

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Dr. (Mrs.) Aruna Goel
2. Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop
3. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
4. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
5. Ms. Gurpreet Kaur
6. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
7. Shri Jitender Yadav, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
8. Dr. Jagwant Singh
9. Dr. Karamjeet Singh
10. Dr. Kailash Nath Kaul alias Kailash Nath
11. Shri Krishna Goyal
12. Dr. K.K. Talwar
13. Sardar Kuljit Singh Nagra
14. Shri Lilu Ram
15. Shri Maheshinder Singh
16. Shri Naresh Gaur
17. Dr. Nandita Singh
18. Professor Naval Kishore
19. Shri Naresh Gujral
20. Professor Preeti Mahajan
21. Professor Promila Pathak
22. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
23. Dr. Parmod Kumar
24. Shri Parimal Rai
25. S. Parkash Singh Badal
26. Smt. Preneet Kaur
27. Professor Ronki Ram
28. Shri Ragbir Dyal
29. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
30. Principal (Dr.) S.S. Sangha
31. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
32. Shri Sandeep Kumar
33. Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra
34. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab

I. The Vice Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the members about the sad demise of –

- (i) Smt. Satya Bhama, mother of Professor Promila Pathak, Department of Botany and President, PUTA, on 10th September 2016; and
- (ii) Shri Biru Ram Pathak, father of Professor Promila Pathak, Department of Botany and President, PUTA, on 29th September 2016.

She lost both her parents within a short span.

As a mark of respect to the departed souls, the Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Smt. Satya Bhama & Shri Biru Ram Pathak and observed two minutes' silence, all standing, prayed to the Almighty to give peace to the departed souls and give strength and courage to the members of the bereaved family to bear irreparable loss of their dear ones.

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

II. At this stage, Professor R.P. Bambah stated that this is the last meeting of the present Senate and some of the members would not be there in the next meeting. He on his own behalf and on behalf of his colleagues would like to congratulate the Vice Chancellor for adding the academic flavour to the University in various ways. They

had organized very good lectures, seminars, conferences, workshops, etc., which help in the academics in various ways. He would also like to wish him (Vice Chancellor) good luck in his efforts; rather, unending efforts for solving the financial problem of the University. They hope that he would succeed soon and the University would not be facing any difficulty, which it is facing now. He further said that he would like to express his gratitude to his fellow Senators for the seriousness in which they have taken/shouldered the responsibility. Since this is the last meeting of the Senate, may he suggest that they have a very pleasant meeting, i.e., without any controversy. Perhaps, he (Vice Chancellor) could consider for guiding them in such a way that they part on a very pleasant and delightful mood.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that whatever has been said by Professor R.P. Bambah, who is a senior member of the House, he endorses that. The House has functioned in a very good atmosphere and in coordination of each other during the last four years. Certain minor and small issues could always arise, and it happens where even similar type of people work. However, where there are persons of different ideologies, such small differences are bound to come. When the present Senate members are meeting for the last time, they should resolve that they would forget all those incidents wherever they had difference of opinion and, in future, work in unison. As said by Professor Bambah, the University had done certain very good works under the leadership of the present Vice Chancellor and for that they all needed to be congratulated. He wished that several members, who have been re-elected to the Senate, should also be congratulated. Since the nominations are still to be made by the Chancellor, they should also hope that majority of them would come back here again. In the end, he said that they should meet in good atmosphere, as was being done during the earlier meetings, and consider the agenda.

Professor Rajesh Gill, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor R.P. Bambah and Shri Satya Pal Jain, stated that she would like to request the Chair that ever since the Court has taken *suo moto* notice of the financial position of the University, they have been flooded with queries as to what is the status. She requested the Vice Chancellor to throw some light on it, so that they could also have some idea about it.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that it would be better if before taking up the agenda items, they take certain cases of admissions of students because the session has almost started. Certain students have been denied admissions for delay on the part of certain Departments. Kindly let them take up this issue because it is the most important issue particularly in self-financing courses. On one side, the University is also facing the financial crunch and on the other side, certain cases of admission, which were sent to the Dean of University Instruction, have been rejected. In certain cases, even the seats have fallen vacant and are lying so for the last 2-3 weeks. He suggested that the delay in such cases should be condoned and the students, who are on merit, should be given admission. The Vice Chancellor should consider this as it is most important because it is not only a loss to the University, but the students, who are on merit, are also the losers. As such, they should be given due opportunity to get admission to various courses.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not a zero hour. So he would request the members not to convert this into a zero hour.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that he also endorses whatever Professor R.P. Bambah and Shri Satya Pal Jain has said, but to make it more memorable, one group photograph of the Senate should be taken.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are already organizing this.

Dr. Tarlochan Singh stated that, whatever has been said by Professor R.P. Bambah, he fully endorses that. He had come to the Senate of this University for the first time, though he has a lot of experience of remaining in Senates of Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University, and he has observed that it is a totally different

experience in PU. He has also seen in the Parliament that when the House meets, how difficult it is for the Speaker and the Chairman of the House, but he must praise the Vice Chancellor in handling the worst type of situations in this house sometimes. He admires his patience & guidance, and he would like to make an appeal to all of them that the anthem, which they had sung just sometime before, that they should all take a pledge for the honour of education in Punjab. They should maintain that pledge that this House would continue to strive for the good of education, University and State of Punjab. With these words, he would like to thank all of them, especially the Vice Chancellor for all the good, which he has done for the University.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that he just wants to draw their attention that when they have this kind of bulky agenda, there is one suggestion which the future Senate could follow and that is the practice in other Universities. For instance, the items from C-3 to C-20, and he is just giving them an example, should in fact be circulated amongst the Senators, and whosoever wants to speak on them could let him (Vice Chancellor) know; otherwise, if no one responds within a week, these particular items are deemed to be approved. This is the circular, which is sent across the board actually. In fact, what he is trying to say is that it would reduce immediately about 325 pages. He is just talking in terms of certain items, which do not really need any consideration as such, but at the same time, they are sent to the Senators, who could write back that they wish to speak on such and such item(s). He is sure that the Registrar would agree with him. This kind of wastage of paper is uncalled for and they must give a little bit consideration to it.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members not to convert the discussion into a zero hour as they have a long agenda to attend to. He also requested the members to allow the meeting to proceed. They would have a zero hour immediately after the lunch.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that whatever has been said by Professor R.P. Bambah and Shri Satya Pal Jain, he fully endorses that. The four-year period of the present Senate was a rewarding and learning experience for all of them. The previous day, in the Syndicate, he was really touched with the knowledge which the Vice Chancellor shared about the history of Panjab University. In fact, the previous day, the Vice Chancellor had said that he would share this with the Senate as well. Since this is the last meeting of the present Senate, the kind of information he (Vice Chancellor) had collected, he thinks that he (Vice Chancellor) should share with the House within 5-10 minutes and the same would be learning experience for all of them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would proceed with the agenda till 12.45 p.m., and thereafter, whatever he shared with the Syndicate the previous day, he would share with them for 10 minutes. Then they would have a photograph, before proceeding for lunch.

III. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-1 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-1 That the period of re-employment of Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor of English (Retd.), Department of Evening Studies, be curtailed/cut-down from five years.

(Syndicate dated 1.5.2016 Para 3)

NOTE: 1. An Agenda item C-37 was placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 27.3.2016 and the Senate vide Para XXXII (Appendix) has resolved that proper item be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

It was further resolved that till a final decision is taken in the matter, the status quo be maintained.

2. As desired by the Senate a proper item along with an office note (Appendix) was placed before the meeting dated 1.5.2016. The proceedings of the Syndicate meeting are attached (Appendix).
3. A detailed office note enclosed (Appendix).
4. The above item was placed before the Senate dated 24.7.2016/3.9.2016 as an agenda item No. C-3 but the same was deferred.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this is not a new item in some sense. They are all familiar with it. This matter was sent, after a long discussion in the Senate, to the Syndicate and the Syndicate also discussed it, and there are very long minutes of the Syndicate meeting, which he expects that, they have gone through the minutes. The Syndicate by a majority vote had endorsed the Vice Chancellor's decision that the faculty member concerned, who is on re-employment for a period of five years, at the end of three years, the Vice Chancellor took a view that he is not academically active, and the Syndicate endorsed that decision, and this is all before them. So all that they are expected to ponder today is whether to accept the majority decision of the Syndicate or they could reject the majority decision of the Syndicate. This is all that is there. Every re-employed Professor is given re-employment for a period of five years and there has to be academically active reports. On the basis of input that he (Vice Chancellor) received at the end of three years, the Vice Chancellor had the freedom to exercise his judgement, and he (Vice Chancellor) exercised his judgement and that judgement stands endorsed by a split decision in the Syndicate, but that stands endorsed. So this is where the matter is. The appointing authority for the Professors is the Senate. As per the Senate decision, the Vice Chancellor was given this privilege to exercise his judgement and he (Vice Chancellor) exercised that judgement and the same is now before them. So in some sense, they do not need any detailed discussion and there is no need to go through over 500 pages, which are there. All of them are well aware. In some sense, it is a simple call, but a difficult call because such a thing has not been done for any re-employed Professor ever since the re-employment scheme was commenced in Panjab University. They are aware why the re-employment scheme was commenced.

Shri S.S. Johl said that he thinks that they should respect the decision of the Syndicate.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that this is not a new agenda. In fact, a majority decision was taken in the meeting of the Syndicate. It has been mentioned in P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, that after three years, conditional extension is to be given on the basis of academically active report(s). Otherwise also, he thinks that the extension up to 65 years of age should be conditional.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not discussing those issues.

Continuing, Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that on this issue, his view is that no extension should be given and the old decision of the Syndicate should be honoured.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that there was no old decision of the Syndicate. In fact, now the decision of the Syndicate has come.

Continuing, Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that his opinion is that in this case no further extension should be given.

Dr. Tarlochan Singh said that he thinks that they should endorse the decision of the Syndicate.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there should be no discussion on this issue as the same is not required, especially when the Vice Chancellor is competent as he has been authorized for the purpose.

Dr. Dalip Kumar remarked that it has been mentioned that the Vice Chancellor is very much competent.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she has a great regards for the very senior people, who initially appreciated this House for the reason that this House comprised very senior and experienced people, and she respects this House because in last four years, which was her first term, she has seen how democracy works actually, and how dissidents are respected, and how every member should have a right irrespective of his/her stature. They are all equal here. In that regard, let them have a dialogue. This is a very serious issue, which they are going to address. The decision might be any, but the House is free to take a decision. It should be a decision, which comes after a dialogue and proper application of mind. This issue, as the chair has rightly said that it was discussed several times, at least in one Senate meeting, it was discussed at length. She remembers that she had requested for some information. For instance, the re-employment is given for five years and the re-employed teachers are supposed to submit their academically active reports after every year. The charge levelled against Dr. Chopra is that he did not submit academically active report(s). She would like the House to have the information from the office as to whether in each and every case the academically active report(s) has/have been received by the office. Whether each and every report has been evaluated by the Vice Chancellor and whether all the reports have been placed before the Senate? How many of them had been placed and how many of them had been evaluated and how many of them had been received by the office? They need that information. Secondly, if the academically active report(s) was/were not submitted by this particular Professor after 1st year, 2nd year and 3rd year, why no action was initiated against him. The timing of the action is highly objectionable. Action comes after he submits some serious complaints against a senior member/official of the University. Before taking any decision, it is the responsibility of the House to first ensure whether the complaints made by this person have been verified, and whether the allegations of purchases with tenders, which violate the Accounts Manual, which compromise the quantity of the item(s) or even the connection between certain firms and a very senior member/official of the University. The House would like to know the details/statement on this issue before arriving at any decision. The term of Dean of Student Welfare expired on 31st July 2016. The term was extended despite the fact that the complaints were pending. Does it happen in all the cases or the principle in their University is "Show me the person and I will show you the rule". The meetings of the Syndicate were held during this period, and it is not that no meeting was held, but without going to the Syndicate or the Senate, the term was extended till 30th October because from 1st of November, the term of new Senate begins. Let this House know whether the Dean of Student Welfare has any relationship with the proprietors of the specific firm, which have been mentioned in the complaints. As the complaints are serious and involve huge sums having financial bungling, and the tendering process is under question, and the fact remains that on 30th November 2015, this Professor files the complaints, and the process of termination of his re-employment begins after that. The chronology of events is very significant. So she would like a statement on this specifically before they go to the other members.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that, perhaps, this is the last meeting of the Senate. Before taking any decision, he would like the members to consider the legal position also. He is made to understand that the matter is already in the Court. The person concerned has already filed a suit in the Court. Since the legal luminaries are sitting in this House, they should not take any decision in a hurry. Before analyzing the legal position also because then there would be embarrassment to the whole House also, if their decision is taken otherwise. He would like the legal luminaries to give their opinion on the issue because they arrived at any decision because otherwise it would be

embarrassment. This is the last meeting of the Senate. He is not going into the details and technicalities. Since the issue has already been discussed much and each and every member knows about the facts and all the proceedings that have been going on between the man and the University. So they must take into consideration the legal position before taking any decision on the issue.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that it is his (Vice Chancellor's) recent judgement that he (Dr. Chopra) is academically inactive. Most of the teachers, who belong to the University system, know his (Dr. Chopra's) work and conduct. Moreover, he (Dr. Chopra) remained academically inactive throughout his life. Let this not become a burden on the University. Whatever the reason is, his (Dr. Chopra's) re-employment should be terminated right now, and this is view of the majority of the members of the House.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is no need to discuss this issue, especially when he (Vice Chancellor) is fully competent; otherwise, if they continued to discuss it till evening, there would be no end.

Professor Anil Monga said that they had already taken a decision in the Syndicate meeting and he endorses that.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they are seeing the majority here, there is no need to discuss the issue.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that he thinks that the Vice Chancellor should accept the wish of the House.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he has taken academically active reports from all the re-employed Professors. The Dean of University Instruction is present in the House and he is also well aware that they have obtained academically active reports, and he has not found others whom he could say that they are not academically active. People have academic contributions, which cover a broad spectrum. It is fine that everybody has certain history, but he does not find anyone else to be not academically active. His judgement in this case is that Professor Chopra is not academically active. So this right was given to the office of the Vice Chancellor during the time of his predecessor, and he has exercised that judgement. The re-employment scheme, which was earlier for three years, was made to five years and right now (for Professor Chopra) the fourth year is going. The Senate decision that if the Syndicate majority judgement is accepted, it would amount to curtailment of the period from five years to a smaller period, up to the date the minutes of this meeting are written and they have accepted the draft of those minutes. So until they accept it and those minutes are circulated, and it would be effective from that date.

When Professor Rajesh Gill raised her hand said that she wants to add, the Vice Chancellor said, "No, she has already spoken".

Professor D.V.S Jain requested not to raise extraneous issues.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that he would like to speak as Chairperson of Department of Evening Studies.

When Shri Varinder Singh said that there is nothing to discuss in this issue, the Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor Malhotra) wants to exercise his privilege as a Chairperson of the Department of Evening Studies. Alright, he wants to allow him to use that right.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since it is democracy, dialogue could not be curbed.

The Vice Chancellor said that, alright she (Professor Gill) has spoken and he would like to give the privilege to the Chairperson of Department of Evening Studies.

