shri Bhandari) has mentioned or not in his representation. In fact, his case is covered under Regulation 3.9 at pages 184 & 185 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and not under point no. 6(b) of the Appendix, which says "At least five (5) years experience in Academic Administration at the Executive level or in a Business House as an Executive". The whole issue has been handled by the Establishment Branch under Regulation 3.9(a), which says "for which postgraduate research or specified qualification or experience in Scientific Technological or "Professional Field" is essential". They observed that the experience earned by Shri Bhandari is professional, but RAO is saying that it is not professional experience. The Committee also observed that his experience is professional as he remained an Executive in the Bank and also remained as Accountant, which is the second highest position in the Banks. It has also been written that he remained Probationary Officer, but nobody could remain Probationary Officer for more than two years as the Probationary Officer meant Officer on probation and the moment, he/she completed the probation, he/she is not more Probationary Officer. Anyhow, his (Shri Bhandari) case is covered under Regulation 3.9(b), which reads as under:

- (b) to which candidates of more than twenty five years of age are normally recruited.

In the instant case, it says, at least 5 years experience in Academic Administration at the Executive level or in a Business House as Executive, which meant, he (Shri Bhandari) has done graduation and postgraduation and has five years experience. Thus, less than 26, he is not supposed to be. Therefore, it is covered under Regulation 3.9(b) where recruitment takes place after 25. Had they handled the case under this clause, then there was no dispute whether he had professional experience or academic experience or administrative experience. He is surprised because what was due to him, had not been given to him for so many years.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that the provision of 5 years service has been made only from the last few years. Certain cases from the teachers even have now been received.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the provision is very old, but it has been implemented only two years ago. However, they should not enter into that it should be informed to the RAO that it experience gained by Shri Bhandari is professional experience. They should simply say that since 5 year administrative experience is required in business house, his service rendered in the Bank should be considered.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath enquired wherefrom he has got the experience should be professional.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been written by the RAO.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the service rendered by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, F.D.O. (Retd.) as Probationary Officer, United Commercial Bank w.e.f. 14.11.1969 to 25.07.1980, be treated as qualifying service for the pension purpose.

Minutes of Executive Committee of PUSC, Directorate of Sports dated 28.03.2015

20. Considered the minutes dated 28.03.2015 (Item No.6) (**Appendix-XXX**) of Executive Committee of PUSC, Directorate of Sports, Panjab University.

RESOLVED: That recommendation 6 of Executive Committee of PUSC, Directorate of Sports, Panjab University, as per **Appendix-XXX**, be approved.

Resolution proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. Mukesh Arora, Fellows

21. Considered the following resolution proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow & Syndic and Dr. Mukesh Arora, Fellow:

“Introduction of M.A. (Sociology) under Private System”.

Explanation

At present there is no provision for the students of Sociology to study M.A. (Sociology) as a private candidate while the same facility is available in other subjects like M.A. (Public Administration) and M.A. (History).

Provision for Post Graduation in Sociology as private candidate may be allowed. This would help in acquiring higher education, which further facilitates in academic enhancement of the students.

NOTE: 1. The Faculty of Arts in its meeting dated 27.03.2015 (Para 9) (**Appendix-XXXI**) has approved the following recommendations of the Post-graduate Board of Studies in Sociology dated 27.01.2015:

1. M.A. Sociology under Private System be introduced w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16.
 2. the Field Work of Paper SOC. R 439: Methods & Techniques in Social Research of M.A. 3rd Semester be exempted for private candidates and be treated as internal assessment as in the case of other papers.
2. The recommendations of the Faculty of Arts will be got noted by the Academic Council in its meeting likely to be held in the month of June, 2015.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that why only M.A. (Sociology) alone is being allowed privately why not M.A. in other subjects. He pleaded that M.A. in the subjects where there is no practical should be allowed to be done privately.

RESOLVED: That the Resolution proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow & Syndic and Dr. Mukesh Arora, Fellow, be forwarded to the Senate with the remarks that the recommendations of the Faculty of Arts dated 27.03.2015 (Para 9), be approved, with the

modification that M.A. in other subjects where there is no practical be also allowed to be done privately.

Award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy

22. 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. Rozy Kamal Abhishek Niwas By Pass Road, Bhattakuffar Shimla (H.P.)	Science/Nuclear Medicine	DEVELOPMENT AND CHARACTERIZATION OF 99M TC LABELED RESVERATROL AND ELUCIDATION OF ITS BINDING TARGET IN EXPERIMENTAL RAT MODEL OF COLON CARCINOGENESIS
2.	Mr. Gurkamal Preet Pal Singh B-II, 860, Near Jaurrian Chakkian, Old City Kotkapura District Faridkot	Arts/Women's Studies	UNITED NATIONS AND WOMEN'S HUMAN RIGHTS: CHANGING APPROACH
3.	Ms. Neha Miglani House No.3337 Sector-15-D Chandigarh	Arts/Mass Communication	INFLUENCE OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND LEADERSHIP STYLES ON ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG MEDIA PROFESSIONALS: AN ANALYSIS
4.	Ms. Poonam Tomar H.No. 15, Defence Colony Hisar (Haryana)	Design & Fine Arts/Fine Arts	A SURVEY OF RELIGIOUS STRUCTURES IN THE UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH
5.	Ms. Kanupriya H.No. 3/B, Block-5 Rail-Vihar, M.D.C., Panchkula, Haryana	Business Management & Commerce	A STUDY ON CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS HERBAL FAST MOVING HEALTH GOODS (FMHG) IN NORTH INDIA
6.	Mr. Rohit Gangoli Boys Hostel No.3 Room No.44, Block No.2 P.U., Chandigarh	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	AMBEDKAR'S APPROACH TO SOCIAL JUSTICE AND ITS RELEVANCE TODAY
7.	Ms. Mridula Garg Singla H.No.994, Sector 7-B Chandigarh	Science/ Chemistry	SYNTHESIS CHARACTERIZATION AND REACTIVITY STUDIES OF NEW ORGANOSILANES AND SILATRANES
8.	Mr. Jagvir Singh C-601, Springdale Tower 2 VIP Road, Zirakpur	Engineering & Technology	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERISATION OF ZINC OXIDE NANOSTRUCTURES AND FABRICATION OF ZnO/POLYMER HYBRID FILM
9.	Ms. Neetu Bala HL-474, Phase-9 Sector-63, Mohali	Design & Fine Arts/Music	BODDH SAHITYA MEIN SANGEET-EK ADHYAYAN (BARTIYA PRIPEKSHYA MEIN)
10.	Ms. Rommani Sen 708, Basant Vihar Kasumpti Shimla (H.P.)	Arts/Mass Communication	CHANGING STRATEGIES OF PUBLIC SERVICE BROADCASTING IN INDIA: A STUDY OF DOORDARSHAN FROM 1984-2009

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
11.	Ms. Satinder Kaur V.P.O. Pakan Tehsil & District Fazilka	Languages/ Punjabi	CANADA DE PUNJABI NOVEL VICH PARIWAR DI SANSTHA DE MOOL TANAQ
12.	Mr. Jaideep Kumar House No.970 Near Govt. School Prem Nagar Sirsa (Haryana)	Science/Public Health	AYURVEDIC GERIATRIC HEALTH CARE PRACTICES IN HARYANA: A SYSTEMIC ANALYSIS
13.	Mr. Vinod Kumar S/o Shri Vasdev H.No.BS-37/60, Turi Bazar Ferozepur City	Law/ Law	A SOCIO-LEGAL STUDY OF CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE STATE OF PUNJAB
14.	Ms. Neha Nanda C/o Dr. D.K. Dhawan Department of Biophysics, P.U., Chandigarh	Science/ Biophysics	EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF CURCUMIN IN ENHANCING CHEMOTHERAPEUTIC RESPONSE OF DOXYCYCLINE BY MODULATION OF mi-RNA EXPRESSION AND APOPTOTIC MACHINERY DURING DMH INDUCED COLON CARCINOGENESIS
15.	Mr. Harvinder Singh H.No. 84, Delhi Colony St. No.3 V.P.O. Sri Bhaini Sahib Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	Design & Fine Arts/ Music	UTTAR BHARTIYA SHASTRIYA SANGEET MEIN DRISHYATMAKTA KI AWDHARNA (GAYAN KE VISHESH SANDARBH MEIN)
16.	Ms. Mamta Bhagat 183, Raja Garden KPT Road, Jalandhar	Engineering & Technology	EQUILIBRIUM AND DYNAMIC ADSORPTION OF SOME ORGANIC AND INORGANIC COMPOUNDS USING ACTIVATED CARBONS
17.	Ms. Randeep Kaur House No.H-424 Phase-I, Mohali	Business Management & Commerce	THE EFFECTS OF STRATEGIC INVESTMENT DECISIONS ON VALUE OF FIRM: EVIDENCE FROM INDIA
18.	Ms. Anandvir Kaur Saini V.P.O. Jaja Tehsil Dasuya Distt. Hoshiarpur	Arts/ Geography	CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES IN RURAL BIST DOAB (PUNJAB): A GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS
19.	Mr. Vivek Kumar Sharma V.P.O. Dari Tehsil Dharamshala District Kangra (H.P.)	Science/ Physics	STUDY OF SOLITARY WAVE SOLUTIONS FOR GENERALIZED NONLINEAR SCHRODINGER EQUATION
20.	Mr. Atul Bhalla WG 19, Islam Ganj Jalandhar City	Science/ Physics	INVESTIGATION OF PHOTON-ATOM INTERACTION PROCESSES AND APPLICATIONS IN ELEMENTAL ANALYSIS
21.	Ms. Tanvi Kiran House No.352 Chandigarh Professional Society, Sector-48-A Chandigarh	Arts/ Economics	WHEAT CROP PRODUCTIVITY AND SOIL FATIGUE: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF SELECTED DISTRICTS OF PUNJAB
22.	Ms. Akshu 746, Sector-16 Panchkula	Science/ Physics	DFT STUDY OF ENDOHEDRAL FULLERENE MOLECULES

Request of Dr. Deepak B. Salunke, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry for withholding of his salary

23. Considered request dated 31.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXXII**) of Dr. Deepak B. Salunke, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, P.U., that:

- (i) the salary for the month of March, 2015 and onwards, be withheld as he will get his salary from the Ramalingaswami Re-entry Fellowship Department of Bio-technology through G&P section of the Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ii) in case the salary for the month of March 2015 has been released, he will refund the whole amount of his salary to the salary section of P.U.
- (iii) he be given other benefits as per Syndicate decision dated 12.07.2014 (Para 10) (**Appendix-XXXII**) as an Assistant Professor at University.