When Professor Rajesh Gill raised her hand, the Vice Chancellor said that she has already spoken.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that please ensure that nobody speaks second time.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that he would like to inform the House that when his (Dr. Chopra's) application for re-employment came, as per the laid down procedure, the academically active report(s) was/were placed before the Academic and Administrative Committees. The said Committees gave in writing that this person is academically active and they are satisfied with him. The Academic and Administrative Committees comprised all the senior Professors, and virtually they comprised almost all the Departments (within DES). The Committee said that they are satisfied with his teaching and want his services to continue. But in the meantime, what happened is that he had issued certain letters against certain officials, and those allegations have been reported to the CVO. Rather people in the University were thinking that he is a whistle blower. Instead of looking into whether those allegations against the official(s) are right or wrong, a letter was issued to Dr. Chopra that his services/re-employment have/had been terminated. They were asked to see his academically active report(s) again. The allegations against the official(s) were also placed before the Academic and Administrative Committees, and at that time their Academic and Administrative Committees said that they could not make any comment against the official(s), and they are not bound to comment on that, but they want to reiterate that Dr. Chopra is academically active. Even then the Vice Chancellor was not satisfied, and he organized a meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committees, under his (Vice Chancellor) chairmanship in his office, in which 13 persons were present. He read out the minutes of that meeting –

“At the outset, the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor briefed the members about the recommendations of the Joint Committee held on 18.02.2016 regarding Dr. V.K. Chopra being academically active in accordance with letter dated 19.01.2016 sent by Dean of University Instruction and about copies of his communications between the Vice Chancellor and Professor Chopra. The Vice Chancellor asked the faculty members whether they still stand by the recommendation of the Joint Committee held on 18.02.2016 sent to the University authorities regarding Professor V.K. Chopra being academically active on the basis of academic activities submitted by Professor V.K. Chopra, and the copies of communications between the Vice Chancellor and Professor Chopra. The members unanimously reiterated and stood by their earlier recommendation of the joint meeting held on 18.02.2016. Further, it was also confirmed by all the members, who were present in the meeting, that it is not within their purview to comment on any communication between the Vice Chancellor and Professor Chopra, the copies of which were brought to the notice of the Chairperson as per instructions of the authorities in the joint meeting on 4th April 2016.”

There are signatures of all the 13 members, who attended the meeting held in the Committee Room of Vice Chancellor's Office. Now to say that Professor Chopra is not academically active is completely wrong. In fact, the Departmental Committees are satisfied with his (Professor Chopra's) teaching and research. Whether he (Professor Chopra) was a whistle blower and if the charges levelled by him are proved to be true, what would happen then? His re-employment is being terminated only because he has raised the wrong purchases made by the University official(s).

Dr. Ajay Ranga intervened to say that it is not a statement of the Chairperson, and rather, he is acting like his advocate.

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed in the House.

The Vice Chancellor said that all members of the Syndicate and Senate have already spoken on it on several occasions in the past. At the moment, they have only one issue at hand that whether they endorse the decision of the Syndicate.

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

Professor Rajesh Gill arose to say that there are certain new facts.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if they decided the issue without settling the issues raised by Dr. V.K. Chopra, a great injustice would be there.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa arose to say that he has raised his hand five times, but is not allowed to speak.

At this stage, both Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. S.S. Randhawa spoke, and Professor Keshav Malhotra listened to say that Dr. V.K. Chopra has got stay from the Court. He added that whosoever has gone to the Court, they have been granted stay on re-employment along with residential accommodation.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to sit down.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it would be contempt of Court.

When Dr. S.S. Randhawa and Professor Keshav Malhotra tried to say something, the Vice Chancellor requested them to sit down, but they did not sit down and a din prevailed.

Professor Rajesh Gill handed over some documents to the officials which were picked up by the Controller of Examinations.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that first of all, to cut down the re-employment of Dr. V.K. Chopra, is a very good decision, for which the Vice Chancellor has been authorized. Secondly, there are two issues correlated to it. The House of teachers is there and he would like to ask whether the academically active report is only required after attaining the age of 60 years; rather, it should be mandatory for each and every teacher.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is already mandatory.

Continuing, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that it should be mandatory on the same pattern on which they are giving re-employment. Secondly, in principle, he had spoken earlier also against it. In fact, the re-employment scheme is a very dangerous as it is great injustice to the coming generations. To whom and for what purpose they are giving the extension. The candidate, who has become eligible for a teaching post, is being blocked for a period of five years. When the re-employment scheme would complete a circle of 30 years, the unemployment would be doubled. What they have thought about the unemployed youths? He is of the considered opinion that there should not be any re-employment at all.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now, this is not an issue under consideration. They could bring it an agenda item. When Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa tried to say something, the Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Randhawa) is a member of the next Senate also, he could submit an agenda item.

The Vice Chancellor said that C-1 is carried by a majority vote, and those, who want to record their dissent, could raise their hands.

Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Keshav Malhotra arose and started speaking loudly and it was heard that this decision would be contempt of Court.

The Vice Chancellor reiterated that those, who want to record their dissent, could raise their hands.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-1 on the agenda**, be approved, and the decision be made effective from the date the

minutes of this meeting are written and finally approved after circulation to the members.

Professor Rajesh Gill, Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. S.S. Randhawa recorded their dissent.

IV. Considered (**Item C-2**) reports of PUCASH and Standing Committee pursuant to the letter/s received from the Chancellor's Office.

NOTE: The above item was placed before the Senate dated 24.7.2016/3.9.2016 as an agenda item No. C-4 but the same was deferred.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that, as said by Professor R.P. Bambah, this is the last meeting of the present Senate and it is in that context that he would like to make an observation or an appeal to the collective conscience of the members of the Senate regarding this item.

The Vice Chancellor said that but he has not yet given the background of the Item C-2.

To this, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that then what they were doing? Since they have already done Item C-1 and Item C-2 has been announced by the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him make an opening statement.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that could he allow him to speak before that.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Bansal) had privilege as he is much senior to him.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that, that is subject to his permission.

The Vice Chancellor said that he respects him (Shri Bansal) as he is in the University much before him and he has a national stature, which he (Vice Chancellor) could not even dream of.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal thanked the Vice Chancellor and stated that he thinks that though the matter has been referred to the Senate, he feels and feels earnestly that since it concerns to an important person of the University, i.e., a person who occupies an exalted office of the Vice Chancellor, and the other senior member of the Faculty and also a member of the Senate/Syndicate. Since the allegations are of personal nature in this matter, he thinks that despite that a way could be found out where they should not discuss this matter in this House, and that is his observation. He thinks that they should not discuss this matter here and his further suggestion which follows this is that he would like to even state few names also and if the House agrees, he would suggest that Professor R.P. Bambah and Dr. S.S. Johl should take up this matter informally and then this matter could be sorted out. He has gone through the papers and at every step, he finds that it has been dealt with cussedly. In fact, a different approach could have been taken, and the matter should have been sorted out, what since it has not been, he thinks that they should not further wait for the muck on this matter in the House. He suggested that an effort should be made to see this matter is sorted out amicably outside the House and he firmly believes that this could be done.

The Vice Chancellor stated that C-2 is an item which has been asked by the Chancellor to be placed before the Senate, which has entire superintendence over the affairs of the University. Matter at the moment is that a member of this House and someone, on whom responsibility is to preside over this House. There are certain allegations, but there is a law of the land that desires all such matters should be dealt

with by a procedure. Now, that procedure has not been gone through to a completion stage. So at the moment, it is this thing. At the moment, there are no matters to be discussed; rather, it is only a procedural thing that the Chancellor has passed on all those things to the Senate. In the meanwhile, there is another letter which has arrived from the Ministry of Human Resource and Development (MHRD). MHRD desires that the procedure should be completed. Who has to complete that procedure? The procedure has been laid down by this House and that procedure has to be done on behalf of this University. So, no details are to be discussed, and nothing has to be gone through as what are the allegations, what are the counter arguments, whether the allegations are right or wrong. All that would come later. They have not been assigned this responsibility to do any value judgement for one thing or the other. The value judgement has to be done by someone else, who has been created by this House, because this House has the entire superintendence over the affairs of the University in consonance with the law of the land. The law of the land says that every organization must put up machinery and it should be done in a certain way, respecting whatever the national standards are. So that has been done, and the evaluation report has to come from somewhere. As such, it is at that stage. At the moment, to the best of his knowledge, there is no evaluation report. The MHRD desires the evaluation report, the Police desires the evaluation report and the Chancellor also desires the evaluation report. The Chancellor has also said that the responsibility is of this august House is to ensure that the process gets completed. As such, his duty as Vice-Chancellor has ended here, and now the matter is before them. No evaluation is to be done of "a thing stated or another thing stated". He thought that he would just put it before them and that is where the matter is.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that as far as he remembers, a complaint has been registered and nothing else is there. An expression has been given that the Vice Chancellor has got a letter, he got it typed and passed on the same to the Registrar for placing before the Senate. There is nothing else. The Chancellor has said that the letter is against the Registrar and he has asked the Vice Chancellor to act on that. Now, an impression has been given that Vice Chancellor got the letter, which he got typed and passed on to the Registrar to place before the Syndicate and Senate and he (Registrar) did that. As far as I am concerned, there is nothing against the Registrar and it absolves Registrar of any wrong doing. So what is there for the Senate to do?

The Vice Chancellor said that there is another thing which was there in a small envelope, which has been supplied to all of them. The letter (from MHRD) says, "You are requested to kindly submit the report of the Senate with copy to the Chairman, PUCASH, with your plan of action on the matter to apprise the Hon'ble Minister of MHRD. When Professor R.P. Bambah enquired report on what, the Vice Chancellor said that the matter was referred to PUCASH Committee. PUCASH Committee is an instrument, which they have created.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that the Senate has already done it. Why has it come here now? He added that the action has already been taken, and the Registrar could write that this is what happened.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that he thinks that basically there is no difference in the three statements, which they have already heard. All of them point to a conclusion that this is not an opportune moment to have any further discussion on this matter for various reasons. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has given his reasons. Professor R.P. Bambah and he (Vice Chancellor) has also pointed out that at this moment, whatever is before them, is for information, and it is in compliance with the directive received from the Chancellor and MHRD, and in compliance with those directives, he (Vice Chancellor) has put these papers before them. They are not supposed to say anything at this stage. They have to wait for the procedures, which they (as Senate members) have ascribed, to be completed. When those procedures are completed, the matter could then come back to the Senate.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that with due deference to Professor R.P. Bambah and Ambassador I.S. Chadha, who intervened in this matter, he thinks that he

would not be true to himself if he does not put across his views once this matter has been taken up. He is conscious of the fact that the entire matter, the gravamen of the charge is not before this House. It is a complaint of the complainant saying that her right of confidentiality has been breached, which has given rise to this matter, and that is the only matter before this House. If he understands the law correctly or the feelings on this matter in the country, one of the core fundamental norms of any matter relating to sexual harassment stipulates that the identity of the complainant must never be disclosed. That is one/something, which has been underlined and highlighted. In this case, the complainant felt that after she had made certain complaints, the Registrar made it public. It is abundantly clear that the Registrar was not responsible for disclosing the identity of the complainant anywhere. So as far as the allegation/s against the Registrar is concerned, the Registrar is absolved of that and there is nothing and nobody could point a finger at him. But he thinks in the process might be the Vice Chancellor was not rightly advised, might be all people advising are not always altruistic in their approach when they advise. The statement of the Vice Chancellor before the Standing Committee puts the Vice Chancellor in the dock. That is why, he said that he would be dishonest to himself if he does not disclose or make it out here. If the House wants, he could read out the statement also, but since Professor R.P. Bambah and Ambassador I.S. Chadha ji and that is the matter on record and it is there on record that the Vice Chancellor had to bias, which is very unfortunate thing. This involves, as he said in the beginning, two important persons, and it for the first time that such an unfortunate thing is happening in the University that they have been called to discuss the matter. He wishes and earnestly wishes that this had never arisen. And, he also feels that once the matter had arisen, this could have been sorted out, had somebody taken the interest, but he does not know really because he is out of the picture. And he does not wish to be in the picture even now. All that he wishes to say is a point which comes to his mind. In this case, while the Registrar is not guilty of disclosing the identity of the complainant, but the Vice Chancellor is. His feeling is, he is sorry if he hurts his (Vice Chancellor) feelings, that is on the record and he (Vice Chancellor) has admitted as Vice Chancellor himself that he took one or two other steps which he (Shri Bansal) thinks were not necessary to be taken at that stage, which he would have to mention now. After the Vice Chancellor was called by the UGC to have an understanding of this matter, the complaint of the complainant was shown to the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor was given a time of a week to reply to that. For making the reply, he (Shri Bansal) understands that he (Vice Chancellor) had to know what were the allegations. A copy of these complaints given to the UGC was given to the Vice Chancellor. When the Vice Chancellor comes there, he is not talking about the Press as he knows what means the Press people adopt and they have their own styles and they could do the things and he would not like to go into that, but here when the Vice Chancellor arrives here, he takes an unusual step, he says an unusual step at that stage because he thinks the Vice Chancellor could very well deny the entire allegation, but the Vice Chancellor chose to contact the Dean of Student Welfare (DSW) and directed him (DSW) to go to the Warden, who (DSW) collects the album, from there on, and on the basis of the album, he (Shri Bansal) is sorry if he again hurts the feelings of even the DSW on this. They take it upon themselves (DSW and the Warden) to analyze the entire album. They worked sequence-wise and said this is what happened, this is where the Vice Chancellor comes in, this is what happened, the complainant moves and sits next to the Vice Chancellor. Shri Bansal asked "Who had called for all that?" The University went to the extent of approaching the Police on its own. To his (Shri Bansal's) knowledge, the Police had not taken action into this matter, and that was the grievance of the complainant. The University approached the Police also through Chief of University Security to say that this all is rubbish and there is nothing in it, and this need be followed up. Shri Bansal further added "where was the occasion to do all that?" "Why did he (Vice-Chancellor) get into the merit of the case at that time?" Only question (raised by complainant) was about disclosing the identity, and that identity as he (Vice Chancellor) has admitted himself, the Vice Chancellor has disclosed the identity on his own and that statement is on page 3 (detailed statement). When he (Vice Chancellor) makes the report to the Chancellor about today's proceedings, please mention this also that, well all members might say, but he (Shri Bansal) did certainly say that it is not the Registrar, it is the Vice Chancellor, who rightly or wrongly or inadvertently/deliberately, he could not get into the minds of anyone, but the identity of the complainant has been

disclosed by none other than the person, who is accused of some wrong doing. He is not going into the merits at all.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood stated that, in fact, he was just wondering that they are discussing this point when the complaint is against Chairperson of the House. What are they doing actually, especially when the complaint is against the Chairperson of the House? How could they discuss this type of point? He thinks that they should never discuss this point when he (Professor Arun Kumar Grover) is presiding over the meeting. As Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has mentioned, let there be a small Committee to sort the issue out.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter has been before them. Since all value judgement, evaluation, enquiries, etc. has to be done by someone else, the law of the land does not permit anyone of them individually investigate into this matter. The matter has to be investigated by a Committee, which has this responsibility, respecting the law of the land. So let that report comes. That report would go to the Chancellor, just as the previous report went. The Committee felt that the allegation is against the Registrar, the report went to the Chancellor. Let the Committee's report go to the Chancellor and whatever the Chancellor directs, they would do it. At the moment, he does not want to respond to anything whatever might be stated about him (Vice Chancellor) and he would like to move on.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that because the report of the Committee has been placed for consideration, she wants to make certain comments on that.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not permit.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill said that he (Vice Chancellor) could not do this as she has to. He is chairing the meeting even though he is accused. She is a complainant and she is not being permitted to have a say.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is the youngest member and says that this type of discussion should not be held here. Secondly, it also does not look nice that this type of discussion should be held here as they are senior members.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is sorry to see this attitude and is pained to see this attitude from the senior Senators. Do they have mothers, wives, and daughters at home? She wants to make a point and this is democracy. She believes this is democracy. This is not fair.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier also, she was not allowed to speak and the matter was hushed up.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is not fair.

Shri Varinder Singh said that she (Professor Rajesh Gill) is a senior member of the House and this issue should not have come here.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill said that senior does not mean that one has no respect.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is not saying that. He is only saying that such matters should not have come here.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is addressing him (Vice Chancellor). There are procedural problems/lapses and she needs to point out.

The Vice Chancellor said, "No".

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he (Vice Chancellor) is chairing the meeting and she is the complainant and (there is) injustice to such an extent.

The Vice Chancellor said, "He is not permitting her".

Professor Rajesh Gill said, "Who is he to permit"? She is the complainant and he (Vice Chancellor) is the accused and both of them (Registrar and Vice-Chancellor) have connived. He (Vice-Chancellor) could not stop her.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why he (Vice Chancellor) is not permitting her to speak.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired why does he not speak now?

Dr. S.S. Randhawa remarked that he (Vice Chancellor) himself is accused. He is behaving like a dictator and this behaviour of his is continuing for the last four years.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he has brought the item for consideration. She remarked that the name of Panjab University would be written in the history in black words and they all would be responsible for that. Nobody has the guts to speak now.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

When Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stood up to say something, the Vice Chancellor said that whatever has been said by him (Shri Bansal), the same would be transcribed and it would be sent to the Chancellor along with the video recording. Let him wait for the Chancellor (to respond).

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that he has also right to say something more. He only wants to say that this matter is for consideration. He did not expect this from the Chair that he (Vice Chancellor) would rush through the item, the way he is doing it. When the Vice Chancellor said that he is not rushing through the item, Shri Bansal said that please don't force him to say that. When the complainant wishes to speak on this and some other members also wish to speak on this, he (Vice Chancellor) said that this is closed and they could not speak on this. What is this? If anybody wishes to speak or if she wishes to speak, she had the right to speak in this House, especially when the matter is for consideration and not for information. Don't bulldoze the proceedings of the House.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not bulldozing.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he is forced to say that, though he never wished to say that. He stated that he began entirely on different note, but he finds him (Vice Chancellor) doing that.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not accept that.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that his (Vice Chancellor) accept would not matter.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Fine".

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that if he (Vice Chancellor) is not doing that let her (Professor Rajesh Gill) speak.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that the report of the Standing Committee has been placed before the House for consideration. The first question, which she wants to ask, is under what provision the Standing Committee was marked the complaint, which pertained to violation of Section 16 of the Act, because such complaint should go to

PUCASH. How and under what provisions it was marked to the Standing Committee. The report of the Standing Committee, which she has seen, suffers from concealment of facts and misrepresentation of facts. It says that only one representation was received from the complainant, while she submitted at least five representations and she had the despatch numbers as well as copies of all the letters. Why those five letters of her, which she sent to A.R. (Estt.), who was the Convener of the Committee, have not been made part of this report? The letter of Registrar dated 13th June 2016, refers to letter of PUCASH Chairperson dated 9th June. Where is that letter of PUCASH Chairperson? That has been concealed and not provided along with the agenda. Now, the allegation/complaint was against the Vice Chancellor, but the Registrar was connived, who is supposed to handle the agenda, the conduct of meetings of Syndicate and Senate, and he was equally responsible. He was supposed to tell the Vice Chancellor that he is not supposed to do this. She would read out Section 16 of the Act, which says, "Notwithstanding anything contained in the Right to Information Act, 2005, the contents of the complaint made under Section 9, the identity and the addresses of the aggrieved woman, respondent and witnesses, any information relating to conciliation and enquiry proceedings, recommendations of the Internal Committee, as the case may be, the action taken by the employer or District Officer under the provision of this Act, shall not be published. Communicated or made note to the public, Press and Media in any manner. Section 16 says, where any person entrusted with the duty to handle or deal with the complaint/enquiry or any recommendation or action to be taken under the provisions of this Act, contravenes the provisions of Section 16. He shall be liable for penalty in accordance with the provisions of Service Rules applicable to the said person or where no such Service Rules exist in such manner as may be prescribed. So not only identity of the complaint, but the content of the complaints and the names of the witnesses everything have been disclosed, whereas none of these is to be communicated or published. The argument is that the members of the Governing Body have to be provided in the confidential statement of the complainant, then are they not entitled to have a copy of the reply/replies which the Vice Chancellor submitted to the UGC. Why that reply/replies has/have not been made part of the agenda or proceedings till date, i.e., even after more than one year? Secondly, the Registrar has said that the Vice Chancellor never submitted his reply to the UGC through him (Registrar), and hence; he has no access to his reply. Then the question is – did the complainant submit the complaint to the Registrar. How had he access to the complaint? Now, the violation of this Act itself is termed as misconduct as per the Service Rules in the Act, which calls for action for misconduct. The question of publication and the judgement says that repeatedly when they public, it is a repeated offence, and it has been published seven times. The publication, for instance, in the law dictionary is – The act of making known, notification to people at large, communication of matter to some persons other than the person to whom it is addressed. The Registrar in defence himself is saying that he has been sending these in closed cover. What about posting of all the proceedings on the University Website? All the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate wherever this complaint was discussed, where the contents of the complaints and all discussions took place are on the Website for the public, and anybody could see all over the globe. She would like the House to please ponder objectively because this is a very responsible House. Don't go by emotions as this could happen to anybody, and it is not easy to go through this process.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not wish to respond.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that then he (Vice Chancellor) should withdraw this item and this is the democratic set up. What he has through is that everything is being rushed up. Either he (Vice Chancellor) should not have brought the item in, but if he has brought the item in.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he has just said that he does not wish to respond. Could he not exercise his right not to respond at this stage at all? He would respond as and when PUCASH Committee asks him to respond.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that ethically, it would have been better, if he (Professor Arun Kumar Grover) has not been presiding over the meeting when this particular matter is being considered. This is his neutral view and he thinks that he (Vice Chancellor) must take this into consideration while considering this case again.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Fine".

Professor Shelley Walia stated that he just wants to go back to what Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji said in the beginning that they, in fact, are now ending the tenure of this Senate and let them end it on a happy note. The way they could really go about it and he speaks as the Chairperson of the Committee appointed by the Syndicate, which set an agenda for him that he should bring about some reconciliation between the Vice Chancellor and Professor Rajesh Gill. He did make an effort and tried that both of them should come to the table because that is the only way of sorting it out. He thinks that as elders and academics they have collected here today, if this suggestion, that it could be sorted out outside the House, then they would be ending on a very positive note for this University and for the Senate. But if this does get escalated, does end up in raking up the muck that they have actually been doing and it is very unpleasant, both for the complainant and for the accused. Therefore, he would request the House that if they want to end on a positive note, let the two parties come to the table and bring about some kind of reconciliation. Reconciliation, he means that people do make mistake, and they do apologize. They could not bring about reconciliation between Palestine and Israel unless they bring them to the table. His request is that it could be done by the elders, who are sitting right in the front row. Though now at the moment, they are silent, they could actually play a positive role.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that, he came to the Senate in the year 1976 and today it is his 40th year in the Senate. This unfortunate incident has happened, and perhaps, such an incident has never happened before. It is very unfortunate. It should not have happened. He would like to say two/three things. Earlier, he was thinking that he should not speak so that it is not given another shape. Allegation was levelled that he (Vice Chancellor) has disclosed the identity of the complainant. It was also alleged that photographs were collected. The complainant is a respected member of this House and she has a place in the Campus. So far as disclosure of identity is concerned, first of all, it was disclosed by both of them. On one hand, she herself is saying that the complainant should be given a chance to speak, and on the other hand, allegation is being levelled that the identity of the complainant has been disclosed. He knows the complainant not from today, but for the last so many years. He has no hesitation to say that Professor Rajesh Gill is a senior Professor of this University and over the years has maintained her credibility. She has self-respect and honour. In the University working, there could be some differences. He has seen during the last 40 years that 2-4 persons might not have worked together. He respects her and honours her academically, socially and in every respect. At the same time, Professor Arun Kumar Grover is the Vice Chancellor and he has watched him very closely after his becoming the Vice Chancellor of this University. The people, who used to be in the University in the past, also respect him (Vice Chancellor). Professor Rajesh Gill is like his real sister, but he would like to tell her and she should not take it badly and if her feelings are hurt, he should be forgiven and he seeks forgiveness from her with folded hands. He could believe for 50 or more things about this Vice Chancellor, and if somebody say him to be proud or that he favours some one, he could accept, but he is saying with clear mind and while seeking apology from her that if somebody says that he (Professor Arun Kumar Grover) has sexual weakness for some other woman then he would not accept it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she strongly objects to this. It is insult to her.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he has already sought apology from her. When Professor Rajesh Gill indulged in counter arguments with him, Shri Jain said that if she has right to put forth her viewpoints, he also has right to put his viewpoints. He added that he respects her and again seeks forgiveness from her with folded hands.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he (Shri Jain) is making personal comments on her.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he is not making personal comments on her; rather, he is defending Professor Arun Kumar Grover. He has made personal comments only to be extent that she is a nice lady, has maintained credibility, has reputation and has respect also.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue of Professor Arun Kumar Grover is not being discussed, and he is defending him.

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that it is his request to her and he had told her earlier also because he knew it that it would hurt her. She could put her viewpoints and he would not stop her, but he is reiterating again that she might have some misconceptions about Professor Arun Kumar Grover, but it does not go down his throat and he has no hesitation in saying this. To whatever extent she wants to protest against him, she could and wherever she wishes to go, she could go. But he again wishes to say that everybody has his own feelings.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is nothing but humiliation and she left the House under protest.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he is saying this about this person (Professor Grover) without any hesitation that his heart is unable to accept that somebody says about Professor Grover that he has some sexual weakness about some woman. He is saying this without any hesitation and also after seeking an apology. Secondly, it has been argued that he (Vice Chancellor) has collected the photographs, etc., and he wishes to know that if any written complaint is received from a responsible person, what would one do? One would definitely get the enquiry done and when the enquiry would be done, one would collect the facts from the spot of the incident. If the prescribed procedure has been followed, according to him, nothing is objectionable in it. It is true that the name of the complainant is not to be disclosed anywhere and there are no two opinions about it, but when the complainant herself is supplying the copies of the complaints to different quarters, including the members of the Syndicate and Senate and also to those, who has objected that the identity of the complainant should not be disclosed. In fact, first of all, they have disclosed in the House that she is the complainant.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal intervened to say that he has not disclosed the identity of the complainant. When the complainant went to the well of the House, only then he told. Please don't say anything wrong.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he does not want to go into the issue as to who is saying wrong. That was why, he was not willing to speak on the issue. She (Professor Gill) has said that she is the complainant. He only wants to tell them that if they had any other enmity, they could settle the score in other ways.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Mr. Vice Chancellor, you are allowing this Senate to become a political arena. It is none other than him, who is allowing this.

The Vice Chancellor said that now, he has no option, but to adjourn the House and he adjourned the House for ten minutes.

After about 10 minutes, the Vice Chancellor and certain others members, including Professor Rajesh Gill, re-entered the House. The Vice Chancellor said that let they resume the meeting.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that after putting his viewpoints, he would like to make 2-3 suggestions. He suggested that this issue should be sorted out after thorough discussion. If they are not able to settle the issue amicably, then let it happen by its Enquiry Committee – whether PUCASH or anybody else, the whole issue should be investigated by listening to both the parties, and action be taken in accordance with the law. Sooner the matter is resolved, the better it would be. Otherwise, it is a mud and it would be on both the parties, which would ultimately bring a bad name to the University. Therefore, this issue should be concluded at the earliest and taken to its logical end.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that, in his humble view, there are only two ways to go into the merits of this case. Though he is not a lawyer, he understands from the common sense that there is a law in place for how to deal with such complaints and that law permits only two possibilities – (i) let PUCASH complete its work and then it could come back to the Senate, and the remaining part of the procedure could be followed; and (ii) which has been suggested by many and tried also as Professor Shelley Walia has pointed out and unsuccessfully so far that it should be put, settle it amicably outside. Now, that amicable settlement outside is permissible provided both the parties concerned agree to participate in that process, out of their freewill, and not that they are forced to do so by anybody. He would be very happy if the matter could be settled amicably between the two, but he repeats that they could not even begin the process by appointing one Committee or another or asking four or five wise men to step outside and do it. It could not be done until both the parties agree to that procedure. A slight arbitration though he is not a legal person, but both the parties have to agree. He is not aware, maybe the consent has not been sought or maybe the consent has been sought, but denied, he does not know and he does not need to know. All he could say is they could not under any circumstances discuss the merits of the complaint in this House before the legal procedures are followed. Doing that would be circumventing the law, and he does not know what kind of legal term they could use, but if they start discussing the merits of the complaint, any aspect of the complaint in this House, while the matter is sub-judice, as it were before PUCASH, would be wrong and would only be possible if, let they hope so, could be settled amicably outside, as has been suggested by many. Several senior people here wish and made this point that let they not vitiate the atmosphere in this last meeting of the Senate, to which everybody had agreed. The only way to prevent that is to follow the law, but the law does not permit them to discuss the merits of this complaint one way or the other. Nobody who is speaking takes side as he/she could not do that. He repeated that the matter is sub-judice, and if they want to settle it amicably outside, the only way is to seek the consent of two parties. He requested that effort should be made and he is for it, but it could not be done without their consent. Until that happens, they could not permit a discussion on any aspect of the merits of the complaint in this House because in his view the same is contrary to the legal provisions of the Act.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that it is sad, as said by Shri Varinder Singh, that junior members have been forced to speak whereas very-very senior members are sitting in the front row, viz. Professor R.P. Bambah, Dr. S.S. Johl, Shri V.K. Sibal, S. Tarlochan Singh and Ambassador I.S. Chadha. He is making the request by names because he has also been practicing law for the last 15-16 years and he has seen that cases are settled out of Court as well and are settled differently then the legal procedures, and there are extraordinary judgements on them. If under any circumstances brotherhood is maintained in the society, then the procedures of the law could be overlooked and overruled. He requested both Professor A.K. Grover and Professor Rajesh Gill that since it is the question of respect of all of them as well as of the Institution, could this issue be not resolved by sitting together. It is a very good terminology that they want to sit across the table before war or after the war. If they sit across the table before war, the chances of loss is very less, but if after the war, the loss

would be much, but under any circumstances, they have to sit across the table. Neither they wish to go by getting somebody hanged nor insulted. It is his request to both the parties and he also belongs to one of the parties that they should keep themselves limited to the issue alone and refrain themselves from flaring it. He wishes to ask that had it been somebody's home issue, had he/she flared it in the air. So it his request to the wise men and legal luminaries, as nobody has more experience than Shri V.K. Sibal, kindly sort out this matter amicably before the term of the present Senate ends. He does not say that Professor Rajesh Gill has done something wrong or Professor A.K. Grover has done something wrong, he only wants to say that the matter should be resolved as they resolve their own home case(s). If they treat it like their own home case, the decision could be taken today itself. But the type of interests the people are sitting herewith, he does not think that the issue could be taken to its logical end. Therefore, kindly constitute a Committee of those persons whom he had named a little while before. If by mistake he has forgotten to mention the name of a senior person, he should be forgiven, but his/her name should be included in the Committee. He urged this should be done immediately after this meeting of the Senate and they should also care for the respect of each other as well as of the Institution.

Dr. R.P.S. Josh said that Dr. Randhawa is absolutely right and he endorses his viewpoints and requests that the consideration of the matter should be deferred.

Shri Varinder Singh said that Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa has rightly said and earlier Professor Shelley Walia had also said rightly and it is also the question of respect of their House. All the senior members should take a plunge together to sort out this matter so that a message of brotherhood and goodwill go outside. As told by Dr. Randhawa that when even the issues serious are settled outside the Courts, even the Courts accept them. However, here nothing serious has happened, and otherwise also, nothing would be finally come out of this. Therefore, he urged the senior members to come forward and sit together, so that the matter is sorted out before the completion of term of the present Senate, i.e., 31st October 2016 and with this their honour would be enhanced because otherwise whenever anything is published about it in the newspapers, it brings bad name to both the parties. Whatever decision is taken by the senior members should be accepted by both the parties.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that he thinks that almost all the senior members have expressed their views. Efforts should have been made at the first instance when the complaint was received. He was worried because the senior members, who should have stepped in at that time, have not intervened. In fact, they should have come forward voluntarily to form a Committee of themselves to resolve the issue amicably. Now, the issue is already in the newspapers and blown out of proportion. Actually, the Committee should have been constituted earlier as well. Almost in every meeting, they were suggesting that a Committee should be formed so that it could sit down and resolve the differences, if any, amicably. Now, the issue has reached to the Chancellor, and he has been made to understand that the reply is now to be sent to the Chancellor. Even the proceedings of the meeting of the Senate are to be recorded and sent to the Chancellor. Why could they not make a Committee immediately, which could sit after the meeting and try to resolve the matter amicably? All the senior members, who are present in this House, are competent enough to resolve the issue. They should do that. He requested the members to endorse in one voice to endorse the formation of the suggested Committee, which should have been formed earlier. However, it is better late than never. Now, also there is an opportunity to form a Committee. He, therefore, suggested that they should form a Committee.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that there is a popular saying that "Lassi and fight could be stretched and reduced to any extent". Before the completion of their term, they should establish such a practice/tradition from where the coming Senators could get guidance, enlightenment and knowledge. He (Vice Chancellor) is a senior member and Head of the Institution, and being the Head of the Institution/family, one is supposed to resolve all the issues. Therefore, he should find such a way, e.g., a Committee comprising persons like Professor R.P. Bambah, Dr. S.S. Johl, etc. should be constituted, which should make both the parties sit together and resolve the matter

amicably, and he is very much sure that they would definitely succeed. Since the issue of Punjab was also resolved on the table and whichever issues are to be settled are to be settled on the table and nowhere else. He again reiterated that a precedent should be set in this Senate so that the coming Senates take guidance from it.