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

NOTE: A copy of Order No.BT/RLF/Re-entry/16/2013 dated 25.03.2015 issued by Director/Scientist 'F', Govt. of India Ministry of Science and Technology Department of Bio-technology enclosed (**Appendix-XXXII**) in which it has been mentioned that the duration of the Fellowship is 5 years w.e.f. 1st March 2015.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the salary of Dr. Deepak B. Salunke, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, P.U., for the month of March 2015 and onwards, be withheld as he will get his salary from the Ramalingaswami Re-entry Fellowship Department of Bio-technology through G&P Section of the Panjab University, Chandigarh;
- (2) in case his salary for the month of March 2015 has been released, he will refund the whole amount of the salary to the salary section of Panjab University; and
- (3) he be given other benefits as per Syndicate decision dated 12.07.2014 (Para 10) (**Appendix-XXXII**) as an Assistant Professor at the University.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 11.05.2015 regarding fee structure for Cricket Ground of P.U.

24. Considered minutes of the committee dated 11.05.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) with regard to frame the Guidelines for membership fee of Cricket Ground of Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 11.05.2015, as per **Appendix-XXXIII**, be approved.

Regulations/Rules for B.A./B.Sc. (General & Honours) examinations

25. Considered minutes dated 12.02.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider the recommendations/ suggestions made by the Standing Committee with regard to framing Rules/Regulations for B.A./B.Sc. (General & Honours) Examination.

NOTE: Standing Committee minutes dated 19.08.2014 and 03.11.2014 enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

RESOLVED: That the Regulations/Rules for B.A./B.Sc. (General & Honours) (Semester System – 6 Semesters) Examinations under 10+2+3 system of education effective from the admissions of 2014, as per **Appendix-XXXIV**, be approved.

Branch Sliding Norms for all Engineering Institutes/ Colleges

26. Considered minutes dated 28.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXXV**) of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology along with letter No.3102/UIET dated 23.04.2015 (**Appendix-XXXV**) of Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology with regard to branch sliding norms. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XXXV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The meeting of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 28.03.2015 has approved that Branch Sliding may be implemented in all the Engineering Institutes/Colleges. But the Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology vide letter No.3102/UIET dated 23.04.2015 has changed the view of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology regarding the issue of Branch Sliding which is different from the earlier decision of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 28.03.2015.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology regarding Branch Sliding along with the addition/s suggested by the Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, as per **Appendix-XXXV**, be approved.

Modification in Syndicate decision dated 25.01.2015 (Para 29)

27. Item 27 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

27. To modify the Syndicate decision dated 25.01.2015 (Para 29) (**Appendix-XXXVI**), as mentioned below with regard to having accommodation on account of attending Conferences/Seminars within India:

Existing Provision	Proposed Provision
That the minimum of Rs.1500/- 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	That the accommodation charges for attending Seminars/Conferences etc. within India shall be allowed for an amount of Rs.1500/- per day or actual expenditure, or normal single room rent

for attending Seminars/Conferences, etc. within India.	as per their entitlement under T.A. rule, whichever is least, subject to the production of the receipt with in overall limit of Rs.20,000/- & Rs.10,000/- per annum out of the Budget head " Impetus to Research 'Education' sub-head, subsidy for attending conferences etc.
--	--

- NOTE:** 1. This facility will be applicable from the date of office notification. However, the subsidy which have already been paid/claim not to be considered.
2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.01.2015 (Para 29) had considered minutes dated 25.11.2014 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.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

RESOLVED: That the Syndicate decision dated 25.01.2015 (Para 29) (**Appendix-XXXVI**), with regard to having accommodation on account of attending Conferences/ Seminars within India, be modified as proposed below:

Existing Provision	Proposed Provision
That the minimum of Rs.1500/- 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.	That the accommodation charges for attending Seminars/Conferences etc. within India shall be allowed for an amount of Rs.1500/- per day or actual expenditure, or normal single room rent as per their entitlement under T.A. rule, whichever is least, subject to the production of the receipt with in overall limit of Rs.20,000/- & Rs.10,000/- per annum out of the Budget head " Impetus to Research 'Education' sub-head, subsidy for attending Conferences, etc. ".

NOTE: This facility will be applicable from the date of office notification. However, the subsidy which have already been paid/claim not to be considered.

Extension in validity period of Advt. No.4/2012

28. Considered if, the validity of the Advt. No.4/2012 for filling up the certain non-teaching posts (except the post of Gunman) be extended for a period of six months /one year from the date of lapse of the advertisement i.e. 12.05.2015 to complete the process.

NOTE: The Advertisement No. 4/2012 was released by the University inviting applications for filling up certain posts. The last date of receipt of applications was fixed for 16.4.2012. However the same was extended up to 15.5.2012

The date of validity of above advertisement was extended for one year more from the date of lapse of advertisement i.e. 14.05.2013 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.05.2013/29.06.2013 (Para-63(viii)) **(Appendix-XXXVII)** and thereafter the date of validity of the same was again extended for one year more from the date of lapse of advertisement i.e. 13.05.2014 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.04.2014 (Para-18) **(Appendix-XXXVII)**.

RESOLVED: That, to complete the process, the validity of the Advt. No.4/2012 for filling up certain non-teaching posts (except the post of Gunman), be extended for a period of six months /one year from the date of lapse of the advertisement, i.e., 12.05.2015.

Introduction of LL.M. (1-Year) course at University Institute of Legal Studies

29. Considered proposals dated 06.05.2015 **(Appendix-XXXVIII)** of the Director, University Institute of Legal Studies with regard to introduction of LL.M. Course (one year) with two specialization subjects namely (i) Law, Science & Technology (ii) Commercial and Corporate Law at University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS) from the Academic session 2015-16.

NOTE: The minutes of the Sub-Committee dated 19.05.2015 consisting of Professor Sangita Bhalla, Professor Rajinder Kaur and Dr. Virender Negi enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVIII)**.

RESOLVED: That proposals dated 06.05.2015 **(Appendix-XXXVIII)** of the Director, University Institute of Legal Studies with regard to introduction of LL.M. Course (one year) with two specialization subjects namely (i) Law, Science & Technology (ii) Commercial and Corporate Law at University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS) from the Academic session 2015-16, as per **Appendix-XXXVIII**, be approved.

Introduction of Foundation Course in Human Rights Education and its Regulations and Rules

30. Considered if:

- (i) the Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (3 months), be introduced from the Academic Session 2015-16.
- (ii) the Regulation and rules **(Appendix-XXXIX)** for Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (3 months) approved and be effective from the Academic Session 2015-16.

- NOTE:**
1. Faculty of Arts in its meeting dated 27.03.2015 (Item No. 13) **(Appendix-XXXIX)** has resolved that the Dean, Faculty of Arts be authorized to take appropriate action on the recommendations of the Board of Studies/ Board of Control regarding left-out subject/s if any, for the examinations of 2015-16 to avoid any hardship in regard to printing of syllabi.
 2. As per authorization given by the Faculty of Arts dated 27.03.2015 (Para 13) the Dean, Faculty of Arts has approved the Regulations/ Rules for Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (3 months), in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council, to be introduced from the academic session 2015-16 as recommended by the Committee to discharge the functions of the Board of Studies in Human Rights & duties at its meeting held on 12.03.2015
 3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIX)**.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (3 months), be introduced from the Academic Session 2015-16.
- (ii) the Regulations and Rules **(Appendix-XXXIX)** for Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (3 months), be approved and given effect to with effect from the academic session 2015-16.

Recommendations of Youth Welfare Committee dated 4.5.2015 of 31. Considered following recommendations (Sr. No. 7 and 9) dated 04.05.2015 **(Appendix-XL)** of Youth Welfare Committee that:

7. the name of the park in front of the building of Department of Youth Welfare be approved as “Shaheed-e-Azam Bhagat Singh Youth Park” which will be developed by the Department.

9. an honorarium of Rs.500/- per day for the Professor/Associate Professor, Rs.300/- for Assistant Professor/Lecturer, deputed as contingent in-charge/Team Manager/Administrative Officer/Deputy Administrative Officer during the National/North Zone/State Inter Varsity Youth Festivals and Youth Training Camps be approved along with T.A. No D.A. will be paid for these days.

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

RESOLVED: That –

1. the name of the park in front of the building of Department of Youth Welfare be approved as “Shaheed-e-Azam Bhagat Singh Youth Park” which will be developed by the Department.
2. an honorarium of Rs.500/- per day for the Professor/Associate Professor, and Rs.300/- for Assistant Professor/ Lecturer, deputed as contingent in-charge /Team Manager/Administrative Officer/ Deputy Administrative Officer during the National/North Zone/State Inter Varsity Youth Festivals and Youth Training Camps be approved along with T.A. No D.A. will be paid for these days.

Proposals in conformity with NCTE Regulations 2014

32. Considered proposals (**Appendix-XLI**) which are in conformity with the NCTE – Regulations 2014 –

- (i) that wherein meaning of one basic unit is defined with the ceiling of two units for each Education College for the session 2015-16.
- (ii) that annual Inspection Committee for grant of temporary/ extension of affiliation for B.Ed. and M.Ed. courses be allowed to visit the different Colleges as per NCTE Regulations.

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

- NOTE:**
1. The relevant clause 3.1 of Appendix-IV of NCTE Regulations 2014 regarding intake of students for B.Ed. Course clearly states that there shall be a basic unit of 50 students, with a maximum of two units.
 2. The Vice-Chancellor has approved the modalities as suggested by the Committee in its meeting dated 5.5.2015 (**Appendix-XLI**).

It was clarified that as per the new NCTE Guidelines, 2014, the duration of the B.Ed. and M.Ed. courses has been increased to two years.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that the NCTE has recently issued letters granting permission even for 4 units.