Shri S.S. Johl stated that it is very unfortunate that two great personalities are involved in this case. Whatever discussion has taken place, it should not have been taken place here in this House. That they are sitting in the front seat, is also a reflection on them that they have not spoken, but when the issue is heated up not even logics are not heeded to. He had also spoken to some of his friends outside, and the suggestion which is coming for the formation of the Committee, is the only solution to this problem. Some of the members should sit together outside the House and try to reconcile because only reconciliation would take them to the logical end. If their intentions are good, any issue could be sorted out. Seeing the personalities involved, his heart sinks as to what is happening. If it is agreeable to both the parties, then he would move a proposal that a Committee should be formed by the House so that an agreement could be reached. If there are certain misunderstandings, the same could be removed and if there is mistake on somebody's part, one could accept the same and there is no harm in accepting the mistake. So he thinks that this proposal should be accepted and perhaps the entire Senate would endorse it, and he appeals that they should endorse it.

Several members in one voice said that it is endorsed and the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he just wants to know for his knowledge as to what is the item under consideration. He does not think that any report has been submitted by PUCASH. As everybody is saying that let them wait for the report of the PUCASH, and in the meantime, they would not take any decision on the item under consideration. That means, the item under consideration is something other than the PUCASH. They are all talking about sorting out the issue so far as allegations of Professor Rajesh Gill against Professor Arun Kumar Grover relating to sexual harassment are concerned, but that is a separate matter, and that probably to his mind, is not under consideration of the Senate as on today. Today the issue under consideration as per his understanding is that the complainant has filed a complaint before the Chancellor that the Registrar has published the confidential papers relating to her case, and the complaint is dated 9th June. In response to that a letter has been received from the office of Hon'ble Chancellor which is dated 27th and later corrected to 21st. So it is letter dated 21st June 2016, and what this letter says, "The undersigned is directed to refer to your letter number so and so addressed to Hon'ble Vice-President of India and Chancellor Panjab University, received in a sealed cover from the office of the Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, with regard to the complaint received from Professor Rajesh Gill pertaining to alleged breach of confidentiality by Colonel G.S. Chadha, Registrar, Panjab University by presenting to the Senate and Syndicate documents submitted by her. What he is trying to say is that a proposal by all the members, including Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa, Shri Varinder Singh, that a Committee should be formed to sort out this issue. He is saying that this item, which has been brought for consideration, why it is being debated. The item under consideration is "Complaint of Professor Rajesh Gill dated 9th June, which has been submitted to PUCASH", which PUCASH has referred to the Chancellor through the Vice Chancellor in a sealed cover. Vide letter dated 21st June 2016, they say "The undersigned is directed to convey (the letter is addressed to the Chairperson, PUCASH) that the Vice Chancellor of Panjab University is being directed to look into the issue(s) as appropriate while seeking guidance of the Senate of Panjab University on this matter. But what has been brought before them is. In fact, there are two items – (i) To consider PUCASH Report; and (ii) To consider the report of the Standing Committee, while the fact is that this letter should have been placed before the Senate as per the mandate of the office of the Chancellor, and had the Senate given the direction that this should be handed over to the Standing Committee or PUCASH or a Committee could be suggested, so that the things would not have reached this stage. Now, his simple submission is if any such Committee, which is proposed by all Hon'ble members, including Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa, that Committee should be given the task of this issue also and not only the first one because even if the first issue stands resolved, this allegation in the eyes of law

still remains to be solved if the compromise is not reached between the complainant and the accused and the accused in this case is not the Vice Chancellor, but the Registrar. So he was just trying to suggest the issue was as a whole, but unfortunately probably, instead of considering it, they all, of course, for obvious reasons, wanted to concentrate on the real issue. Secondly, it is in such a good taste that the proposal has been made, but at the same time, it has pained him a lot because the impression in the minds of most of the members must have been, barring those who know the reality, as if these efforts have not been made by any of the members earlier to sort out the issue. It is not once, but twice at the initiative of the Syndicate (different Syndicates), it was tried to sort out the matter. In one such Committee, of which he was also a member, allegations starting coming that he (Shri Goyal) would not let the matter sorted out because Professor Rajesh Gill has made the complaint on his asking. Then he immediately said better it is for him to withdraw from the Committee and he did so. Thereafter, another Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Professor Shelley Walia and he (Professor Walia) was very confident that there is no problem; rather, it is an in-house problem, which usually occurred in home, they would be able to sort it out. He does not want to share in this House and would say it in private as to why that also could not materialize. However, it is always better sooner than have. If the efforts have not succeeded earlier, they should not say that the efforts have not been made, they should actually say that efforts were made, but they could not succeed. If now such an attempt could be made, that must be made, but it should be keep in mind that the item which is not on the agenda so far, a solution for the same should also be found and the item which is on the agenda today, at least its solution must be found.

The Vice Chancellor stated that let him respond. It is not appropriate for him to form any such Committee because then again it might be alleged that it the Committee of the Vice Chancellor. As such, he does not want to make any such Committee.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if the House suggests 3-4 members Committee, then the Committee could be formed.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would leave this House. Let Chancellor Johl chair this meeting and thereafter they could form any Committee. That Committee would have to its task as it deems appropriate because at the moment, his job is only to preside over this House, and while presiding over this House, he does not want to make once again any such Committee. Even the PUCASH Committee has this problem although it has been formed by this House. When the PUCASH Committee was formed, he had chaired this House. So he does not want to become a party.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nobody suggested to him to make the Committee.

Shri S.S. Randhawa suggested that the Hon'ble members sitting in the front row should give five persons for the Committee.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor left the House and the members in one voice requested Shri S.S. Johl to chair the meeting in the absence of the Vice Chancellor, and Shri S.S. Johl chaired the meeting.

Shri S.S. Johl said that first of all, he is grateful to all the members for giving such a respect to him and they unanimously given him the responsibility to chair the meeting in the absence of Vice Chancellor. His proposal is, as earlier suggested by several members, that a Committee should be formed, and he requested the members to propose the names. According to him, there should be only five-member Committee.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that it (five names) should not be given the status of a Committee. He suggested that a five-member informal Committee should be formed comprising three senior members. Since today two youngsters (Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa and Shri Varinder Singh) have played an exemplary role, both of them must be included in the Committee.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu and certain other members objected to this suggestion. Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that they authorize him (Shri Johl) to form a Committee of senior members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that may he suggested.

The chair replied in affirmative.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that names of Professor R.P. Bambah, Shri V.K. Sibal, Professor D.V.S. Jain and S. Tarlochan Singh.

S. Tarlochan Singh said that according to him, it should be left to Shri Johl Sahib.

Shri S.S. Johl said that if they had faith in his honesty and integrity, he would like to suggest the Committee under his chairmanship of Professor R.P. Bambah.

At this, Professor R.P. Bambah said that he suggests the name of S. Tarlochan Singh ji, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Shri Satya Pal Jain, two ladies and one nominee of the Vice Chancellor and one of Professor Rajesh Gill.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he does not want to serve on the Committee and instead suggested the name of Shri Punam Suri.

Shri S.S. Johl said that he does not want to put any nominee of the Vice Chancellor on the Committee. He further said that so many members are not required on the Committee. They do not wish to held a Court; rather, they wish to make reconciliations.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he would like to tell them that it has come to his notice that Committees were being formed, but no result came out. If they really wish, earlier, he had suggested two names, i.e., Professor R.P. Bambah, his (Shri S.S. Johl) and third person should be S. Tarlochan Singh ji, and it should formally be not called a Committee otherwise problem would again be there; rather, they should take up the matter informally by calling both the parties. If they do this, he is sure that the matter would be resolved. If they formed a Committee and record the proceedings, problem would again be there. He, therefore, requested them (Shri S.S. Johl, Professor R.P. Bambah and S. Tarlochan Singh ji) to sit together to sort out the issue keeping it informal. In House, such decisions could be taken.

Shri S.S. Johl said that he, Professor R.P. Bambah, S. Tarlochan Singh ji and if they permit, he would co-opt a lady from outside.

This was agreed to.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor was called back, and chaired the meeting further.

V. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-3 and C-4 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-3. That the appointment and Waiting List of the persons to the posts and the pay-scales noted against their name be approved as under:

Sr. No.	Person/ recommended for appointment	Post	Pay-scale	Pay per month
DEPARTMENT OF NSS				
1.	Ms. Navdeep Sharma	Programme Co-ordinator (On contract basis for the period of three years & extendable for further one year).	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000 Plus allowances admissible under University rules	she be offered basic salary in pay-Band-4 equal to whatever she is getting in her present position at A.S. College, Khanna.
WAITING LIST Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur				
NOTE: As per decision of the Syndicate the appointment letter has been issued after obtaining Legal opinion. (Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(i))				
DEPARTMENT OF BIOTECHNOLOGY				
2.	Dr. Desh Deepak Singh	Professor (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 10,000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(ii))				
DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY				
3.	Dr. Gaurav Kalotra	Associate Professor (SC)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9,000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xvi))				
UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY				
4.	Dr. Krishan Kumar	Professor of Information Technology	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 10,000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xix))				
UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MANAGEMENT SCIENCES				
5.	Dr. Manoj Anand	} Professors	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 10,000	Keeping in view their outstanding performance and merit, their pay be fixed after granting them one increment over and above protection of their present basic salaries and respective grade pay.
6.	Dr.(Ms.) Upasna Joshi Sethi			
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xx))				

Sr. No.	Person/ recommended for appointment	Post	Pay-scale	Pay per month
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION				
7.	Dr. Thingnam Nandalal Singh (SC)	Associate Professor (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9,000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xxi))				
UNIVERSITY BUSINESS SCHOOL				
8.	Dr. Rishi Raj Sharma	Associate Professor	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9,000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
WAITING LIST Dr. Tejinderpal Singh (SC) (Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xxii))				
UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MANAGEMENT SCIENCES				
9.	Dr.(Ms.) Monika Aggarwal	Associate Professor (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9,000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
WAITING LIST Dr. (Ms.) Nishi Sharma (Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(xiii))				

- NOTE:**
- The above recruitments would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.
 - The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching department/s 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. norms.
 - Appointment letters to the above persons have been issued in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

C-4. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Navneet Kaur (w.e.f. 01.07.2014)	Centre for Nanoscience & Nanotechnology
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(iii))		

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

Sr. No.	Name	Department
2.	Dr. Vijayta D. Chadha (w.e.f. 01.07.2014)	Centre for Nuclear Medicine
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(iv))		
3.	Dr. Nirmal Prabhakar (w.e.f. 01.09.2015)	Biochemistry
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(vi))		
4.	Dr. Namita (w.e.f. 20.07.2014)	Centre for Human Rights and Duties
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(vii))		
5.	Dr. Aman Khera (w.e.f. 21.09.2015)	University Institute of Applied Management Sciences
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(viii))		
6.	Dr. Manu Sharma (w.e.f. 12.09.2015)	University Institute of Applied Management Sciences
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(ix))		
7.	Dr. Arunachal Khosla (w.e.f. 21.07.2014)	University Institute of Applied Management Sciences
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(x))		
8.	Ms. Nidhi Gautam Prabhakar (w.e.f. 19.12.2013)	University Institute of Applied Management Sciences
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xi))		
9.	Shri Anish Slath (w.e.f. 15.10.2015)	University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xiii))		
10.	Dr. Ramnik Aurora (w.e.f. 07.11.2011)	French & Francophone Studies
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xiv))		
11.	Dr. Jasbir Singh (w.e.f. 07.07.2015)	History
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(ii))		
12.	Dr. Rajnish Saryal (w.e.f. 12.09.2015)	University Institute of Laws, PURC, Ludhiana
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(iii))		
13.	Dr. Rajneesh (w.e.f. 28.07.2015)	P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(iv))		

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

Sr. No.	Name	Department
14.	Dr. Monica (w.e.f. 18.12.2014)	P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(v))		
15.	Dr. Angrej Singh Gill (w.e.f. 30.08.2015)	P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(vi))		
16.	Dr. Vivek Kumar (w.e.f. 01.07.2014)	Centre for Medical Physics
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(vii))		
17.	Dr. Ranvir Singh (w.e.f. 10.04.2010)	Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(viii))		
18.	Dr. Anuj Sharma (w.e.f. 20.12.2015)	Computer Science & Applications
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(ix))		
19.	Dr. Surinder Pal Singh (w.e.f. 24.10.2015)	Mathematics
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(x))		
20.	Dr. Rajeev Kumar (w.e.f. 08.11.2014)	Environment Studies
(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 2(ii))		
21.	Shri Lallan Singh Baghel (w.e.f. 24.11.2011)	Philosophy
(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 2(v))		
22.	Dr. Kalpana Thakur (w.e.f. 14.09.2015)	Institute of Educational Technology & Vocational Education
(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 2(vi))		

- NOTE:**
1. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 3. Appointment letters to the above persons have been issued in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

VI.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-5. That Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **04.08.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

NOTE: 1. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

3. As per decision of the Syndicate the appointment letter has been issued after obtaining the legal opinion.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xv))

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the meeting of the Syndicate it was decided that legal opinion be obtained and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take appropriate decision, but the copy of the legal opinion has not been appended. He pleaded that the legal opinion should be shown to them enabling the office to issue a general circular so that the similarly placed persons could also get this benefit. He urged that the item should not be approved till legal opinion is shown to them.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the item should be approved because when the guidelines of the UGC itself say that if the temporary part of the service is in continuity, that has to be accepted. In the cases under consideration also, there is notional break and the Court also does not accept the notional break. Previous day also, he has made them aware of various decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and High Courts on notional break. In the UGC Regulations, 2010, it has been clearly mentioned that if the temporary service is in continuity, the same would be accepted. This is the case under consideration and these persons want the University count their previous service.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to why the legal opinion has not been disclosed to them. He requested the Vice Chancellor to read out the proceedings of the Syndicate for them.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired as to what is the precedent. If the precedent is there, it should be done because different legal opinions come in different cases.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that whosoever is similarly placed, they all should be given this benefit.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is in favour of granting the benefit(s), but the legal opinion which the other member(s) knew, why the same is not in his knowledge. He requested the Vice Chancellor to place before them the whole case, including the legal opinion. If it has been done, then it should be circulated to all.

The Vice Chancellor said that the benefit could be given to all the persons, who are similarly placed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that benefit should be given, but only after showing them the legal opinion.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the benefit is being given in accordance with the UGC Regulations and on the basis of this, the cases of all the teachers, who are similarly placed, would be dealt with.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the office should be directed to bring the file containing the legal opinion so that the same could be shown to them, and till then they should wait.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra urged the Vice Chancellor to first read out the decision of the Syndicate for them.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is the issue? The issue is – the benefit which is being given to Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur, the same should be given to all, who are placed in the similar situation.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this is not the issue and the issue is that as per the decision of the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor is supposed to obtain the legal opinion, and if he (Vice Chancellor) is satisfied, he could give the benefits. However, the legal opinion has not been placed before the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, there is no issue. What Dr. Ranga says is correct that it has been done by the Syndicate, so there is no problem in approving it. But could they ignore as to with what condition the Syndicate has done it.

The Vice Chancellor said, “No”, they could not ignore.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they could not ignore the decision of the Syndicate and that is what he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) is saying. Note 3 of the item says, “As per decision of the Syndicate, the appointment letter has been issued after obtaining the legal opinion”. So Professor Keshav Malhotra says why that legal opinion has not been annexed with the item. If it has not been annexed by mistake, he only wants it to be shown to the House, so that the benefit is extended on the basis of that to all. Or the Vice Chancellor could say that he has not taken the legal opinion and he has bypassed the decision of the Syndicate, but that is not the case because Note 3 says that they have done it after taking the legal opinion. He does not know as to why they want to rush through it, especially when the Syndicate has done it with condition.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they should be told whether the legal opinion has been obtained or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not remember.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is written.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Registrar to get the file wherein the legal opinion has been sought.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if the legal opinion has been sought, a copy of the same should be circulated to all the members.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Okay, let them move on”.

After sometime the legal opinion was shown to Professor Keshav Malhotra, and the Vice-Chancellor said that now the item stands withdrawn and they would come back to it later on. In the meantime, he would follow it up with the UGC, as mentioned in the

legal opinion. If the UGC accords its approval, the benefit would be given to all the similarly placed persons.

This was agreed to.

VII.

The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-6, C-7, C-8, C-9, C-10, C-11, C-12 and C-13 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e.

C-6. That Ms. Mona Pall be promoted from Assistant Librarian to Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage 1 to Stage 2) at A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. 01.04.2011, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.7,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 2. The letter of promotion/appointment to the person has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(i))

C-7. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Gayathiri Pathmanathan (w.e.f. 27.12.2014)	Anthropology
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(v))		
2.	Dr. Mukesh Kumar (w.e.f. 07.10.2015)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xii))		
3.	Dr. (Ms.) Amandeep (Assistant Professor in English) (w.e.f. 19.03.2016)	Evening Studies-MDRC
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(xi))		
4.	Er. Ramesh Kumar Sharma (w.e.f. 06.12.2014)	University Centre for Instrumentation & Microelectronics
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(xii))		
5.	Dr. Paru Bal Sidhu (w.e.f. 26.05.2013)	Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(xvii))		

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

Sr. No.	Name	Department
6.	Dr. Ashu Khosla (w.e.f. 07.11.2014)	Geology
7.	Dr. Parampreet Kaur (w.e.f. 07.11.2014)	
8.	Dr. Gurmeet Kaur (w.e.f. 19.03.2016)	
(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 2(i))		
9.	Dr. Hema Setia (w.e.f. 09.01.2016)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 2(iii))		
10.	Dr. Amit Sobti (w.e.f. 01.10.2015)	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 2(iv))		

- NOTE:**
1. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 3. The letters of promotion/appointment to the persons have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

C-8. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the pay-scale of Rs. 37400-67000 + AGP Rs. 9000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Purva Kansal (w.e.f. 29.01.2016)	University Business School
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(xiv))		
2.	Dr.(Ms.) Simrit Kahlon (w.e.f. 30.04.2014)	Geography
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(xv))		
3.	Dr. Renu Thakur (w.e.f. 26.09.2014)	Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(xvi))		

- NOTE:**
1. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 3. The letters of promotion/appointment to the above persons have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

C-9. That Dr. Chander Mohan be promoted from Associate Professor in Punjabi (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in Punjabi, in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. 19.07.2015, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs.10,000/- 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:**
1. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 3. The letter of promotion/appointment to the above person has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 92(xviii))

C-10. That Dr. D.B. Rishi be placed in the Lecturer (Selection Grade) w.e.f. 27.07.1998 instead of 31.12.2008 (i.e. the date he was placed in the Lecturer (Selection Grade) as per UGC guidelines 1998) and be granted the pay-scale of Rs.12,000-420-18300 (revised to Rs. 15600-39100+8000 AGP) and, thus, consequent upon his placement as such, he may also be re-designated as Associate Professor w.e.f. 01.01.2006, on completion of 3 years service as Lecturer (Selection Grade) in accordance with UGC Regulations, 2010, as re-designation of Associate Professor was given to all Readers/Lecturers (Selection Grade), who have completed three years in the current pay-scale Rs.12000-18300, instead of 30.12.2011.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 49)

C-11. That in view of the Clarification dated 8.10.2013, Dr. Bakhshish Singh, School of Punjabi Studies, P.U., be promoted from Reader to Professor, under CAS 1996, w.e.f. 05.11.2002, i.e. after one year from the date of his interview dated 05.11.2001 vide which his promotion case was rejected by the earlier Selection Committee.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 14)

C-12. That, since API score of Dr. Suchi Gupta has been re-calculated for the period 17th July 2006 to 16th July 2010 and her score in category 3 comes out to 57, which is more than the required score (i.e. 40) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), she be granted promotion from the date of her eligibility, i.e. 17.07.2010, as there are two publications (for which she was not the

main author in both the papers) with a marked factor of 4.893 and as a result of that with augmentation of the score on impact factor, each paper will get a score of 35 and she not being the main author gets 40% weightage for that which come out to 14 each.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 15)

C-13. That –

- (i) the appointment of Dr. Kuldeep Singh, as Assistant Professor be regularized in the Department of Biochemistry, whose appointment was approved by the Vice Chancellor, w.e.f. 29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) on notional basis up to 24.02.2014 without monetary benefits on the direction of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and financial benefit be given from actual date of joining i.e. 25.02.2014 up to 23.02.2015 (i.e. the date when his resignation was accepted by the Syndicate), and;
- (ii) his salary be fixed at Rs.39100+GP of Rs.8000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining at Panjab University, i.e. 25.02.2014 with the next date of increment as usual the services of Dr. Kuldeep Singh as Assistant Professor, be regularized in the Department of Biochemistry.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 9)

VIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-14 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-14. That the following persons be appointed Principals in Constituent Colleges of Panjab University in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.10000/-, on one year's probation, on the starting pay to be fixed and protected according to rules of Panjab University. Each of the candidates has to be given one increment, over and above their protected limit, while determining the additional starting salary:

1. Dr. N.R. Sharma
2. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
3. Dr. Kuldip Singh

- NOTE:**
1. The appointment letters to the appointees have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.
 2. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 3. The Principal appointed in a Constituent College can be transferred to any other P.U. Constituent College by the competent authority.
 4. The recruitment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 75)

IX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-15. That Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be appointed the next Dean of University Instruction of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 93)

X. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-16 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-16. That since the probation period of Dr. Jagdish Rai, Assistant Professor at Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology could not be extended within the stipulated period, he be confirmed from the due date i.e. w.e.f. 06.06.2015.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 13)

XI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-17 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-17(i). That the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

(i) University Business School

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Luxmi	Reader	9.5.1978	1.12.2014	1.12.2015

Vide Senate Para VI dated 28.09.2014, her appointment as Reader was approved w.e.f. 29.6.2010 i.e. from the date of Syndicate decision vide which recommendation of Selection Committee were approved. The period from 29.6.2010 to the date of her actual joining has been treated as notional and probation period of one year has been treated w.e.f. the date of her actual joining i.e. 1.12.2014.

(ii) Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
**1	Dr. Puja Ahuja	Assistant Professor	29.6.1971	23.1.2015	1.10.2012 (deemed)

** In terms of orders of Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 19285 of 2011 the deemed date of joining of Dr. Puja Ahuja as Assistant Professor is 1.10.2011 i.e. one day after the date of joining of all the candidates who were selected by the same Selection Committee dated 1.8.2011. She has actually joined w.e.f. 23.01.2015 therefore her appointment from her deemed date of joining and upto the date of actual joining has been treated as notional and she will be deemed to have confirmed as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 1.10.2012 i.e. after one year from the deemed date of joining.

(iii) P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Brajesh Sharma	Assistant Professor in Law	2.4.1978	1.12.2014 (AN)	01.12.2015
2.	Dr. Dharam Pal Singh Punia	Assistant Professor in Law	10.1.1979	1.12.2014 (AN)	02.12.2015

Sr. No. 1 to 2 above are in order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee. Their appointment is subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 24115 of 2014 vide which their appointment have been challenged by Ms. Rajni Nanda, who was one of the candidates for the said posts, therefore, their confirmation will also be subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court CWP No. 24115 of 2014.

(iv) History

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
^1.	Dr. Priyatosh Sharma	Assistant Professor	14.07.1980	02.01.2015	31.12.2015
^2.	Mr. Ashish Kumar	Assistant Professor	12.03.1985	01.01.2015	01.01.2016

^In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.

(v) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Jagjit Singh	Assistant Professor (Mathematics/ Applied Mathematics)	25.07.1982	24.12.2014	21.12.2015
2.%	Dr. Sunil Bansal	Assistant Professor (Physics/ Applied Physics)	01.03.1983	31.12.2014	22.12.2015
3.@	Ms. Neelam Goel	Assistant Professor (IT)	04.08.1985	31.12.2014	23.12.2015
4.*	Dr. Vivek Pahwa	Assistant Professor (EEE)	25.07.1974	01.01.2015	24.12.2015
5.%	Dr. Suresh Kumar	Assistant Professor (Physics/ Applied Physics)	28.01.1982	01.01.2015	25.12.2015
6.*	Ms. Aditi Gupta	Assistant Professor (EEE)	29.03.1981	31.12.2014	26.12.2015
7.*	Ms. Sabhyata Uppal Soni	Assistant Professor (EEE)	22.11.1971	31.12.2014	27.12.2015
8.@	Ms. Yogita	Assistant Professor (IT)	01.06.1985	28.01.2015	28.12.2015
9.@	Ms. Nidhi	Assistant Professor (IT)	01.07.1989	30.12.2014	30.12.2015

@%* In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.

NOTE: Confirmation of all the above will be Subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

(II) The Vice-Chancellor has recommended that probation period of Dr. Sunaina and Dr. Ritu Salaria, Assistant Professor in Law, SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur, be extended by one more year.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 22)

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

I. (i) University Business School

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Luxmi	Reader	9.5.1978	1.12.2014	1.12.2015

Vide Senate Para VI dated 28.09.2014, her appointment as Reader was approved w.e.f. 29.6.2010 i.e. from the date of Syndicate decision vide which recommendation of Selection Committee were approved. The period from 29.6.2010 to the date of her actual joining has been treated as notional and probation period of one year has been treated w.e.f. the date of her actual joining i.e. 1.12.2014.

(ii) Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of Confirmation
**1	Dr. Puja Ahuja	Assistant Professor	29.6.1971	23.1.2015	1.10.2012 (deemed)

** In terms of orders of Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 19285 of 2011 the deemed date of joining of Dr. Puja Ahuja as Assistant Professor is 1.10.2011 i.e. one day after the date of joining of all the candidates who were selected by the same Selection Committee dated 1.8.2011. She has actually joined w.e.f. 23.01.2015 therefore her appointment from her deemed date of joining and upto the date of actual joining has been treated as notional and she will be deemed to have confirmed as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 1.10.2012 i.e. after one year from the deemed date of joining.

(iii) P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Brajesh Sharma	Assistant Professor in Law	2.4.1978	1.12.2014 (AN)	01.12.2015
2.	Dr. Dharam Pal Singh Punia	Assistant Professor in Law	10.1.1979	1.12.2014 (AN)	02.12.2015

Sr. No. 1 to 2 above are in order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee. Their appointment is subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 24115 of 2014 vide which their appointment have been challenged by Ms. Rajni Nanda, who was one of the candidates for the said posts, therefore, their confirmation will also be subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court CWP No. 24115 of 2014.

(iv) History

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
^1.	Dr. Priyatosh Sharma	Assistant Professor	14.07.1980	02.01.2015	31.12.2015
^2.	Mr. Ashish Kumar	Assistant Professor	12.03.1985	01.01.2015	01.01.2016

^In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.

(v) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Jagjit Singh	Assistant Professor (Mathematics/ Applied Mathematics)	25.07.1982	24.12.2014	21.12.2015
2.%	Dr. Sunil Bansal	Assistant Professor (Physics/ Applied Physics)	01.03.1983	31.12.2014	22.12.2015
3.@	Ms. Neelam Goel	Assistant Professor (IT)	04.08.1985	31.12.2014	23.12.2015
4.*	Dr. Vivek Pahwa	Assistant Professor (EEE)	25.07.1974	01.01.2015	24.12.2015
5.%	Dr. Suresh Kumar	Assistant Professor (Physics/ Applied Physics)	28.01.1982	01.01.2015	25.12.2015
6.*	Ms. Aditi Gupta	Assistant Professor (EEE)	29.03.1981	31.12.2014	26.12.2015
7.*	Ms. Sabhyata Uppal Soni	Assistant Professor (EEE)	22.11.1971	31.12.2014	27.12.2015
8.@	Ms. Yogita	Assistant Professor (IT)	01.06.1985	28.01.2015	28.12.2015
9.@	Ms. Nidhi	Assistant Professor (IT)	01.07.1989	30.12.2014	30.12.2015

@%* In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.

NOTE: Confirmation of all the above will be Subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That probation period of Dr. Sunaina and Dr. Ritu Salaria, Assistant Professor in Law, SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur, be extended by one more year.

XII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-18, C-19 and C-20 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-18. That the following person working in the Pay-Scale Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.6600/- be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of joining	Date of confirmation
Shri Parveen Gupta Senior Scientific Officer Central Instrumentation Laboratory	07.04.2014 (A.N.)	08.04.2015

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 29)

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

- C-19.** That the following persons working as System Manager, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of joining	Date of confirmation
1.	Ms. Mamta Computer Centre	02.02.2015 (F.N.)	02.02.2016
2.	Ms. Monika Rani University Institute of Engineering & Technology	02.02.2015 (A.N.)	03.02.2016

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 30)

- C-20.** 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, Department	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
1.	Mr. Ram Chanter Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Bio-technology	13.06.2014	13.06.2015
2.	Mr. Hoshiar Singh Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Physics	13.10.2014	13.10.2015
3.	Mr. Raj Kumar Dogra Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Physics	13.10.2014	14.10.2015

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 28)

- XIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-21 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

- C-21.** That the following person working as Director, Physical Education & Sports, Directorate of Sports, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
Dr. Parminder Singh Director Physical Education & Sports Directorate of Sports, P.U., Chandigarh	10.03.2015 (A.N.)	11.03.2016

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 95)

XIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-22 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-22. That the following programmers working in the Departments mentioned against each, be confirmed on completion of one year of probation in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, under Rule (viii), page 128, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009:

Sr. No.	Name/ Department	Date of Joining	Date of completion of one year probation	Date of confirmation
1.	Shri Mohinder Singh Negi Programmer Department of Computer Science & Application	30.05.2014	29.05.2015	30.05.2015
2.	Shri Ankur Kukreja Programmer Computer Centre	09.07.2014	08.07.2015, L.W.P. 63 days (2 months 3 days)	17.08.2015
3.	Shri Balram Sooden Programmer, Computer Centre	19.08.2014	18.08.2015	18.08.2015

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 96)

XV. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-23, C-24, on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-23. That the resignation of Dr. Anupama Goel, Associate Professor, Department of Laws, Panjab University, be accepted w.e.f. 21.12.2015, under Regulation 6 page 118-119, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 7)

C-24. That the resignation of Dr. Vaneeta Aggarwal, Assistant Professor, University Business School, Panjab University, be accepted w.e.f. 06.05.2016, under Regulation 6 page 118-119, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 8)

XVI. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-25 and C-26 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-25. That Professor Gurmail Singh (Re-employed), Department of Economics be granted extension in Leave without pay for one year more, w.e.f. 5.5.2016, to enable him to continue as Vice-Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Punjab.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 10)

C-26. That the recommendation of the Committee dated 05.05.2016, for re-employment of Dr. Shveta Mahendra, Department of Indian Theatre, Panjab University, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 89)

XVII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-27 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-27. That the recommendations of the Committee dated 05.02.2016 that the Associate Professor/Joint Director and Assistant Professor/Assistant Director in the PRCs, be given benefit of Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) to be followed as per the UGC guidelines, 2010 wherever the UGC scales adopted; otherwise CAS adopted by State or similar posts shall be applicable, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 50)

XVIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-28 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-28. That since the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh has dismissed the CWP No. 9055/2011 (Bachan Singh Vs P.U.), Dr. Satish Patil be appointed Assistant Registrar (Reserved for SC) on one year's probation, in the latest pay-scale of Assistant Registrar plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.