It was further clarified that regarding the number of seats in these courses, the Government of India notification clearly mentions that maximum 2 units are permissible in a College. A meeting was held on 22nd April 2015 in the office of the Chairman, NCTE wherein it was decided that the existing Colleges could have the same number of units as they were having earlier. After that, the Punjab Government issued a notification which was in consonance with the decision of the NCTE that the existing Colleges could have the seats earlier sanctioned. The University sought a clarification from the Punjab Government. The Punjab Government coordinated with the NCTE and withdrew that notification and issued a new notification in which it is clearly mentioned that the NCTE regulations shall prevail in terms of requirement of number of seats and number of teachers. Till date, there is no recommendation allowing more than 2 units to any of the Colleges.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they could write they follow the NCTE Regulations as amended from time to time. If the NCTE Regulations are amended, the same shall be accepted. The existing Colleges have been given the option under the regulations to retain the number of units which they were having earlier.

On a query made by Principal Gurdip Sharma about the B.A.B.Ed. course, it was clarified that that the colleges which had applied for composite course, the NOC have been issued by the University accordingly. The University Committee had devised a mechanism that only those Colleges be granted NOC which are either affiliated with the University permanently or NAAC accredited.

Principal Gurdip Sharma pointed out that they have not issued NOC in accordance with the decision taken by them for B.A.B.Ed. course. He added that as per the requirement of NCTE, they have to convert B.Ed. Colleges into composite Colleges. He pointed out that the Colleges which were running only B.Ed. course have been left out whereas the Colleges running B.Ed. and M.Ed. courses have been made composite Colleges.

It was clarified that NOC as well as orders regarding conversion of a B.Ed. College into composite College have been issued a couple of days ago and the College has also been given M.Ed. course.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that, in fact, he was not talking about M.Ed. Course but for giving B.A.B.Ed. integrated course to the Colleges.

It was clarified that the courses including B.A.B.Ed. has been given to all the Colleges, which fulfilled the conditions. He added that composite Colleges are those where courses in humanities, science, arts, etc. are going on or where 1-2 courses in education are being offered and only those Colleges could be given B.A.B.Ed. Integrated course. He also read out Regulation 2.1 of NCTE which reads "composite institution means a duly recognized higher education institution offering undergraduate and postgraduate programmes of study in the field of liberal arts or humanities or social sciences or sciences or commerce or mathematics as the case may be at the time

of applying for recognition of teacher education programmes or an institution offering multiple teacher education programme". Secondly, so far as B.A.B.Ed. programme is concerned, it could be offered in a composite institution as defined in Regulation 2.1. As such, Colleges which are offering B.Ed. course alone, could not be given B.A.B.Ed. Integrated course. However, they could be given M.Ed., B.P.Ed., D.P.Ed. courses.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Colleges which are offering only B.Ed. course, would have to take B.A.B.Ed. Integrated Course and if they have to take B.A.B.Ed., then whatever Principal Gurdip Sharma is saying on the issue is right.

It is again clarified that as per NCTE Regulation 2.1, the Colleges, which are offer B.Ed. course alone, could only take M.Ed., B.P.Ed., D.P.Ed., but could not take B.A.B.Ed. Integrated course.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are two options – (i) the College having B.Ed. course could either take M.Ed. course; or (ii) B.A.B.Ed. Integrated course, but the land condition/s would have to be fulfilled.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that that was why they had extended the date, the notification of which would come within a couple of days. He, therefore, suggested that a meeting of the Committee should be convened again to review the whole issue.

The Vice-Chancellor directed Professor Naval Kishore to convene the meeting of the Committee and asked him that it should be ensured that all the benefits should not be taken by Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that when the NCTE has decided that hereinafter there would be composite Colleges giving graduation as well as B.Ed. degree as one unit, would it not be discrimination, if they did not allow the Colleges, which are offering B.Ed. course, to add B.A.B.Ed. Integrated course?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could also be possible that the College having only B.Ed. course, might also have to go for B.A.B.Ed. Integrated course. Secondly, there is confusion about the date of retirement of teachers of Colleges of Education.

Principal Gurdip Sharma pointed out that a Committee has already been appointed. He pleaded that the meeting of the said Committee should be convened at the earliest.

It was clarified that as per the new NCTE Regulations 2014, the age of retirement in the Colleges of Education, is in accordance with the Regulations/Rules of State Government or affiliating University.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that until their amended regulations pertaining to age of superannuation are not approved by the Government of India, the writs relating to continuing in service beyond the age of 60 years, have no standing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, as pointed out, as per new NCTE Regulations 2014, the age of retirement is subject to State or

affiliating University and since the age of retirement as per State of Punjab, U.T. Administration as well as Panjab University is 60 years, the age of superannuation is 60 years. However, they have to see what was the age of superannuation as per earlier regulations, which were effective before notification of new NCTE Regulations 2014.

It was clarified that as per earlier NCTE Regulations 2009, the age of superannuation was 65 years.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the age of superannuation was 60 years, but in case the teachers are not available, they could be re-employed up to the age of 70 years on year to year basis.

It was clarified that as per NCTE Regulations 2009, the age of superannuation was 60 years and in the case of ineligible/non-availability of qualified persons, the incumbents could be re-employed up to the age of 65 years on year to year basis. But the NCTE issued a notification in 2010 through which the upper age limit was extended to 70 years. However, since the NCTE Regulations 2014 are in supersession to all, everything has been nullified. Now, if they wanted to do it, it should be done as per the Degree Colleges though it is not inconsonance with the regulations, wherein they had done that in the case of non-availability/ineligible Principal is there and the management could give the benefits from their own sources, the person concerned could initially be re-employed for two years, but the same would not be accepted by the grant-in-aid Colleges.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that though a Committee has been constituted to frame new admission guidelines under the chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction, no meeting of the Committee has been convened.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that the meeting of the Committee has already been convened.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that though certain members of the Senate belonging to affiliated Colleges were being appointed members of the affiliation Committees, they are not appointed as members of the Selection Committees. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to appoint them on the Selection Committees.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor has recommended introduction of 5-Year Integrated Course in Social Sciences w.e.f. the session 2015-16. He urged the members to approve the same so that admissions could be made accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not take any decision in haste because he remembered that when 5-Year Integrated Course in Economics was started so much ground work was done by former Professor A.C. Julka so that the course could become an exemplary one. If they wanted to start a similar course, they should proceed further.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Ronki Ram to bring detailed proposal to the Syndicate for consideration.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that if a person is re-employed in a College from where he/she has retired, there is no problem. Problem arose only in those cases where the retired person has to seek re-employment in other Colleges and for that a Committee has already been constituted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is the situation so far as degree Colleges are concerned. However, so far as Colleges of Education are concerned, they had already allowed re-employment up to the age of 70 years. He, therefore, suggested that the existing practice/system should be allowed to continue.

Closing the discussion, the Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Naval Kishore to get a regular item in this regard prepared for consideration by the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the following proposal which is in conformity with the NCTE Regulations 2014, be approved that –

- (1) wherein meaning of one basic unit is defined with the ceiling of two units for each Education College for the session 2015-16.
- (2) as per NCTE Regulations, Annual Inspection Committee/s for grant of temporary/extension of affiliation for B.Ed. and M.Ed. courses be allowed to visit the different Colleges.

NOTE: The relevant clause 3.1 of Appendix-IV of NCTE Regulations 2014 regarding intake of students for B.Ed. Course clearly states that there shall be a basic unit of 50 students, with a maximum of two units.

Regulations for M.E. (Regular) courses offered at NITTTR

33. Considered the recommendation of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 28.3.2015 (Item No. 10) (**Appendix-XLII**) that the Regulation for Two-Year M.E. (Regular) Courses and three & a half year M.E. (Modular) Course (Seven Spells) offered at NITTTR, Sector 26, Chandigarh, be approved w.e.f. the session 2014-2015. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XLII**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That the Regulation for M.E. (Regular) 2-Year Courses and M.E. (Modular) (Seven Spells) 3½-Year (three and a half years) Course offered at NITTTR, Sector 26, Chandigarh, w.e.f. the session 2014-2015, be approved.

Recommendation of Pension Committee dated 18.02.2015 regarding giving another chance to employees to opt for pension

34. Considered recommendation (Item No. 5) dated 18.02.2015 of the Pension Committee (**Appendix-XLIII**) that a letter be written to the MHRD for having approval with regard to giving another chance to opt the old Pension Scheme by those employees who joined the University service on or before 31.12.2003 and failed to exercise the option within the period as prescribed by the Syndicate. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XLIII**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. After the notification of the Panjab University employees pension regulation on 28.02.2006, the date for exercising the option was fixed 03.04.2006. But later on, on the representation of the Union the said date was extended up to 17.04.2006 by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 05.04.2006 ratified the above said dates for exercising the option for Pension Scheme.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 12.07.2006 (Para 6) again extended the date for exercising the option up to 31.08.2006. It was further extended up to 31.03.2007 as a special case by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.01.2007.
 3. 260 employees of the University who failed to exercise the option within the said stipulated dates filed the CWP No.3576 of 2015 in the Hon'ble High court for the states of Punjab and Haryana, praying therein that they may be given the opportunity to exercise the option for Pension.
 4. The Hon'ble High Court in its order dated 27.02.2015 has disposed off the petition with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioners by passing a speaking order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order (**Appendix-XLIII**).

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, according to him, they could not take decision to allow the widows/legal heirs of the deceased employees to opt for the pension on behalf of the employees concerned, but could plead with the Government to allow them to permit the widows of the deceased employees to opt for the pension because the employees concerned could not get any opportunity to opt for the pension. He added that this item has to be placed before the Syndicate today itself because speaking orders have to be passed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar drew the attention of the House towards the following paragraph:

“The Syndicate was empowered to exercise such powers for once and cannot extend date for option time and again. It is pointed out that if the dates extended time and again, there will be no end to it and it will affect the pension corpus adversely.”