NOTE: That the letter of appointment to the appointee, has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 26)

XIX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-29 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-29. That Dr. Ram Gopal, Professor (Retd.), Department of Sanskrit & Gurdev Singh Gosal (Retd.), Department of Geography, be granted the benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension, under Regulation 3.9 at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 on the basis of other advertisements of the contemporary period as the advertisement vide which they were appointed are not available in the office.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 11)

XX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-30 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-30. That Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-Placement Officer, UIAMS, P.U. be treated as on deputation basis from Punjabi University, Patiala and his pension contribution, leave encashment and gratuity share as per Panjab University rules be sent to the Punjabi University Patiala, as per their letter dated 21.12.2015.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 12)

Initiating discussion, Shri V.K. Sibal said that if he (Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha) is already on permanent job, how could they take him on deputation? In his own application, he has written that he is permanent. If he is permanent, they could not convert him into on deputation.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they should not allow the persons to work on deputation in such a manner. If he is allowed deputation in such a manner, the other persons, whosoever seeks deputation, should also be allowed.

The Vice Chancellor said that firstly the person has to apply, and secondly, the employer concerned has also to agree for sending him/her on deputation.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that his simple request is that if someone apply for deputation and his/her parent department permits him/her, he/she should also be taken on deputation.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that deputation should not be allowed in general; rather, it should be allowed on need/case to case basis and that too after making advertisement that people could also be hired on deputation, ensuring that there is no back door entry.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that those who are already in the University and are facing some kind of problem/s, if their parent departments permit, should be allowed.

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that he would like to read for them Para 1 of application of the candidate (Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha) which states, "I am grateful to the Panjab University for having granted me the permission to serve as Training-cum-Placement Officer, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences (Non Teaching Post) since October 2010 (on temporary basis) and then from May 2013 (On permanent basis)". If he is already on permanent basis, then where is the logic of taking him on deputation? He does not understand this.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that this was the matter for consideration in the meeting of the Syndicate day before yesterday, but they did not progress to that stage. So whatever arrangement was there between Punjabi University, Patiala and Panjab University, Chandigarh, they were following that. However, during the last week Punjabi University has communicated that they would not permit him (Dr. Marwaha) on this arrangement beyond last week of October. Meaning thereby that whatever arrangement was there between them would be curtailed up to the last week of October. So at the moment, in the light of discussion held so far in the case, he thinks that he should withdraw the item from the Senate and take it back to the Syndicate because whatever is to be done, has to be placed before the Syndicate again. They had agreed to keep him on deputation and were transferring his benefit(s) to Punjabi University towards his pension, but the Punjabi University has communicated that they had put a limit to this arrangement. As such, Punjabi University has put a stop to all this. Now, he has to take a call whether he wishes to go and join back Punjabi University and if he chooses to go back, then his services at Punjabi University would continue. Even if they pass this, it would mean only that he could join back Punjabi University with all his benefits; otherwise, if they insist that nothing doing from now onwards, then from the last week of October 2016, if he wishes to stay here, all his benefits at Punjabi University would finish there and here he has to seek fresh appointment. He could get extra benefits for having transferred his benefits back, though he (Vice Chancellor) does not know how many years of service he has. He might get some extra gratuity, etc. from Punjabi University after completing the service of certain number of years. So it is call which this gentleman has to take. Of course, if he decides to return to Punjabi University, it would be loss to Panjab University because he is contributing meaningfully to their programme. He is at a key position, and if he decides to return, they have to find another person for this key position. So this is matter which needs sorting between Punjabi University, Panjab University and this individual.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that alright, the item should be withdrawn.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that they should not look at the effect as he is serving at Punjab University, Patiala, on regular basis.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay, fine".

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he just wants to clarify that what does not happen anywhere else, happens in Panjab University. The observation made by Shri Sibal is very well appreciated and very well received also because he (Shri Sibal) must be confused how one could be on deputation and permanently also. How one could enjoy two positions at the same time? In fact, there was no such advertisement as has been pointed out by Shri Jarnail Singh that they wanted the people on deputation also. It was an open post and the persons applied through proper channel. The biggest difficulty, being faced by the fresh entrants, is that they (University) could not give them the pension.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Yes, for the back service".

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that no, whosoever has joined after 2004, is not entitled for Pension Scheme. Whosoever is coming from an institution where the Pension is available, he/she does not want to lose the benefit of Pension also and he/she wants to stay in Panjab University as well. So he/she says instead of confirming him/her after one year, get his/her probation period should be extended. As such, firstly he/she tries to get his/her probation period extended. It is the employee who requests that his/her probation period should be extended, but he (Shri Goyal) thinks that the people who know the service law, probation is decided by the employer, extended or not extended by the employer, and the probation could be waived even on the first day, the employer could confirm the employee also. However, in Panjab University the employee has the privilege to say that his/her probation period should be extended and they are extended the probation period for one year, two years, three years and so on. They feel and their right also, if they are hoping that sometime the case would be decided in their favour that they would be entitled for pension in Panjab University also, and till that time, they do not want to get confirmed because the moment they get confirmed here, wherever from they have come, their lien ceases to exist. As such, they do not want to lose that post also and they do not want to lose this post also. But in some of the cases, as in the instant case, their employers are not ready to extend the leave and say for how long it would take them to get confirmed. Now, the man has requested that he might be treated on deputation and they said that they need the consent of his employer. He gives the consent that he is ready to be treated on deputation and the Punjabi University has written, alright if they want him to take on deputation, then they have to give these many things. Interestingly, the pension, which they are not in a position to give him here, they are sending contribution towards pension to Punjabi University. Is it in order? If they could send contribution towards pension to Punjabi University, why could they not give him pension here? So instead of doing that, they should see under which provision they are sending the contribution towards pension to Punjabi University, under the same provision, why should they not try to cover these people by paying pension here. He knows the reaction of the Vice Chancellor that the Government of India is already after them that they (Government) are not responsible for their (University) Pension Scheme. He just wants to tell them that the moment the Government of India comes to know that they (University) have not allowed these people, who have joined after 2004, the pension as per the regulations, but they are indirectly contributing towards the pension from where they have come, probably it would be an embarrassing position for them. So far as the item before the Syndicate in yesterday's meeting is concerned, that was because a letter was written by Punjabi University to Panjab University, wherein they ask as to what is the position. However, the letter was not responded to by Panjab University. In the absence of any reply to that letter, a letter has now been received in the month of September only that they could not grant him leave beyond such and such date. The person is on leave also from there, the person has been appointed here also. Shri Sibal has pointed out only one thing that he is serving on permanent basis and at the same time also on deputation, besides that he is on leave from Punjabi University and serving here on deputation. If need be, the item should be withdrawn from here, and the issue should be examined in totality. Dr. Ajay Ranga is right that if they want to bring in any person, they should frame a policy that whosoever requests that he/she should be treated on deputation, they would treat him/her on deputation till endless time.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Central Government had once given a directive that for all these new Institutions like IISERS, they should be allowed for 10 years, so that they could get pension from somewhere. They had considered it in the Syndicate and they felt that this applies to Central Institutions even though they are an autonomous University, the Centre's directive does not apply to Panjab University. So they did not take it even though they tried to argue that since they have also implemented the Pension Scheme after 2004, they are a quasy Central Institution in some sense. They are not an Institution created after 2004, and they are an Institution which was created earlier, but they have implemented Pension Scheme after 2004, but they have given the benefit of Pension Scheme to all people, who have been there in the past via a very imagination and innovative arrangement, which is beautifully recorded in a 65 pages document, and he thinks the copy of the same might have received by them. Okay, there is a document entitled "PANJAB UNIVERSITY: ITS ORIGIN, PROGRESSION AND FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ITS SUSTENANCE". This document has some annexures and more than the document, interesting things are in the annexures. One of the annexures gives a beautiful summary and the entire background as to how Pension Scheme was introduced in this University and it is a very innovative thing, which happened on behalf of this University. He does not think in the history of academic institutions in the country, anyone was given this kind of concession as the Central Government gave to Panjab University. All its ramifications are beautifully recorded. So coming back to the agenda Item C-30, he thinks they should permit him to take it back and address it once again in the Syndicate.

This was agreed to.

Arising out of the above, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that such types of cases, though he does not go into the merits, where the people have requested that their probation period should be extended and they have extended the same. They also know under what circumstance the probation period has been extended, but for all practical purposes, they stand confirmed. All those, who are continuing under such probation, maybe two years, three years, and so on, when ask for some kind of leave, they say no, he/she is not confirmed and is on probation. So all those at least should be given the leave because there is no bar as such that those, who are under probation, could not be granted leave.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay, fine, well taken".

XXI.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-31 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-31. That Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh, PVSM, AVSM, General Officer Commanding in Chief Western Command, Chandimandir be offered Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair Professorship at the Department of Defence & National Security Studies initially for a period of three years and he be given an honorarium of Rs.5,000/- per visit/lecture subject to a maximum of Rs.40,000/- p.m. or whichever amount is payable to a Visiting Professor from within a country.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 36)

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that why are they so miser. If the person is doing Professor's job, give him Professor's salary minus pension. If the people, who are invited to the Chairs, do Professor's job (full-time), then why should they put a limit of Rs.40,000/-. Why not pay them the salary of Professor minus pension.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this has been done in the background of all these financial constraints. They are not supposed to make new appointments without the approval of Centre. So they are just taking recourse to that there is a notion of Visiting Professor written somewhere and for that Visiting Professor there is a notional limit of Rs.40,000/-. They tried to get this notional limit enhanced from Rs.40,000 to Rs.60,000/-, but even that was not permitted during the last meeting of the Board of

Finance. So they just did some hotchpotch, hotchpotch in the sense that they took advantage of the provision that a Visiting Professor could be there, which is already approved, and the Board of Finance has no issue with it and the limit for the same if Rs.40,000/-. Then they appointed these Chair Professors and there they said that they would give them Rs.5,000/- a day. What should be the limit on Rs.5,000/- a day. So the Board of Finance said that use this provision of Rs.40,000/-. Right now, since people coming on these Chairs are not typically going to come more than 8-10 days in a month, it is 5000×10 , which would be Rs.50,000/-. They just did it Rs.40,000/- because there was practical problem. If they are able to resolve the financial problem, then the matter goes back to the Board of Finance and so on. At the moment, the Board of Finance when it met last on 1st of August, they did not want to enhance anything and said that all limits should remain wherever they are.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that he would like to endorse what Professor R.P. Bambah has said and he also understands the financial constraints he (Vice Chancellor), but please do try that in future because if they really want able people to come as Visiting Professors, and if they want take fullest advantage of their knowledge, experience, then this is really miserable. The limit should only be his/her last pay.

The Vice Chancellor said that then one has to come regularly.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that why did they not have a rule that the Visiting Professor should come regularly. Sometime they might have people, who well qualified, are available and willing to come as Visiting Professors, but they would not come if they offer them Rs.40,000/- p.m.

The Vice Chancellor said that these Rs.40,000/- were decided many-many years ago. It was decided in the scheme of things of 6th Pay Commission. 7th Pay Commission is coming and everything would move by 257%, and if everything moves by 2.57 times, then the $40,000 \times 2.57$, it would become Rs.1 lac, but they have to reach that stage.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that they would not expect that the Visiting Professors should come regularly. Since they are visiting, they could not compare them with regular Professors.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now, they just wanted to have these Chairs filled up. They have person available and he is coming. Earlier also, he has come 3-4 times.

Shri S.S. Johl said that, according to him, his engagement is more important and salary does not matter to him. However, the point raised by Professor Bambah and I.S. Chadha is genuine. As such, there should be provision for the Visiting Professor, under which the Professor could be invited for a year, six months or three months, but with full salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that full salary has to be again against some existing position(s). When Professor Bambah said something, the Vice Chancellor said that right now, let him just stabilize the system. First stabilize the system, then have the output.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-31 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXII. Considered the Regulations/Rules for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16 (**Item C-32 on the agenda – Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 52**), and unanimously –

RESOLVED: That the Regulations/Rules for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16, be approved.

XXIII. Considered the recommendations of the Regulations Committee (**Item C-33 on the agenda**) meetings dated 29.10.2015, 3.11.2015 and 3.12.2015 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 36, 37, 41 & 43, and meeting dated 30.12.2015 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 & 24, circulated to the Fellows vide letter No. S.T. 11849-11939 dated 16.9.2016:

Meeting dated 29.10.2015, 3.11.2015 and 3.12.2015

ITEM 1

Amendment/deletion in Regulation 8 and 11 respectively for Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation and Networking (Annual System) (effective from the session 2011-12), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 2

Amendments/additions in Regulation 10 at page 149 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007 (effective from Senate decision dated i.e. 28.9.2014), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 3

Amendment in Regulation 1.2 for Masters in Remote Sensing & Geographic Information Systems (GIS) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 4

Amendment in Regulation 5(iii) for 5-Year Integrated B.Sc. & M.Sc. in Fashion & Lifestyle Technology (effective from the session 2014-2015), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 5

Amendment in Regulation 3.1(k) (iii) at pages 82-83 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-2015), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

ITEM 6

Amendment in Regulation 1.5 for Bachelor of Engineering (B.E.) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 7

Amendment in Regulation 2 for Bachelor of Architecture (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 8

Addition to Regulation 1.1(d) for Ph.D. degree in the Faculties of Arts, Languages, Education, Science and Design & Fine Arts at page 187 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 9

Addition of Regulations 17 and 19.2 for B.Sc. (Honours School) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2009-10 & 2013-14 respectively), in anticipation of the approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 10

Amendment in the eligibility criteria for admission to Postgraduate Diploma in Cosmetology and Beauty Care (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 13

Amendment in Regulation 5 for Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation & Networking (Annual System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 14

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 anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 15

Addition in Regulation 36 as a 'Special Provision' for B.A./B.Sc.(General and Honours) examination at page 50 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 16

Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Fashion Designing (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 17

Regulations for Certificate Course in Music (Vocal and Instrumental) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 18

Regulations for Bachelor of Library & Information Science on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the academic session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 19

Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Applied Agriculture (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), in anticipation approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 21

Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Child Guidance and Family Counselling (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 22

Regulations for Diploma in Stock Market & Trading Operations (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 23

Regulations for Post M.A. Diploma in Professional Counselling & Psychotherapy and Post M.A. Diploma in Psychological Testing on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the academic session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 24

Regulations for M.Ed. Special Education (Learning Disability) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 25

Regulations for Special Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged (Two-Year course) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 26

Regulations for Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged (Four-Year Course) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 29

Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Nutrition and Dietetics (Semester System) (One-Year Course) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 30

Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Cosmetology & Beauty Care (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2012-2013), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 31

Regulations for Master of Fine Arts (Two-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-2015), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 36

The eligibility criteria for following courses newly introduced from the session 2014-2015, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

- (i) M.E. (Food Technology)
- (ii) M.E. (Chemical with Specialization in Environmental Engineering)
- (iii) M.Tech. in Material Science & Technology
- (iv) M.E. in Mechanical Engineering
- (v) M.E. in Electrical Engineering (Power System)

ITEM 37

Addition in Regulation 10.2 of Chapter III "General Regulations for Examinations" (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 41

Regulations for Post-Graduate Diploma in Cyber Crime (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 43

Amendment in Regulation 3.2 for BDS course (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

Meeting dated 30.12.2015**ITEM 1**

Amendment in Regulation 1.3 for Masters in Remote Sensing & Geographic Information System (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 2

Amendment in Regulation 2.1 for Masters in Disaster Management (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 3

Addition to Regulation 8.3 for MBA (Off Campus) (effective from the session 2012-13), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

ITEM 4

Amendment in Regulation 8.1 (iii) for Master of Entrepreneurship and Family Business (MEFB) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 5