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item, which should have been placed before the Syndicate in its April 2015 meeting as per the orders of the Court, has not been placed even today.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Goyal to go through the minutes of the Committee particularly Item 5 on page 4 of the **Appendix**.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the item under consideration is 'to consider recommendation (Item No. 5) dated 18.02.2015 of the Pension Committee (**Appendix-XLIII**) that a letter be written to the MHRD for having approval with regard to giving another chance to opt the old Pension scheme by those employees who joined the University service on or before 31.12.2003 and failed to exercise the option within the period as prescribed by the Syndicate' and the office expects them to go through the entire minutes and consider all the minutes. Earlier, they had given another opportunity beyond the year 2007 to the employees who could not opt for the pension. Another issue is that those employees who wanted to opt for the pension scheme within the stipulated time, but could not exercise option because the employee had already expired and their widows were not given a chance to opt for the pension. Such widows went to the Court wherein the University gave a statement that they had already decided in the Syndicate that the widows be given family pension and had allowed the widows even to deposit the requisite amount. Some of the widows had deposited the money which was later on refunded to the widows because it was not sure whether the Government would allow them the pension or not. The issue is, in fact, that whether it is covered under the regulation and could the widows or legal heirs of the deceased employees exercise the option on behalf of the employee concerned.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that once the Widows have lost their case in the Punjab and Haryana High Court. He added that he distinctly remembers that the Hon'ble High Court in one of its orders had observed that the widow of a deceased employee has no right to opt for the pension scheme.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he knew that in one such case the orders were passed by the High Court, but there was another case where the High Court took a positive view and the University made a statement and in view of that statement the writ petition was disposed off. Thereafter, when the University did not implement the same, the present writ petition was filed. They could themselves see that the University did not give a chance to the widows to exercise the option because the employee serving the University had already died. But they took a decision to give an opportunity to those who could not opt for the pension earlier up to 31st March 2007. As per the regulations, the employee was to exercise the option within the period as decided by the Syndicate and the option exercised once was irrevocable. As per those regulations, the pension could not have been reopened, but they reopened. When they reopened the option or when the employees could not exercise the option, they have to keep those persons in mind who could not afford to refund the money because the amount to be refunded was too much as most of them had withdrawn 90% of the amount at their credit. As such, they were waiting for an opportunity when they had sufficient money to refund to the University. The Resident Audit Officer had raised an objection that the 'The Syndicate was empowered to exercise such powers for once and cannot extended date for option time and again.... Senate/Syndicate has no powers to amend the regulation'. The University gave reply to the RAO, not that they would not reopen it again, but replied that the reopening of the option is not on the cards

of the University. The persons who have left are pleading that since the regulations are the same which were in force at the time when the options were reopened earlier, why could not the option be reopened again? Now, they are appending that if they reopened the option for pension again, the Government would not allow them. But they had not told anybody that when they reopened the option for pension in 2007, at that time also they had sought permission from anyone.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that that is why Professor A.K. Bhandari has told him that until their finances are secured by the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, they should not open the Pandora's box because that would jeopardize their transfer of funds Budget of Government of India from Plan Budget to Non-Plan Budget. As such, they had that uncertainty.

Professor Ronki Ram said that at that time also it was said that 'The pension cases will not be admitted beyond this date without the approval of Government of India as the Senate/Syndicate has no powers to amend the Regulations'. At that time they committed the mistake, but should not commit the same mistake again.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that they committed the mistake at that time when the pattern of funding was different, but now the pattern of funding is going to be changed totally by the Government of India. Secondly, if about 200 more employees were allowed to opt for the pension scheme, the burden on the pension corpus would increase exorbitantly, which would be certainly questioned by the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that firstly they have to get out of the headache of the Fact-Finding Committee which has been constituted by the Government to look into as to why the University is maintaining the budget in a different manner and is asking who has authorized the University to maintain the budget like this. The University clarified that the budget is maintained according to the Accounts Manual, to which the Government asked since when they are doing so. They had sought clarification from the University on 12 points. After submission of a reply by the University, the Government would decide whether the complaint that the University has misappropriated funds in claiming the deficit from the Central Government is valid or not. Until then, the funds would not be released by the Government to the University.

When a couple of members requested the Vice-Chancellor to find a way to give pension to the widows, the Vice-Chancellor said that since the widows case is easier to defend, they could keep the widows case in forefront and the reopening of the option for pension at the back and make a plea to the Government that the Court has asked them to consider the case of widows sympathetically.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they could plead that since the pension has been given from retrospective effect, it was impossible for the deceased employee to opt for the pension as pension was not available when they were alive. Therefore, their legal heirs should be allowed to opt for the family pension.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier they had reopened the option for pension ignoring the claim of widows though wrongly. Therefore, they could say that the case for reopening the option for

pension should also be considered sympathetically as the persons who are left could not opt for the pension because of non-availability of funds which were required to be deposited by them immediately after opting for the pension.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor would convene a meeting of the following Committee to examine the whole issue and contemplate and decide as to how they could come out of this problem keeping in view the fact that the University did not fall in a serious problem and at the same time if some people are benefitted that could also be thought of:

1. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor A.K. Bhandari
4. Professor Ronki Ram.

Routine and formal matters

35. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xvii)** on the agenda was read out and ratified:-

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of Syndicate has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 16.04.2015 (**Appendix-XLIV**) with regard to finalize the guidelines (**Appendix-XLIV**) for admission under the Reserved Category of Sports for MBA Programmes, M.Com. Hons. and in other teaching departments of P.U. Campus/P.U. Regional Centres for the session 2015-16.

(ii) In partial modification to office letter No. 3454-56/Estt.I (**Appendix-XLV**) dated 24.04.2015, the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has cancelled Extra Ordinary Leave Without Pay w.e.f. 31.03.2015 to 15.04.2016 instead of 01.04.2015 to 15.04.2016, already granted for two years w.e.f. 15.04.2014 to Dr. Nishi Sharma, Assistant Professor at University Institute of Applied Management and Sciences.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/ Senate, has approved the promotion of the following persons, as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400 with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, w.e.f. the date they reports for duty, against the vacant posts in the Department of Physics. Their pay will be fixed as per University Rules:

1. Mr. Prem Singh, Sr. Tech. (G-II), as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I)
2. Mr. Shakti Chand Danda, Sr. Tech. (G-II), as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I)

NOTE: 1. As before, all other terms and conditions of service and rules of the discipline and conduct as

contained in the University's Calendar, Vol. I & III and other rules and instructions framed there under from time to time shall be applicable.

2. A copy of orders issued by the A.R. Estt. vide Endst. No. 10367-68 dated 29.4.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XLVI**).

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Kuldip Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, w.e.f. 23.02.2015 (F.N.) by waiving off the condition of giving one month notice, 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, reads as under:

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

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has granted temporary affiliation for the following courses at Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32-B, Chandigarh, for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI before making admissions in the said courses/ subjects:

Sr. No.	Name of Course	No. of Seats
1.	MD (Paediatrics)	Six seats per year
2.	MD (Biochemistry)	Four seats per year
3.	MD (Radio Diagnosis)	Six seats per year
4.	DM (Neonatology)	Two seats per year

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has condoned shortage of Lectures of following Students of the department mentioned against each, for the academic session 2014-15, as recommended by the Board of Control of the departments (**Appendix-XLVII**):

Sr. No.	Name of the Students	Class	Department
1.	Ms. Kulwinder Kaur	MPH 2 nd Semester	Centre for Public Health (IEAST)
2.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	B.Sc. (H.S.)	Department of Chemistry

		4 th Semester	
3.	Ms. Sangeeta Katnaur	B.Sc. (H.S.) 4 th Semester	Department of Chemistry

NOTE: 1. Statements showing the shortage of lectures for the academic session 2014-15 of Class/Semester MPH 2nd Semester of Centre for Public Health (IEAST) and Class/Semester B.Sc. (H.S.) 4th Semester of Department of Chemistry enclosed **(Appendix-XLVII)**.

2. The Senate in its meeting dated 12.10.2003 (Para XXIII) has resolved that the power of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate to condone shortage of lectures be approved as under, the amendment/additions in the relevant regulations be made accordingly and given effect from the academic session 2002-2003 in anticipation of the approval of the Government of India/ Publication in Government of India Gazette:

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Board of Control and for reasons to be recorded, be authorized to condone shortage of lectures up to another 10 lectures delivered in various paper(s) to the best advantage of the candidate in addition to the authority vested in the Chairperson/ Head of the Department.

(ii) The Syndicate may, for reasons to be recorded, make further relaxation up to 10 lectures delivered in various paper(s) in cases of extreme hardship beyond the limit/s stipulated in (i) above.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Academic Council dated 2.7.2014 that the following weightage in the eligibility be added to Regulation 3.2 at page 52 of the Panjab University Calendar, Vol.-II, 2007 for Bachelor of Computer Applications (B.C.A.) course with effect from the session 2015-16:

(i) 10% weightage be given for each subject of Mathematics/Statistics and Computer Science/Computer Applications/Information Technology or equivalent to the candidate, who studied at 10+2 level at the time of admission in B.C.A. 1st year from the admission of 2014.

- (ii) 20% weightage in total to those students who studied Mathematics/ Statistics and Computer Science or Computer Applications or Information Technology or Information System at 10+2 level be given.

NOTE: The Academic Council at its meeting held on 2.7.2014 has approved the above mentioned provision from the admission of 2014, but the same could not be implemented, as the Academic Council was convened in July 2014. The Academic Committee of the Department of DCSA in its meeting held on 21.1.2015 has now unanimously approved the above provision w.e.f. the Academic session 2015-16.