Addition of the eligibility condition for M.E. (Biotechnology) newly introduced at UIET in Regulation 1.4 meant for M.E./M.Tech. courses (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 6

Deletion of Regulation 2 (b) for B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Honours) 5- years Integrated course (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 11

Amendment in Regulation 10 for Master in Fashion Designing & Management (effective from the session 2016-17), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 12

Addition of nomenclature in Regulation 2.2 for Environment Education & Road Safety (effective from the session 2016-17), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 14

Regulations for Master of Business Administration (Executive) introduced at University School of Open Learning (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 15

Regulations for (i) M.E. (Regular) Two-Year Course and (ii) M.E. (Modular) (Seven Spells) Three and a Half Years Course, (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 16

Regulations for Master of Laws (LL.M.) (One Year Course) (Semester System) with two specializations i.e. (i) Law, Science & Technology and (ii) Commercial and Corporate Law newly introduced at University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 18

Regulations for Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing (DPN) (One Year Course) (effective from the session 2014-15), as per Appendix, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 19

Regulations for (i) Master of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology and (ii) Master of Philosophy in Psychiatric Social Work (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 20

Regulations for Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (3 months) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 21

Regulations for Bachelor of Ayurvedic Medicine & Surgery (B.A.M.S.) (effective from the session 2012-13), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 22

Regulations for B.A./B.Sc.(General & Honours) (Semester System) examinations (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 23

Regulations for (i) Bachelor of Hotel Management and Catering Technology (BHMCT) (Four-Year Programme) and (ii) Bachelor of Tourism and Travel Management (BTTM) (Four-Year Programme) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 24

Amendment in Regulation 11(D)(ii) at page 138 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 6)

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are several mistakes in the framed/amended Regulations, which she has pointed out in the Fellow Set supplied to her. She suggested that necessary corrections should be made from her copy and she might be supplied another copy of the Fellow Set, which was supplied to her.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That additions, deletions, amendments in Regulations as well as newly framed Regulations as below, be approved, with the stipulation that necessary corrections pointed by Professor Rajesh Gill and other corrections, if any, be carried out:

1. Amendment/deletion in Regulation 8 and 11 respectively for Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation and Networking (Annual System) (effective from the session 2011-12), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
2. Amendments/additions in Regulation 10 at page 149 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007 (effective from Senate decision dated i.e. 28.9.2014), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
3. Amendment in Regulation 1.2 for Masters in Remote Sensing & Geographic Information Systems (GIS) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

4. Amendment in Regulation 5(iii) for 5-Year Integrated B.Sc. & M.Sc. in Fashion & Lifestyle Technology (effective from the session 2014-2015), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
5. Amendment in Regulation 3.1(k) (iii) at pages 82-83 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-2015), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
6. Amendment in Regulation 1.5 for Bachelor of Engineering (B.E.) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
7. Amendment in Regulation 2 for Bachelor of Architecture (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
8. Addition to Regulation 1.1(d) for Ph.D. degree in the Faculties of Arts, Languages, Education, Science and Design & Fine Arts at page 187 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
9. Addition of Regulations 17 and 19.2 for B.Sc. (Honours School) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2009-10 & 2013-14 respectively), in anticipation of the approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
10. Amendment in the eligibility criteria for admission to Postgraduate Diploma in Cosmetology and Beauty Care (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
11. Amendment in Regulation 5 for Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation & Networking (Annual System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
12. 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 anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
13. Addition in Regulation 36 as a 'Special Provision' for B.A./B.Sc.(General and Honours) examination at page 50 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
14. Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Fashion Designing (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
15. Regulations for Certificate Course in Music (Vocal and Instrumental) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

16. Regulations for Bachelor of Library & Information Science on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the academic session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
17. Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Applied Agriculture (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), in anticipation approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
18. Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Child Guidance and Family Counselling (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
19. Regulations for Diploma in Stock Market & Trading Operations (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
20. Regulations for Post M.A. Diploma in Professional Counselling & Psychotherapy and Post M.A. Diploma in Psychological Testing on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the academic session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
21. Regulations for M.Ed. Special Education (Learning Disability) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
22. Regulations for Special Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged (Two-Year course) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette
23. Regulations for Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged (Four-Year Course) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
24. Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Nutrition and Dietetics (Semester System) (One-Year Course) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
25. Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Cosmetology & Beauty Care (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2012-2013), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
26. Regulations for Master of Fine Arts (Two-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-2015), in anticipation of approval of the

Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

27. The eligibility criteria for following courses newly introduced from the session 2014-2015, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:
 - (i) M.E. (Food Technology)
 - (ii) M.E. (Chemical with Specialization in Environmental Engineering)
 - (iii) M.Tech. in Material Science & Technology
 - (iv) M.E. in Mechanical Engineering
 - (v) M.E. in Electrical Engineering (Power System)
28. Addition in Regulation 10.2 of Chapter III “General Regulations for Examinations” (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
29. Regulations for Post-Graduate Diploma in Cyber Crime (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
30. Amendment in Regulation 3.2 for BDS course (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
31. Amendment in Regulation 1.3 for Masters in Remote Sensing & Geographic Information System (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
32. Amendment in Regulation 2.1 for Masters in Disaster Management (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
33. Addition to Regulation 8.3 for MBA (Off Campus) (effective from the session 2012-13), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.
34. Amendment in Regulation 8.1 (iii) for Master of Entrepreneurship and Family Business (MEFB) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
35. Addition of the eligibility condition for M.E. (Biotechnology) newly introduced at UIET in Regulation 1.4 meant for M.E./M.Tech. courses (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
36. Deletion of Regulation 2 (b) for B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Honours) 5-Year Integrated course (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
37. Amendment in Regulation 10 for Master in Fashion Designing & Management (effective from the session 2016-17), in anticipation of

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

- approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
38. Addition of nomenclature in Regulation 2.2 for Environment Education & Road Safety (effective from the session 2016-17), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 39. Regulations for Master of Business Administration (Executive) introduced at University School of Open Learning (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 40. Regulations for (i) M.E. (Regular) Two-Year Course and (ii) M.E. (Modular) (Seven Spells) Three and a Half Years Course, (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 41. Regulations for Master of Laws (LL.M.) (One Year Course) (Semester System) with two specializations i.e. (i) Law, Science & Technology and (ii) Commercial and Corporate Law newly introduced at University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 42. Regulations for Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing (DPN) (One Year Course) (effective from the session 2014-15), as per Appendix, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 43. Regulations for (i) Master of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology and (ii) Master of Philosophy in Psychiatric Social Work (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 44. Regulations for Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (3 months) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 45. Regulations for Bachelor of Ayurvedic Medicine & Surgery (B.A.M.S.) (effective from the session 2012-13), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 46. Regulations for B.A./B.Sc.(General & Honours) (Semester System) examinations (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 47. Regulations for (i) Bachelor of Hotel Management and Catering Technology (BHMCT) (Four-Year Programme) and (ii) Bachelor of Tourism and Travel Management (BTTM) (Four-Year Programme) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
 48. Amendment in Regulation 11(D)(ii) at page 138 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

XXIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-34 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-34. That the recommendations of the Standing Committee dated 21.03.2016 with regard to Semester System at Undergraduate level, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 49)

XXV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-35 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-35. That the following amendments, be incorporated, in the earlier Senate decision dated 29.09.2013 (Para-LX (8)(iii)):

Decision of the Senate dated 29.09.2013 (Para-LX (8)(iii))	Amendment as proposed by the Committee dated 27.02.2016
(i) They will continue to perform the duty as Store-Keepers.	(i) No Change
(ii) They will not claim for seniority from back dates.	(ii) No Change
(iii) They will be given seniority in the Clerical cadre after the last confirmed Clerk.	(iii) They will be given seniority in the clerical cadre after the Last appointed Clerk.
(iv) Their inter-se-seniority will remain the same as Store-Keepers.	(iv) No Change
(v) They will be given pay-scale & all other benefits as are applicable to Clerks from the date on which their cadre is merged.	(v) No Change
(vi) The implementation of merger into Clerical cadre will be effective w.e.f the date of decision of BOF.	(vi) No Change

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 19)

XXVI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-36 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-36. That the recommendation of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 (Chairs in Category-2) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.2.2016 (Para 11) to frame guidelines for the Chair Professorships to be given to the existing Professors/Re-employed Professor, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 6)

XXVII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-37 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-37. That the recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 19.05.2016 to ensure the representative of both MHRD and UGC as ex-officio member of Board of Finance only be approved.

NOTE: The matter with regard to ex-officio member for Syndicate/Senate has been deferred.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 34)

Initiating discussion, Shri V.K. Sibal stated that he has gone through this item very carefully and he finds that the prime reason for not giving this representation to the MHA is like the autonomy related issue, but that does seem to be very convincing. For example, he was in the Senate and Syndicate as a Government representative and so was his counterpart in Punjab in the 60s, and there was no effect on autonomy. He had been on the Board of Governors of six Public Sector Banks where the RBI and he (Shri Sibal) were there and there was no effect. In fact, there could not be any effect. It is something which is misconceived. It would bring transparency and mutual understanding. Perhaps, the autonomy has not been intruded. Secondly, the transparency would be very good for the University. It would bring in mutual understanding. If the representatives would be there, they would see how the issues are decided. They would also have background information, which they could transmit to the Centre. So it is something to which they should not be seemed to be resisting. Actually, the person, who gives the money, had a right to sit in the meetings of the Board of Finance. So he thinks that it is good and it would be bringing in transparency & mutual understanding and there would be no effect on the autonomy of the University. Hence, they should accept this.

Shri S.S. Johl said that, in fact, every University has got a member from the funding agency. Even the Central Universities have got a member.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-37 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXVIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-38 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-38. That recommendations of the Joint Academic and Administrative Committees dated 16.3.2016 (Item 3) of the Department of Laws with regard to revised/proposed fee structure of LL.B. 3rd year course (under the head of Department Fund) from the session 2016-17, be approved.

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor has been authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, relating to Fund for up keeping of institution after getting the feedback from the Department.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 43)

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that one more concept of fee has been introduced, i.e. Convocation Fee and the charges are very high (Rs.1,000/- per student). Secondly, there is also a Law Review Fee, which has been enhanced manifold from Rs.120/- p.a. to Rs.500/-. Earlier also, the issue was discussed and suggested that the increase in any kind of fee should not be more than 5%, and that too, in consultation with the students. He has gone through the formation of the Committee and neither saw any representative of the Students' Council nor representative of students from any Department. He had also raised this issue in the Syndicate that no fee should be enhanced without consulting the students or their representatives. Whenever they effect such types of hikes without consulting the students, retaliation from the students comes. He urged that while considering or proposing fee hikes – whether at Department level or at the University level, the participation of the students should be ensured. As such, he strongly opposes the proposed fee hike. So far as Convocation Fee is concerned, if they reduced it to Rs.250 or so, it would be better, but Rs.1,000/- is on higher side.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Convocations are very expensive business. Convocations are not inexpensive things as huge expenses are involved in the Convocation. So many people voluntarily work for these Convocations and nobody is paid except few officials. Wherefrom the money would come for holding the Convocation?

Ms. Anu Chatrath informed that the students are willing to pay these charges.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the students are willing to pay, but were they consulted? In fact, there were never. There were four departmental representatives from the Department of Laws.

The Vice Chancellor said, "All right, the point raised by Dr. Randhawa is well taken". He requested the Dean, Faculty of Law to give them the account of the money collected for the purpose during the last two years. There is no harm in it as they are already giving the account to the Audit. He is saying that have it done and put it in a participatory way. It is easier to convince instead of having apprehension.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he is only saying that the students should be consulted and made party to the decision so that they might not retaliate. If the students are consulted, they would be able to convince the other students.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Randhawa is well taken.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is always said, but after well taken, it is not being implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no desired not to implement.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he knows that there are several other priorities, but it should definitely be given due attention.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Randhawa) is there for four more years. He requested Ms. Anu Chatrath to include him in the next year's Convocation Committee. In the end, he said that he would put him (Dr. Randhawa) as well as Shri Ashok Goyal on the Convocation Committee.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-38 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXIX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-39 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-39. That ICP Plasma Scan Model 8410 (lying in lab No.102) at Centre of Advanced Study in Geology, Department of Geology, P.U., purchased on 26.02.1988 costing Rs.9,65,814/-, under DST project of Dr. Naresh Kochhar (Retd.), be written off as the instrument is obsolete, lying in a dilapidated condition and is beyond any repair.

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

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

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 53)

Professor D.V.S. Jain stated that it is very unfortunate that such costly equipments are not much in use. This instrument was not used at all. In fact, same instrument was bought earlier also with the Advanced Centre Grant and he knows that the same was not even installed. So such costly equipments, purchased and not used at all is very painful, and he thinks that they should enquire into as to why these equipments were bought if are not to be used and not even to be installed.

The Vice Chancellor said that, in fact, Professor Jain is saying a very serious thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the issue raised by Professor Jain is very-very serious one, but he might be having the knowledge of only one instrument of one or two Departments, but the situation is very bad in this University that the instruments worth lacs and crores of rupees are lying sealed in the store, which have never been used, not for months but for years. In several cases even the seals have not been broken and the warranty periods have also gone by, where the Company's responsibility was to install, demonstrate and assure that the machine is in working condition at such and such time. However, the Machines have not been opened even.

The Vice Chancellor said that what they are saying is very serious. He would interface with the Director, Research Promotion Cell as well as the Director, IQAC and have a Committee of competent colleagues, who understand these things because these things could be raised when the National Accreditation Assessment Committee (NAAC) would come as these are the things which they want to know. In view of the matter being raised in the Senate and it is going to be recorded, he would have a serious follow up because this could cause them problems at the time of NAAC Review.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that during the last election he happened to visit almost all the Departments. He would like to tell them that in certain Departments namely Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, 25-30 Air Conditioners are lying in the store. He urged that the equipments/instruments, which have been dumped, should be put to use.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood suggested that the Committee should be appointed, which should visit each and every Department.

The Vice Chancellor said that he knows how to do it because he is aware that such audits are being done in research organizations. In fact, these audits are done by the audit people. He knew that the Audit Department of U.T. (Sector 17) had gone to an Office and done audit there of the facilities created/purchased during the last 10 years. They have done the audit machine-by-machine.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-39 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXX.