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to make the addition in clause i.e. either of the options of clause 34 (b) at (iv) for appointment of Supervisors/ Joint or Co-Supervisors, in the Revised Guidelines for the award of Ph.D. Degree, already circulated vide No.ST.4732-4821 dated 28.05.2014 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) as under:

Existing	Amended
<p>34. Norms for appointment of Supervisors/ Joint or Co-Supervisors:</p> <p>(1) Teachers/scientists working in the University Teaching Departments, University Institutes, University Schools, University Centres, Panjab University Regional Centres/ Government Institute of the level of CSIR Lab., DST approved Institutions, BARC, etc./approved Research Centres or affiliated Colleges of Panjab University shall be eligible to become Supervisors/ Joint or Co-Supervisors for guiding Ph.D. research provided they fulfill the following conditions:</p> <p>(a) Hold the Ph.D. degree</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>(b) (i) have published post-doctoral research work in the form of books, articles, research papers in referred research journals, patents for at least two years. The published work should not be a part of his/her Ph.D. thesis</p>	<p>34. Norms for appointment of Supervisors/ Joint or Co-Supervisors:</p> <p>(1) No Change</p> <p>(a) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>(b) (i) No Change</p>

OR	OR
(ii) have teaching experience of at least two years and have a research project with provision to take a research student from some National/ State Funding Agency like DST, UGC, DRDO etc.	(ii) No Change
OR	OR
(iii) have five years' experience of teaching Postgraduate Classes , though may not have any published research work other than that of Ph.D. However, such teachers would be allowed to supervise maximum of two candidates up to July 2017. During this period, all such Supervisors would have to publish two research papers independently or a book other than text book or edited book. Those who fail to meet the aforesaid requirement by July 2017, would be ineligible for registering more students.	(iii) No Change
	OR
	(iv) have at least 10 years experience in related industry with research profile and good quality of research work/in terms of research papers/patents/tech. transfer etc. duly approved by academic and administrative committee of the concerned department which before deciding will evaluate the profile of the proposed Supervisor/ Joint Supervisor.

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Shri Raghbir Singh, Jr. Tech. (G-III) (Retired on 30.04.2015), Department of Psychology on contractual basis on fixed remuneration of Rs.20,000/- p.m. for a period of two months w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, as a special case. His salary be charged/paid from the post of Jr. Tech. (G-III) vacated by him on his retirement.

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) to the following candidates, whose viva voce were conducted between 24.01.2015 to 13.03.2015, at 64th Annual Convocation of Panjab University, held on 14.03.2015:

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
1.	3010	Neeraj Kumar	Pharmaceutical Sciences	DEVELOPMENT OF TOPICAL FORMULATIONS OF

				ITRACONAZOLE USING NOVEL COLLOIDAL CARRIER SYSTEMS
2.	3011	Honey	Pharmaceutical Sciences	STUDIES ON DEVELOPMENT OF TARGETED DRUG DELIVERY SYSTEMS FOR COLON CANCER
3.	3012	Rashbinder Kaur Grewal	Science/ Microbiology	ROLE OF CERVICAL MICROFLORA AND THEIR EXTRACELLULAR PRODUCTS IN CASES OF UNEXPLAINED INFERTILITY IN HUMAN FEMALES
4.	3013	Isha Rani	Science/ Biochemistry	EFFECT OF FISH OIL ON CHEMOTHERAPEUTIC EFFICACY OF 5-FLUOROURACIL IN EXPERIMENTAL COLON CARCINOGENESIS
5.	3014	Vaneeta Bala	Science/Physics	THEORETICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF SEMICONDUCTOR/ POLYMER NANOCOMPOSITES
6.	3015	Sheenam Girdhar	Science/ Chemistry	AN EXPLORATION IN THE FIELD OF PENTA-AND HEXACOORDINATED SILICON COMPOUNDS: SYNTHESIS, CHARACTERIZATION AND REACTIVITY STUDIES
7.	3016	Varsha Singh	Science/ Biochemistry	STUDIES ON REGULATORY EFFECTS OF HEPATOCYTE NUCLEAR FACTORS-1 FAMILY TRANSCRIPTON FACTORS ON POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE – 1 GENE PROMOTER
8.	3017	Gurdeep Kaur	Science/ Biotechnology	NITRILE-DEGRADING ENZYME FROM AN EXTREMOPHILE: OPTIMIZING CONDITIONS FOR MAXIMAL PRODUCTION, PURIFICATION, CHARACTERIZATION AND GENE(S) CLONING
9.	3018	Apneet Kaur	Science/ Zoology	STOCK IDENTIFICATION OF TWO COMMERCIAL CARPS, <i>LABEO ROHITA</i> (HAMILTON-BUCHANAN, 1822) AND <i>CYPRINUS CARPIO</i> LINNAEUS, 1758 FROM DIFFERENT LOCALITIES OF PUNJAB AND HIMACHAL PRADESH
10.	3019	Richa Sharma	Science/Physics	STUDY OF NEUTRINO INTERACTIONS IN MINOS
11.	3020	Ruchi Gupta	Science/Physics	STUDY OF MULTIJET EVENTS IN P-P COLLISIONS AT 7 TEV USING THE CMS DETECTOR AT THE LHC
12.	3021	Vineet Kumar	Science/ Zoology	ULTRASTRUCTURAL STUDIES ON SPLEEN OF NORMAL, <i>PLASMODIUM BERGHEI</i> (NK-65) INFECTED AND IMMUNIZED BALB/C MICE
13.	3022	Kirti Singhal	Science/ Biochemistry	STUDIES ON THE ALTERATIONS IN CALCIUM HOMEOSTASIS IN HYPERGLYCEMIA-INDUCED COGNITIVE DECLINE IN EXPERIMENTAL DIABETES

14.	3023	Vibha Mandhan	Science/ Biotechnology	MINING THE <i>STEVIA REBAUDIANA</i> SMR NAOME FOR IDENTIFICATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF MICRORNAS
15.	3024	Gurjeet Gujral	Science/ Chemistry	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERISATION OF MIXED ALKYL/ARYL PYRIDYL AND PICOLYL CHALCOGENIDES (E=Se, Te) AND THEIR DERIVATIVES
16.	3025	Karanbir Singh	Arts/History	GHADAR AND LEFT MOVEMENTS: ROLE OF SOHAN SINGH BHAKNA
17.	3026	Uma	Arts/Public Administration	ADMINISTRATION AND PERFORMANCE OF JAWAHAR NAVODAYA VIDYALAYAS IN PUNJAB
18.	3027	Mani Pal	Arts/Sociology	JOB RESERVATION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION: A STUDY OF SCHEDULED CASTE EMPLOYEES IN CHANDIGARH
19.	3028	Ekta Sachdeva	Arts/History	MAHATMA GANDHI'S PRESENCE IN PUNJAB
20.	3029	Khushboo Mahajan	Arts/Political Science	URBAN MIDDLE CLASSES, DEMOCRATIC POLITICS AND ECONOMIC REFORMS: A CASE STUDY OF CHANDIGARH CITY
21.	3030	Tania Gupta	Education/ Education	COMMUNITY PERCEPTION OF COMMERCIALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDIA
22.	3031	Sonam Bansal	Education/ Education	EFFECT OF COLLABORATIVE LEARNING ON LONELINESS, SENSE OF COHERENCE AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR AMONG CHILDREN WITH DISABILITY IN INCLUSIVE AND SPECIAL SCHOOLS
23.	3032	Gurpreet Singh	Languages/ Punjabi	BHARTI NAVAL VICH SAMPARDAYAK RAJNITI DI PESHKARI
24.	3033	Shilpa Pandey	Languages/ Sanskrit	KAUṬILYOKTA YUDDHANĪTI: EKA VIŚLEṢANĀTMAKA ADHYAYANA
25.	3034	Amit Sharma	Languages/ Sanskrit	ŚUKRANĪTI KE VIŚEṢA SANDARBHAMEN BHĀRATĪYA NĪTIVIDYĀGATA RĀJANAYA KĀ ADHYAYANA
26.	3035	Prakriti Renjen	Languages/ English	THE LOCATION OF SUBJECT FORMATION AND POTENTIAL RESISTANCE: A FOUCAULDIAN ANALYSIS OF ORHAN PAMUK'S SELECTED WORKS
27.	3036	Surabhi Verma	Languages/ Sanskrit	PRECOGNITION IN DREAMS (WITH REFERENCE TO INDIAN PHILOSOPHY)
28.	3037	Sushma Jindal	Languages/ Hindi	VIMUKT JANJATIYAN AUR HINDI UPNYAAS: BHARTIYA SAHITYA KE PERIPREKSHY MEIN
29.	3038	Maninder Pal Singh	Engineering & Technology	IMPACT ANALYSIS OF IMC'S ON TECHNOLOGY UPGRADATION & TRAINING SKILLS IN ITI'S
30.	3039	Pathak Sudhir Somnath	Engineering & Technology	DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH STRENGTH SELF COMPACTING

				CONCRETE USING BLEND OF FLYASH AND RICE HUSK ASH
31.	3040	Harleen Kaur	Business Management & Commerce	INFLUENCE OF EMPLOYEES' JOB FITNESS EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE ON TURNOVER INTENTIONS AND ON-THE-JOB-BEHAVIOUR IN SELECT SERVICE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS
32.	3041	Meera	Design & Fine Arts/Music	SWATANTYOPRANT PUNJAB KSHETRA MEIN TANTRIVADAN KE SANRAKSHAN EVAM SAMVARDHAN MEIN VADAK KALAKARON KA YOGDAN-EK ADHYAN (SHASTRIYA SANGEET KE SANDARBH MEIN)
33.	3042	Mudasir Ahmad Bhat	Law/Law	EMERGING DIMENSIONS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING: A CRITIQUE OF THE EFFICACY OF LEGAL FRAMEWORK
34.	3043	Chetna Janveja	Science/. Microbiology	A COCKTAIL OF DEPOLYMERISING ENZYMES FROM <i>ASPERGILLUS NIGER</i> C-5 FOR BIOCONVERSION OF KITCHEN WASTE INTO ETHANOL
35.	3044	Lalita	Science/Botany	WOOD ROTTING BASIDIOMYCETES OF UTTARAKHAND: A MONOGRAPHIC STUDY AND SCREENING FOR LIGNOCELLULOLYTIC ENZYMES
36.	3045	Charanjit Kaur	Science/Physics	STUDY OF BARYON NUMBER AND LEPTON FLAVOUR VIOLATION IN THE NEW MINIMAL SUPERSYMMETRIC SO (10) GUT
37.	3046	Harnoor Sandhu	Arts/ Psychology	A STUDY OF SLEEP RELATED DISTURBANCES AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, ANXIETY, STRESS, COPING AND FAMILIAL FACTORS
38.	3047	Lakhibir Kaur	Education/ Physical Education	PADMA SHREE PARGAT SINGH ARJUNA AWARDEE, SPORTS ADMINISTRATOR AND SPORTS PROMOTER- A CASE STUDY
39.	3048	Maryam Hassani Golyakh	Education/ Education	STUDY OF FACTORS AFFECTING PERSISTENCE AMONGST DISTANCE LEARNERS IN INDIAN UNIVERSITIES
40.	3049	Yugdeep Kaur	Law/Law	PARDONING POWERS OF PRESIDENT AND GOVERNOR IN INDIA: A CRITICAL STUDY
41.	3050	Tulika Kakkar	Languages/ English	REPRESENTING THE CULTURAL IMAGINARY: A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE NARRATIVES OF <i>AMAR CHITRA KATHA</i>
42.	3051	Preeti Swangla	Education/ Education	AN EVALUATIVE STUDY OF GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN EDUCATION IN TRIBAL AREAS OF HIMACHAL PRADESH