The Vice Chancellor stated that, as requested by Professor Keshav Malhotra, now he would give a brief summary. Picking up the blue folder, he stated that this brief summary relates to a document which has been given to all of them. Nine pages of it were sent as a soft copy to all of them, but there are important annexures, which could not be sent because after scanning them, the file was becoming too big. Right now, he has got everything re-typed, whatever is there in the annexures and has been placed as a information with them. He would send them a soft copy of entire 65 pages document. This 65 pages document records all things, which are important to understand – University's origin, progress, and financial requirements for its sustenance. This is not for the first time that one has worried about such issues. This University has continuously worried about them and it had started to worry as the University was commenced. So he first wishes to draw their attention to a brief abstract. He (Vice Chancellor) read that abstract and stated that this abstract is based on things which are there in 65 pages. In this abstract, he is not stating anything new, and he has only picked up lines from the next 64 pages and just connected in a certain way. So

what does it say, “Panjab University was established as the 4th University of Indian Sub Continent in 1882 by the then Central Government in response to a campaign by the nobles and the members of the public”. So, there is something called Panjab University Act, 1882, and the first line of that Act actually says that this University is being built or started in the background of a University College, which was a University College of Calcutta University, and was created in 1869 because people of Punjab wanted that. The British, i.e., then Central Government, had made a condition that if they collected money, the College could be commenced. So first the nobles were asking for the University, but they were first given a College, and they were asked to collect money. They as well as the general public collected the money. So in the background of that a College was established, and the College had a Governing Body, called a Senate, and in the very first meeting of that Senate, they decided to form an Executive Body, which was called the Syndicate. So the Senate and the Syndicate for the governance of this University, is a creation that happened in 1869, i.e., before even the University was established in 1882 by the then Central Government. The first line of that says, “Act and Ordinances of Panjab University”, which is available on the Web Page of University of Punjab at Lahore. It describes how the University commenced in 1882 in the background of University College in 1869, and how the governance has transformed. Initially, it looks as if their University came in a unique way, and it had a Senate and the Syndicate and the participation of the campaigners in the governance of the University. Though only handful of people were nominated, as the time goes by, the Universities earlier than them (Bombay, Calcutta and Madras) were just affiliating and examination bodies. They affiliated Colleges and conducted examinations. They did not pay salaries to any of the teachers from the Budget of the University. They created those Universities, affiliated the Colleges and they started them initially putting some money, but from that point onwards, the number of students writing the College Entrance Examinations increased. The College Entrance Examination became the School Board Examination eventually. Once that number swelled, the British did not contribute little to the Universities. The Universities were more on less self-sustaining, but they had no teachers on their behalf. Panjab University was commenced in the background of the University Constituent College being created for which they asked money from the public, and that University College affiliated to it something called “an Oriental College” and something called “a Law School”, which was existing from 1860 onwards. So the Panjab University College was an affiliated body and it had handful of teachers, and it was paying only to the teachers, who were at the Oriental College. Oriental College was a School of Oriental Studies of the Government College, which was given a higher stature of a Department of Oriental Studies, in which the founder Principal of Government College had an interest, it was converted into an Oriental College, the teachers of which were paid out of the funds of the University. College became University in 1882, and now this also was an affiliating University, which conducted the Entrance examination(s) and the money, which was earlier going to Calcutta University, started coming to Panjab University at Lahore. Most of the expenses were being made up from the examination fees of school students as well as College Students. So the University was being sustained in this manner. At the end of 19th Century, India had five Universities, i.e., Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Lahore and Allahabad, but there was hardly any teacher employed by them. Since, there was no UGC, 1904 Act, which was called the Universities Act. the Universities Act enacted by the Central Government, which applied to all the five Universities of the country (Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Lahore, Allahabad), and that Act now said that the Universities must appoint teachers, which means that some teaching must happen on behalf of the Universities. Now, the University’s expenditure had started, which had to be spent on the teachers and also in creating the Departments, and if they created Science Department(s) on behalf of the University, it would cost much. So, again the money was demanded from the Rajas and Maharajas in 1882, and now the same has become history. 1904 a Universities Act had come in practice and this Universities Act says for the first time that every University of India would have Senate, Syndicate and Faculties, but there are no teachers. Then who is in the Faculties. It says there would be 10 Senators from the Registered Graduates’ Constituency, which was the start of the Registered Graduates’ Constituency. It says that there would be 58 members, who are nominated by whosoever is the Chancellor, and the Chancellor differs in Lahore, Allahabad, Madras, Calcutta and Bombay. So there is a Chancellor, who nominates 58 members. So these 58 persons and 10

Senators from the Registered Graduates' Constituency, would be assigned to three Faculties as the academic issues had to be administered. So there were no Professors and no teachers. For Panjab University, 11 Faculties were specified, and today also they have 11 Faculties. The number remains the same, but there is slight change. So there were 11 Faculties, and these 58 plus 10 Senators, i.e., 68 people and certain ex-officio members (Chief Justice, Bishop of Lahore, DPI at Lahore, DPI at Peshawar and representatives of Maharajas', i.e., Maharaja of Kashmir, Maharaja of Kapurthala, Bahawalpur, etc.). As such, there were 10 such people. So $58+10 = 68 + 10 = 78$ were assigned to three Faculties. So now there were Faculties, which were distributed in this manner, and every Faculty has different strength. The five Faculties were asked to elect a Fellow each, and which were these five Faculties? At that time, they had the same Faculties, which they had today minus the Combined Faculty. Today, they have five Faculties (Science, Arts, Language, Law and Medical), and there was no Senator on behalf of rest of the Faculties. So it is this Act, 1904, which continued up to the year 1947. The University teachers started to get appointed when the Honours School(s) was started and the Departments were commenced. When the Departments were commenced all the teachers belonging to a given Department were not the employees of the University. Only about 20 people were there to whom the University was paying, and all of them were not Professors. So a given Department had a Head of the Department, who could be a University teacher or a College Professor, who had been invited plus the teachers invited from the Colleges to become a University Department, but these Heads of the Departments were not members of the Faculties. The members of the Faculties were only the Senators who had chosen these three Faculties, and since the Faculties had to administer academics, this is how they started the notion of Added Members of the Faculties that any two Senators could get an Added Member. As such, the Added Members came in and that is how the Academic Administration was done, not only on behalf of Panjab University, but all the Universities of India. India becomes independent and they moved from Lahore to Shimla and the number of Faculties remains the same, i.e., 11 and the Syndicate was also elected now Faculty-wise. Four members of the Syndicate were from Oriental, four from the Arts, three from the Science, two from the Medical and two from Law. This is how, the 15 members of the Syndicate were elected. Lahore to Shimla, Oriental Studies was abandoned and the same becomes Languages. The Language Faculty has now two members, and two members were taken out from the Oriental and one from Arts. These three members are now assigned to Combined Faculties, six Faculties from where earlier no member was there. So this is how the Combined Faculties was carved out of six Faculties. So Lahore to Shimla, instead of three it is four and all the Professors and Heads of the Departments were made members of the Faculties in the new Indian Panjab University. Now, since the worry is about the finances, who was paying for sustenance of the University prior to 1947, the Government gave very little money. The money was coming from examination fee(s) and the biggest expense was to construct the University buildings and there were hardly one or two hostels. It took 15 years to construct the building of Law College and Oriental College took another five years. There was only one hostel in Lahore, though there was hostels of Colleges, but they were all sustained by the Colleges and the University did not worry about them. So everything came from examination fees. Tuition fee was minimal and the campus students were very small in number. In fact, there were no campus students as the students enrolled in the Colleges, paid fees to the Colleges, but they attended Honours School on behalf of the University and they were taught by handful of teachers of the campus and rest of them were from the Colleges to whom the University did not pay. University paid for conducting the Syndicate and Senate meetings, Convocation/Library functions and so on and so forth. So all this was an inter-Colleges expense. If it was an inter-Colleges expense, the entire money was to come from anyone who subscribes to the University. Whether one was a student at Lahore or Peshawar or Kapurthala or Jalandhar, wherever the College was affiliated, the examination fee was the only source of income. This is how the University was sustained. During the period of 2nd World War, the salaries of the University employees had not been increased for a very-very long time. War ends and India was about to become independence, and on the eve of India's independent, the Senate (this very body) took a decision that the salaries to the University employees have to be paid properly because their counterparts, who are Government employees in Government Colleges, were getting more salaries. So the salaries of University employees were lagging behind, and they took a decision to bring

the University employees salaries to a respectable level – salaries of the employees as well as handful of teachers, who were there on behalf of the University. In fact, they took a painful decision of enhancing the examination fee in that year by 15%. Though they were increasing the examination fee every year, to implement the new salary structure for which they did not go to any Government, this body decided what should be the respectable level, and to have that respectable level, the examination fee alone was increased because that could be distributed all across as it could generate a large sum of money to sustain the University at Lahore. That means, handful of teachers and whosoever helped in administering the University's examination over this that and so on and so forth. When the University commenced here, once again there was very little money to construct. The University came in a very strange way. The refugees were to be rehabilitated and Dr. M.S. Randhawa was looking after the rehabilitation for some years and he was also looking after the Chandigarh Project for five years. He was also connected intimately with Professor A.C. Joshi, who was his classmate, and a student of Shri Shiv Ram Kashyap. So the circumstances were fortuous for them and the University was commenced by collecting money from here and there. This fund based accounting was again a concept which was introduced very innovatively. An Account Manual was evolved by this very Governing Body and everything else was also done. However, overall supervision always remained with the Central Government. In the whole history of 134 years of the University, only from 1938 to 1966, wherever Central Government was there in this document, in place of Central Government, the responsibility was entrusted to the Punjab Government, but once the Reorganization of Punjab happens, the Chandigarh is a part of Union Territory and the Centre again steps in. This is what it says, "All its stakeholders have participated in its progression and sustenance since then. During 134 years of its existence, its governance has been the responsibility of the Central Government of India for 108 years. The reorganization of State of Punjab by an Act of Parliament in 1966, enjoined the Central Government to explicitly assume the responsibility towards its maintenance deficit, by virtue of the campus of Panjab University being an integral part of the Union Territory, Chandigarh. The maintenance expenditure of the University, which mainly comprises salaries and other concurrent service and retirement benefits, has been shared by the different stakeholders of the University in a participatory manner, i.e., by the students in the shape of their fee (tuition and examination fees), the successor State Government(s) as well as the Central Government in the shape of their annual grants. The funding pattern of the University as well as proportions of share(s) towards its maintenance grant, between the Central Government and other stakeholders, have undergone changes on a number of occasions in the past decades. As and when a serious difficulty arose, the Central Government graciously came forward to save this institution of national importance and global stature, for the fulfilment of national agenda of Higher Education and Research." In these appendices, which they have, there is a document of 1976, when Professor R.C. Paul went to Delhi at a time when Haryana withdrew its Colleges from Panjab University. University was in shortfall because Haryana was also paying some money to it. The Central Government came forward and the U.T. Administration at that time also routed the money to them. As such, the entire burden was taken by the Centre. Things went forward and when the 5th Pay Commission came, they were again in the difficulty. At that time, normalcy had returned in Punjab and Punjab had an elected Government, and the Centre started to withdraw funds. Money was not coming to Punjab and instead its reserve was depleting. Punjab faced a squeeze because they had a huge burden of loan, which they had accumulated during the disturbed period. Somebody was keeping an account of the money given to Punjab during the disturbance years, and the Punjab had to pay the interest of that money as it was a loan given to Punjab State. So Punjab was in trouble as it did not get the money. When they did not get the money, they said they could not give them (Panjab University) more than Rs.16 crores. That was a decision, which happened in 1998-99. So the University was again in deep trouble, and the Central Government once again rescued them. The money which was not paid by the Punjab Government, the U.T. stepped in. The 60:40 arrangement, which was put in during the time of Professor R.C. Paul, underwent a change at the start of the 20th century, but this very Body took decision that they have to meet their requirements and they came up with innovative idea of starting self-sustaining courses. So in that background, the self-sustaining courses were commenced one by one at University Institute of Engineering & Technology and so on

and they kept on adding. For 7-8 years, they had really surplus money from these self-sustaining courses. In this way, the University's income was enhancing because even though the buildings were not ready, but they were collecting the same money. As such, they were already in surplus, and that is the reason for the first few years after starting of self-sustaining courses, they did not increase the fees of those courses, and up to 2007-2008 they did not increase the fees. Then when it was realized that 6th Pay Commission is coming and they have implemented the Pension Scheme, and had allow old people, who had taken their gratuity, Provident Fund, etc., to join the Pension Scheme because the Pension Scheme was conceived in the year 1991-92, but was not implemented. So the University felt that all those, who have retired in the past but are living, should be permitted to become a part of the Pension Scheme because the Pension Scheme was conceived by them, but to their misfortune, it could not be implemented. So in that background, the Pension Scheme was started. Everybody knew that Pension Scheme is a very-very expensive proposition. When Dr. Manmohan Singh, former Prime Minister, came here in the year 2009, he set up a task force to look after the University. That Task Force was fully aware of what is going on in the University. Every penny that the University has in every account, it was before them. It is beautifully recorded in the Task Force documents and the appendices. Any student of Panjab University who was interested to know about the finances of the University, can refer this document it is all there in the 65-page document. There is nothing hidden from the Central Government about the situation of Panjab University and in this document there are statements recorded which are exactly on the same lines that he has read like the Panjab University being a unique institution, Panjab University being an institution of national importance. These are not the words which a given Vice-Chancellor, sitting on this chair, has made. These are the words recorded by Central bureaucrats as they served as members of the Task Force to review and make stock taking of this University. So, everything is there. It says that Panjab University is the responsibility of the Centre. It says what should be done on behalf of the University. It also says that, what they discussed a little while ago, that the representative of the MHRD should be on the governing bodies of the University. It also says that the retirement age should be 65 years instead of 60. Everything that there is in the wish list of alumni, the employees and the teachers of this University, from campus and the affiliated Colleges of this University, is there in black and white in this 65-page document. So there is no need to say anything as everything is there in the document. They just faced a problem exactly the same that they had faced twice earlier that somebody had put a capping on the grants to be given to the Panjab University. The capping which Punjab Government put once, U.T. Administration put once. They must have seen in the newspapers that the U.T. Administration is asking Rs.1300-1500 crores extra from the Central Government just to run the city. If that much money is not given, the U.T. has to cut down somewhere. The U.T. Administration had faced the similar situation in the year 2005-06. The money asked for was not given by the Centre and the U.T. Administration implemented whatever they wanted. The U.T. said that they would pay the salaries to its teachers of Government and grant-in-aid Colleges but for the University whatever was given the last year, they would freeze it at that level. So, this capping by a central agency which provides grants to Panjab University is also not a new concept. They faced it in the year 2005-06. But they did not have the money. They could look at this report and this reports tells that why they took a loan of Rs.175 crores and it is also recorded that the pension corpus of Panjab University was created, if the pension is to be given from the pension corpus itself, the corpus would finish within 5-10 years. Concept of pension for the teaching and non-teaching employees of Panjab University would disappear. That is why a very innovative scheme was devised that a pension fund be created and the interest of that be made a part of the income of the University and the pension should be the responsibility of the Centre because the Centre takes a decision on the increase in the salaries. The University does not decide it. The University used to take such decisions before 1947. After 1947, how much salaries of the teachers would be increased, it has not been decided by the University. The pay-scales of the teachers which the University had fixed in the year 1946-47, those scales were nowhere available in any University of India. They could read the history of the UGC from the book 'Diamond Jubilee of the UGC' where it is recorded that in the year 1955 after the UGC came into being when Dr. Bhatnagar was the first Chairman of the UGC and he was conscious of the fact what the salaries of the teachers were at Panjab University, because he was the honorary Professor of Panjab University even

though he had left Lahore on 1st April 1940. So, it is Dr. Bhatnagar who took initiative to bring the salary scales of all teachers of India to the same level as that of the University of Panjab at Lahore in 1946-47. The journalists sitting here must have a curiosity as to from where he is saying so. He came to know all these things from a book that he got from the Library and he could also make available to all. So, the entire University system of India had the salary structure which was equivalent of this body, had decided in Lahore in 1946-47. The salary structure that this Body allowed before 31st March, 1947, without getting approval from any Government, and on the strength of the income generated by on its own, the same salary was given to the teachers of all the Universities of India by Dr. Bhatnagar. After that, they are not deciding their own salary structure, neither of the teachers nor of the employees. These are all decided by UGC Regulations and how does the UGC regulate the Universities of India, how does the UGC enforce minimum standards in the Universities. These are not his words, it is written in the history book '60 years of UGC'. The UGC uses the pay commission recommendations as an instrument to enforce minimum standards on the Universities of India. The UGC pays 80% salary arrears and pays only, when certain conditions are fulfilled. So, the salaries are not determined by this House any more, it is determined by somebody else. They have to enforce it, because they have to satisfy the UGC norms. If they did not satisfy the UGC regulations and if they have to get the NAAC review done, if they do not do well in the NIRF ranking which consider the student-teacher ratio, they would not be able to sustain the brand of the University. The students must get jobs and every University must have a placement cell. Every University must have a skill development centre. Every University must carry on *swachhta* campaign. Every University must have e-governance. These are the requirements imposed by the Centre. Salary is also a requirement imposed by the Centre. If they do not do that, then they are not a good institution. They are not being fully supported by the Centre, because they are not a central institution enacted by the Act of Parliament, for which the Government would grant the whole money. So, they are a unique institution. As far as the governance structure is concerned, all other Universities of India have reformed their governance structure. Panjab University has not got that done so far. Even the University of Panjab at Lahore has changed its Act so many times, the last amendment being in the year 2014. Panjab University has not amended its governance structure, and that is what NAAC had pointed out. They should also amend their governance structure. So, this very House had authorized the creation of a Think-Tank to look after the finances. This very House has authorized some wise people amongst themselves, all are wise, but some have been given the responsibility to worry about these things and come out so