43.	3052	Harpreet Kaur	Science/ Biochemistry	NEUROPROTECTIVE POTENTIAL OF CURCUMIN IN EXPERIMENTALLY INDUCED CHRONIC EPILEPSY
44.	3053	Bhajan Singh	Arts/History	GENDER RELATIONS IN MEDIEVAL INDIA WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO INEQUALITIES AND EXPLOITATION
45.	3054	Manoj Kumar	Pharmaceutical Sciences	DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF SOLID LIPID NANOPARTICULATE DELIVERY SYSTEM FOR STREPTOMYCIN SULPHATE, VITAMIN A AND D FOR TREATMENT OR CONTROL OF TUBERCULOSIS
46.	3055	Nirmal Renuka	Science/Botany	MICROALGAL DIVERSITY, NUTRIENT REMOVAL POTENTIAL AND UTILIZATION OF BIOMASS FROM SEWAGE WASTEWATER
47.	3056	Kuljinder Kaur	Science/Botany	EVALUATION OF ANGIOSPERM FLORA AND USE OF TRADITIONAL MEDICINAL PLANT REMEDIES IN DOABA REGION OF PUNJAB
48.	3057	Jitendra Gangwar	Science/Physics	MICROSTRUCTURE ASSISTED PHASE TRANSFORMATION IN PURE AND DOPED OXIDE NANOSTRUCTURES WITH OPTICAL AND ELECTRICAL PROPERTIES
49.	3058	Deepali Ashok	Science/Botany	TAXONOMIC STUDIES ON THE WOOD ROTTING FUNGI OF BILASPUR, HAMIRPUR, LAHULSPITI, MANDI, SIRMOUR AND UNA DISTRICTS OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AND THEIR SCREENING FOR LIGNOCELLULOLYTIC ENZYMES
50.	3059	Neelam Kumari	Arts/Public Administration	ADMINISTRATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION IN STATE OF PUNJAB: A CASE STUDY OF DISTRICT S.A.S. NAGAR
51.	3060	Deepak Sharma	Arts/Public Administration	PROCESS AND PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTING OUT LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICES: A CASE STUDY OF MUNICIPAL CORPORATION CHANDIGARH
52.	3061	Kamal Ebrahimi Kavari	Languages/ English	THE IMPACT OF VOCABULARY LEARNING STRATEGIES ON ESP LEARNERS' VOCABULARY RETENTION: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY
53.	3062	Anju Bala	Science/ Microbiology	MOLECULAR CHARACTERIZATION AND CONTRIBUTION OF QUINOLONE SIGNALLING SYSTEM IN THE VIRULENCE OF <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>
54.	3063	Ranjna Sharma	Science/ Environment Science	GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS OF LIMESTONE MINING IN PARTS OF

				DISTRICT SOLAN, HIMACHAL PRADESH, INDIA
55.	3064	Kalpna Bhandari	Science/Botany	EVALUATION OF TEMPERATURE SENSITIVITY OF LENTIL (<i>LENS CULINARIS</i> MEDIK.) GENOTYPES
56.	3065	Samandeep	Science/Physics	TEXTURE SPECIFIC FERMION MASS MATRICES AND SO(10)
57.	3066	Priyanka	Science/Botany	INVESTIGATING THE ROLE OF β -PINENE IN ALLEVIATING THE PHYTOTOXIC EFFECT OF HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM [Cr (VI)]
58.	3067	Rajeev Kumar	Science/Zoology	BIODIVERSITY OF <i>APIS FLOREA</i> F. IN CHANDIGARH PLAINS AND FOOTHILLS OF HIMACHAL PRADESH
59.	3068	Amandeep Saroa	Science/Chemistry	SYNTHESIS, CHARACTERIZATION AND REACTIVITY STUDIES OF NOVEL ALKOXY SILANES AND THEIR HYPERVALENT COMPOUNDS
60.	3069	Shallu	Science/Chemistry	SYNTHESIS OF NATURAL PRODUCTS AND STUDY OF SOME ORGANIC TRANSFORMATIONS USING CONVENTIONAL/ UNCONVENTIONAL METHODOLOGIES
61.	3070	Upasna Thapliyal	Education/Education	LEARNING STRATEGIES, MOTIVATIONAL BELIEFS AND COURSE EXPERIENCES AS CORRELATES OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AMONG UNIVERSTIY STUDENTS
62.	3071	Harjeet Kaur	Education/Education	RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS WITH PERSONALITY HARDINESS JOB SATISFACTION AND FEMINIST IDENTITY
63.	3072	Aditya Sharma	Arts/Public Administration	HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION: A CASE STUDY OF SELECT TRIBAL AREAS OF HIMACHAL PRADESH
64.	3073	Anita Chhatwal	Arts/Library Science	INFORMATION-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR OF SOCIAL SCIENCE FACULTY: A STUDY OF UNIVERSITIES OF PUNJAB, HARYANA AND CHANDIGARH
65.	3074	Tajinder Bhatia	Languages/Hindi	21VI SADI KE PRAMUKH UPNYASON MEIN AKAKIPAN (SAN 2000 SE SAN 2012 TAK)
66.	3075	Reenu Bai	Languages/Hindi	SUSAM BEDI KE UPNYASON ME ANTERDUANDUA
67.	3076	Manpreet Kaur	Law/Law	EUTHANASIA AND RIGHT TO DIE WITH DIGNITY: A SOCIO-LEGAL STUDY
68.	3077	Priyanka Malla	Pharmaceutical Sciences	SYNTHESIS AND STUDY OF NOVEL PROTEIN TYROSINE PHOSPHATASE IB INHIBITORS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TYPE 2 DIABETES MELLITUS

69.	3078	Maninder Kaur	Science/ Physics	INVESTIGATION OF HEAVY-ION INDUCED FUSION REACTIONS AT NEAR AND ABOVE BARRIER ENERGIES
70.	3079	Yumlembam Khogen Singh	Arts/Sociology	SOCIO-RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS AMONG THE MEITEIS OF MANIPUR: A STUDY OF SANAMAHI AND MEITEI CHRISTIAN MOVEMENTS
71.	3080	Gargi Ghosh	Arts/ Economics	INFRASTRUCTURE, ECONOMIC GROWTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF GUJARAT (1991-92 TO 2009-10)
72.	3081	Veer Pal Kaur	Languages/ Punjabi	PANJABI LOK KALAVAN VICH AURAT DI SIRJANKARI DI CHIHAN JUGAT
73.	3082	Poonam Negi	Pharmaceutical Sciences	DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT AND OPTIMIZATION OF VESICULAR AND NON-VESICULAR CARRIER SYSTEMS FOR TOPICAL DELIVERY OF LIDOCAINE AND PRILOCAINE
74.	3083	Nandita Kaushik	Law/Law	LEGAL AID IN INDIA: AN AUDIT IN TERMS OF ITS EFFICACY
75.	3084	Parveen Kumar	Science/ Biochemistry	STUDY ON THE INTERACTION OF SOME BIOMARKERS WITH ANTIBODY CONJUGATED QUANTUM DOTS FOR BREAST CANCER DIAGNOSIS
76.	3085	Roobee Garla	Science/ Biophysics	SPECTROSCOPIC AND COMPUTATIONAL STUDIES OF METALLOTHIONEIN BINDING WITH ARSENIC AND ZINC
77.	3086	Satinder Kaur	Arts/ Women's Studies	WOMEN AND SHELTER: A STUDY OF SHORT STAY HOMES OF PUNJAB AND CHANDIGARH
78.	3087	Dharmendra Singh	Arts/Public Administration	TRAINING OF NON-GAZETTED POLICE OFFICERS IN HARYANA: A CASE STUDY OF HARYANA POLICE ACADEMY, MADHUBAN

NOTE: The result of the above candidates have already been declared vide No.DOC/2015/3 dated 03.03.2015, No.DOC/2015/4 dated 04.03.2015, No.DOC/2015/5 dated 09.03.2015, No.DOC/2015/6 dated 10.03.2015, No.DOC/2015/7 dated 12.03.2015, No.DOC/2015/8 dated 12.03.2015 and No.DOC/2015/9 dated 13.03.2015.

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, Director, UIHMT, P.U. (Additional charge) be paid Rs.2000/- p.m. as honorarium and telephone facility at her residence as per University rule w.e.f. 24.03.2015 (FN) i.e. the date on which she has taken over the charge.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendations of the Academic Committee dated 06.04.2015 (**Appendix-XLIX**) that from the coming session there will be no upper age limit for admission to B.A./B.Com LL.B. (Hons.) 5 years integrated course as per Supreme Court judgment regarding age limit prescribed for CLAT (Common Law Admission Test) as well as BCI Notification and resolution published in the Gazette of India on 31.10.2013, whereby Clause 28 as mentioned in the writ case No.5219 of 2015, has been withdrawn, the age limit for the Information Brochure-cum-Prospectus for admission to PU-B.A./B.Com LL.B (Hons.) 5 years Integrated Course-2015 be also removed and a corrigendum for the same be published on the University Website.

- NOTE:**
1. Letter vide No. UILS/15/588 dated 08.04.2015 from the Director, University Institute of Legal Studies enclosed (**Appendix-XLIX**).
 2. The provision of age limit available in the relevant Regulations (**Appendix-XLIX**) is required to be deleted.

(xiii) The Vice Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, BGJ Institute of Health, P.U. for one year more i.e. w.e.f. 07.03.2015 to 05.03.2016 (06.03.2016 being Sunday) with one day break on 06.03.2015, on the previous terms & conditions.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Professor Chaman Lal Verma as Guest Faculty in the Department of Music as a very special case, for having his completed the teaching allotted to him in the given semester, for the month of April and May 2014 on lecture basis on an honorarium of Rs.1000/- per lecture subject to the ceiling of Rs.25,000/- p.m. against vacant post of the Department.

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/ Senate, has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 24.04.2015 (**Appendix-L**) that the nomenclature of "M.Tech. Nano Science & Nano Technology" being offered by Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology under the premises of Department of Physics under the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, be retained as such.

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-LI**) between Institute of Development and Communication (IDC), Chandigarh and Centre for Police Administration, (UIEASS), Panjab University and the Maharaja Ranjit Singh Punjab Academy (PPA), Phillaur (Panjab).

- (xvii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to transfer an amount of Rs. 25.00 crores from the Plan Account to Non-Plan Account to meet the expenditure on salaries and other committed payments for the day to day working of the University, which shall be transferred back on receipt of grant from the Government.

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

Routine and formal matters

- 36.** The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(xi)** on the agenda was read out and noted:-

- (i)** His Excellency, M. Hamid Ansari, Vice-President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh vide Govt. of India Gazette Notification No.744 dated 09.04.2015 (**Appendix-LIII**) has extended the term of Professor A.K. Grover as Vice-Chancellor of the Panjab University, Chandigarh for a period of three years with effect from 23rd July 2015, on the existing terms and conditions.

- (ii)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal, Department of Public Administration as Dean of International Students for another year w.e.f. 01.06.2015, on the same terms and conditions.

NOTE: Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal, Department of Public Administration was appointed as Dean of International Students for one year w.e.f. 01.06.2014 to 31.05.2015, by the Syndicate and Senate vide Para 3 & Para IX dated 12.07.2014 and 28.09.2014 respectively, under Regulation 1 at page 108 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

- (iii)** The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that:
- (i) Professor Meenakshi Goyal will hold charge as Honorary Director of Energy Research Centre concurrent with her Chairpersonship of UICET and Professor U.S. Shivhare will hand over the charge to Professor Meenakshi Goyal.
- (ii) Professor Amrit Pal Toor, UICET will be Co-ordinator of Energy Research Centre for a period of three years.

- (iv)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors (already working on temporary basis) in Department of Biotechnology, P.U. to work as such up to 31.05.2015, with one day break as usual in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Dr. Monika Sharma
2. Dr. Baljinder Singh Gill.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors (already working on temporary basis) at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management (UIHTM), P.U. to work as such up to 22.05.2015, with one day break as usual in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.6000/- plus allowances, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Mr. Jaswinder Singh
2. Mr. Gaurav Kashyap
3. Mr. Abhishek Gahi
4. Ms. Lipika
5. Mr. Amit Katoch
6. Mr. Manoj.

(vi) In term of decision of Syndicate meeting dated 24.08.2013 (Para 26) and authorization given by the Syndicate and Senate dated 04.08.2012 and 22.12.2012 respectively, the Vice-Chancellor, has approved the protection of pay of Dr. Jatinder Grover, Assistant Professor in Education, USOL, at Rs.17620/-+AGP Rs.6000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining in the P.U., i.e. 02.11.2006 in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 as per revised LPC issued by his previous employer i.e. DAV College of Education, Abohar (**Appendix-LIV**).

- NOTE:**
1. 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.
 2. The observations/objection raised by audit is re-produced as under:

“On the basis of revised LPC the case be submitted to Syndicate & Senate being the appointing authority for considering the protection of pay of Dr. Jatinder Grover (Asst. Prof.) in relaxation of this rules if autonomous deem fit it necessary as the earlier pay protection in relaxation of the rules stands approved by Syndicate & Senate.”

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has approved the minutes dated 30.03.2015 (**Appendix-A (LV)**) of the meeting of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.03.2015 (Para 9) after making necessary correction in the wording of

the proceedings dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-B (LV)**) as well as in the appended *pro forma*.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 (Para 9) while approving the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 16.01.2015 with regard to prepare Regulations/Rules for adoption of 'Child care Leave' to the University female employees (teaching and non-teaching) has constituted a Committee which would examine/ made necessary correction in the wording of the proceedings of the Committee as well as *pro forma* appended with the proceeding **and authorized the Vice-Chancellor to approve the minutes after modifications, on behalf of the Syndicate and it be placed before the Syndicate in one of its meeting as an Information Item.**

- (viii) Since, the interim orders dated 30.06.2014 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and Another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP (6395 of 2015) was adjourned to 11.05.2015, the Vice-Chancellor had ordered that Dr. P.K. Sharma, Associate Professor in Economics, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC (Transferred to UIAMS, P.U. Chandigarh till further orders) be allowed to continue till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it. The same is being informed to the Syndicate and shall be informed to the Senate in due course. The retiral benefits already sanctioned and conveyed to the above faculty member vide office order No.3312-21/Estt.-I dated 21.04.2015 (**Appendix-LVI**) have been treated as withdrawn for the time being till the Court Case/s is/are finalized.

(ix) 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.	Shri Ramesh Singh Superintendent DCDC Office	08.03.1982	31.05.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
2.	Shri Ram Paul Kaundal Superintendent R&S Branch	18.12.1982	31.05.2015	
3.	Shri Paul Work Inspector (Technician G-I) P.U. Construction Office	02.09.1974	31.05.2015	
4.	Shri Narinder Singh Sr. Technician G-II Central Instrumentation Laboratory	01.05.1987	31.05.2015	
5.	Shri Ram Deo Head Mali P.U. Construction Office	19.07.1982	31.05.2015	
6.	Shri Tulsi Ram Thakur Superintendent Department of Sociology	15.11.1976	31.05.2015	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
7.	Ms. Renu Chopra Superintendent (P.R.) General Branch	07.11.1977	30.06.2015	
8.	Shri Prem Singh Senior Technician/ ATO (G-II) Central Instrumentation Laboratory	22.08.1978	31.05.2015	
9.	Shri Roop Singh Senior Technician (G-II) Department of Microbiology	14.03.1980	31.05.2015	
10.	Shri Rakesh Kumar Section Holder P.U. Press	19.01.1977	31.05.2015	

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

(x) In terms of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Paragraph XXI), the Vice-Chancellor has approved extension in re-employment of Dr. Manjeet Paintal, Professor (Retd.), Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, P.U., on contract basis, upto 13.03.2017 i.e. the date of her attaining the age of 65 years, as per Rules/Regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008, and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of

teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowances.

NOTE: 1. Senate decision dated 28.09.2014 (agenda item C-22) circulated vide Endst. No.11622-11792/Estt.I dated 12.12.2014 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.

2. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year of re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment.

(xi) To note the information contained in office note dated 23.05.2015 (**Appendix-LVII**) of D.C.D.C., Panjab University with regard to transfer of 5 acres vacant land belonging to the Government College Sri Muktsar Sahib, by the Punjab Government for construction of new Complex of the P.U.R.C. in a phased manner by building a State of Art Campus with latest technology modules to ensure its longevity and provide the necessary teaching facilities as it would make new campus academically vibrant.

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

(1) Professor A.K. Bhandari pointed out that many departments are enquiring whether they should allow the guest faculty to continue or not. Though the High Court had ordered that guest faculty should not be replaced by the guest faculty, the Syndicate last year decided that the persons working as guest faculty should be allowed to continue only for 1 year, i.e., for the session 2014-15.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that all the persons working as guest faculty and/or temporary or part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointees.

This was agreed to.

(2) Shri Ashok Goyal said that certain items were placed before the Senate in its meetings held on 29th March 2015 and 26th April 2015 but the same could not be noted/ratified because the meeting was adjourned before they were taken up. Though the orders have been issued in anticipation of approval of Senate, the same are not being implemented by the office. He pleaded that since the Vice-Chancellor had approved issuance of orders in anticipation of approval of Senate, all those orders should be got implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all such orders would be got implemented.

- (3) Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since they are facing problems, a Committee should also be constituted for taking care of the Guest House, Faculty House, Golden Jubilee Guest House, etc. The Committee which is existing presently has not met for the last more than 1 year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is being attended to.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath pointed out that earlier Deputy Registrar (Colleges) used to deal with the affairs of the guest houses, but now the Deputy Registrar (Estate) has been assigned this job due to which the problem has arisen. As far as he knew the staff members who had proceeded on leave or transferred to some other place, the person who is looking after the job of reservation of accommodation in the guest houses, is not dealing with them properly. Two years ago, a Committee of the Syndics was formed, but thereafter no Committee was formed. Basically, the Guest House has been built to accommodate and facilitate those who devote time to the University without getting anything in return. He has been told by many and he himself also felt that this Committee must comprise of those persons who usually get accommodation in the guest houses so that everybody gets properly facilitated.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the earlier Committee, which was constituted to look into the affairs of the Guest/Faculty Houses, was not of Syndicate as none of the Syndics was member of the said Committee.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that now a Committee of the Syndics should be constituted.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to inform that, in fact, the Committee was constituted by the Syndicate and the same comprised Syndics as well as President, PUTA. He did not know whether somebody else was a member of the Committee or not. He added that he got a letter about a couple of months ago stating that the Vice-Chancellor has dissolved that Committee constituted by the Syndicate. However, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath is saying that the Committee was formed 2 years earlier but it did not meet, which is not true. He did not know why and how that Committee was dissolved by the Vice-Chancellor and was replaced by a new Committee referred to by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, which did not comprise of any member of the Syndicate. Probably, this Committee is constituted under the chairmanship of the Registrar. He vehemently said that since the Committee was constituted by the Syndicate, it could have been dissolved by the Syndicate alone and constituted another Committee. Secondly, there were problems with that Deputy Registrar and the Manager (Guest House) and those problems were discussed earlier also. The Committee met and recommended that the work is being done satisfactorily and also recommended that the lady Deputy Registrar, who was Deputy Registrar (Estate) at that time, be made in-charge of the Guest House so that the Guest House works smoothly. But to his utter shock, the Deputy Registrar (Colleges), who was subsequently transferred and given the charge of Deputy

Registrar (Estate), was again made the in-charge of Guest/Faculty Houses. If some practical difficulties are being faced, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath knew only about the difficulties being faced by the members of the Syndicate and Senate, but the University might also be facing certain difficulties and the same should not only be the concern of the Officers of the University, including Vice-Chancellor, Dean of University Instruction, Registrar, but that should be the concern of all. In view of that, a new Committee should be constituted, maybe replacing the old Committee of the Syndicate, to ensure that the smooth functioning of the House/Faculty House is there and everybody gets facilitated.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that since the Guest House is being used by various dignitaries and the members of the Syndicate and Senate, its proper functioning is absolutely necessary.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the convener of the Committee should be the person who is looking after the affairs of the Guest/Faculty Houses, so that he could make aware the members of the Committee about the problems/difficulties being faced.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should do whatever they wanted to, but at least the scholars, who visited the University for various purposes, should be given proper facilities/attentions. When Principal Gurdip Sharma said that such small issues should be left to the Committee purposed to be constituted, Professor Ronki Ram suggested that only those members should be put on the Committee, who could actually give/devote time for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that everybody has few facts, whereas the total facts have many parts. Unless all the facts are not before them, it is not good to proceed in the matter. If they did it in an *ad hoc* manner, it would not serve the purpose. So this matter is receiving the attention in the background of the facts which stood collated at one stage. It is true that a Committee of Syndics was formed, but the same was on experimental basis – only for three months and the same was supposed to be reviewed after a period of three months. As such, the things were supposed to be done satisfactorily and so on. Nobody could say that the affairs of the Guest House are to the satisfaction of all the stakeholders and everybody has one problem or the other. Therefore, the matter required to be relooked into. Earlier, there were 15 rooms in the Guest House and now there are 7 additional Suites. Now, there is lot of accommodation at the campus, as they have accommodation in the Guest House as well as in College Bhawan and Alumni House, almost all the needs of the University can be met. Of course, the members of the Syndicate and Senate prefer to stay in the University Guest House, but they could find a solution to that also. For example, they could reserve 4-5 suites for dignitaries and official purposes and rest of the suites could be provided to the members of the Syndicate and the Senate. The kind of requirement, which Professor Ronki Ram was saying, could be met as they had enough capacity available in the Guest House, but they have to manage that capacity in a professional manner. They have to come out with a good plan as to how

they have to manage that capacity and they also required somebody, who could be available there on 24 hours basis. So they needed to introduce some professionalism so far as the functioning of Guest/Faculty Houses is concerned. In the background of whatever staff they had, they have to make the system work and for making the system work, there has to be some thinking and planning. There are certain members amongst Syndics who want to volunteer to serve on the Committee, the Registrar, D.R. (Estate) and Shri Rakesh Gupta are also there. They should come out with a detailed proposal so that the same can be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact the Committee was constituted to oversee the work of that person and not that the Committee was constituted for three months. Had the life of the Committee been three months, he would not have got a letter from University Administration even after six months requesting him to give a suitable date and time for holding the meeting of the Committee. Secondly, if somebody came at 11.00 p.m. and midnight, nobody is there to attend. That is way, they wanted to suggest as to how this Guest House could be made functional in a way that it served the Guests for 24 hours and that too, without burdening the University. He had already shared his idea with Professor A.K. Bhandari as to how it could be made viable and they were thinking of implementing it also. But on one fine morning it came to his notice that the recommendations made by the Committee not accepted; rather, the Committee was dissolved by the Vice-Chancellor without assigning any reason.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they might be remembering that they had faced a lot of problems at the Guest House about two years ago. He pleaded that arrangements for catering the needs of the guests at night should be made.

Professor Ronki Ram suggested that Suites of Guest House should be allocated/earmarked, e.g., two rooms for Guests, two for Scholars, 14 for members of the Syndicate and Senate, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the next meeting, he would come back with a proper proposal.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they request the Vice-Chancellor to constitute a Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate and if 1 or 2 members are to be added, same should be suggested. He further stated that the contract of the Contractor of Golden Jubilee has expired more than six months ago. Why he is being allowed to continue till date? Secondly, what are the reasons for not taking any payment from him for the last one and a half years and who is responsible for that? It is a very serious matter that no payment is being taken from the Contractor. Moreover, even though his contract is expired, he is allowed to continue. Even the standard of meal has come down. He pleaded that the entire balance should be taken from the Contractor.

It was told that the Contractor was issued notice and now he had been removed. The process for giving fresh contract has also been initiated. However, the earlier

contractor has not paid the amount of the contract which was due from him, and that was why, he has been removed.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the question is who is responsible for not taking a sum of money amounting to Rs.6 lacs from the Contractor for more than one and a half years.

It was told that not only, there are so many other things. Once the problem/s came to the notice of the Registrar, he changed the Deputy Registrar (Estate) also.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that, in fact, the person in-charge should have brought the entire matter, including pending of contracted money, to the notice of the Registrar. Who was that person? He further said that since the College Bhawan and the accommodation available there is very good, it has eased the load of accommodation on the University Guest House/Faculty House. If arrangement of meal is made there, it would be better.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that a Hospitality Wing should be created and all the accommodation should be taken care of by that wing.

- (4) Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that it is good that they had advertised three posts of Principals of P.U. Constituent Colleges and had given four stations, i.e., Baba Balraj Panjab University Constituent College, Balachaur, Panjab University Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Panjab University Constituent College, Moga and Panjab University Constituent College, Sri Muktsar Sahib. He pointed that the appointment of Shri Sunil Khosla has specifically been made as Principal at Baba Balraj Panjab University Constituent College, Balachaur. He, therefore, pleaded that the given advertisement needed to be changed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 'No', he is not going to change the advertisement. He added that he has already talked to Dr. Sunil Khosla and he has agreed to move to another place. Principals of all the Constituent Colleges would be subject to transfer to other Constituent College.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that what does this mean. He (the Vice-Chancellor) has taken the decision and he alone has made the policy for transfer of Principals of Constituent Colleges. On the one side, he (the Vice-Chancellor) is ever saying that the Syndicate is the Governing body of the University and on the other side, he himself is taking the policy decisions. He wondered if somebody is Principal at Panjab University Constituent College, Sikhwala and the person belonged to Hoshiarpur and if he is transferred to Balachaur on request and later on they would say that he is again transferred to any other Constituent College. That was why, he was saying in the Senate also that the days are not far when the teachers at the Panjab University Campus would be subject to transfer to P.U. Regional/Rural Centres and vice versa. He urged the Vice-Chancellor not to undermine the authority of the Syndicate and Senate, the Governing and Supreme bodies of the University. He has seen for time that an advertisement has been given that Principals are required

at any three of the four Constituent Colleges and which is the fourth College, which has been left out of the advertisement. He wondered, is it a lottery system? It has also been mentioned in the advertisement, it has come to his knowledge for the first time as member of the Syndicate and Senate, that the College at Guru Har Sahai, the nomenclature of which they did not know even till date, has been mentioned as Government College Guru Har Sahai/P.U. Constituent College at Guru Har Sahai. He did not know whether the College at Guru Har Sahai is a Government College or P.U. Constituent College. Who has made it as such, nobody knows. They also did not know who has approved the given advertisement and who has approved the rules of transfer of Principals of Constituent Colleges. Now when one of the members has pointed out, the Vice-Chancellor is saying that he is not going to change the advertisement reasoning that Dr. Sunil Khosla has agreed to move to another place. Since Dr. Sunil Khosla wanted to serve the University/Constituent College, he did not have any option but to agree to the proposal of his transfer. However, they are not here to accept the excesses being committed to the employees of the University whether they are Principals, Deans, etc. Every time when the Syndicate suggests something, the Vice-Chancellor said that he will not do it. He knew that he (Vice-Chancellor) has become habitual of insulting the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he does not accept this assertion of Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Ronki Ram said that, in fact, this case was also examined/considered by a Committee and Principal Gurdip Sharma was also aware of this case. Some counselling between Dr. Sunil Khosla and one of the temporary lady employees of the College was also held. He (Dr. Sunil Khosla) had also approached couple of members of the Syndicate and might have also approached Principal Gurdip Sharma. The Vice-Chancellor had also invited him and told him about the entire case. The girl, who was a temporary employee in that College, was also transferred to another place.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that the days are not far away, when even the employees appointed on contract basis would also be transferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to close the discussion. However, if they wanted, he would bring a regular item having all the facts relating to the issue to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in the mean time the advertisement made for the posts of Principals of P.U. Constituent Colleges, which is against the rules of the University, should be withdrawn or it should be got approved from the Syndicate and the Senate that these are subject to transfers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright, he would bring a regular item for consideration by the Syndicate.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that how the advertisement in question has been issued without the approval of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the advertisement for the P.U. Constituent Colleges was given some years ago.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the advertisement has been given in this form. He further said that it is his request, plea and suggestion that please do not do anything which required the approval of the Syndicate and Senate; otherwise, they have to completely change the structure of three Calendars of Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that alright if it requires the approval of the Syndicate, they would extend the date of advertisement. Secondly, they would bring an item for consideration as to why this has been done. He further stated that the Constituent Colleges are to be considered as Colleges where the transfers should be permitted; otherwise, there would be issues of the kind that has happened with Principal Khosla.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that the Vice-Chancellor is advocating that the persons should be transferred from one Constituent College to another, it has come to his notice that persons are also being transferred from Constituent Colleges to University Campus as well.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there was an issue between a faculty member and the Principal, which was coming into the functioning of that College. As such, he had to take a practical view so that the students did not suffer. He has to disengage the people involved in a dispute and in that effort, he had to talk to Principal Khosla, who has also agreed to move elsewhere.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar remarked that it is not a good solution. Even if there was a problem, he (Vice-Chancellor) should have enquired the whole matter and taken to a logical end by taking disciplinary actions. If they started acting like this, tomorrow they would find students raising slogans in front of the offices of Registrar/Dean of University Instruction/Vice-Chancellor to force decisions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since right now he did not have all the relevant papers, he would not like to discuss the issue any more and there would be no recruitments done for the Principals. He would place the matter before the Syndicate along with all the relevant documents and till then, the consideration of the issue is deferred.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR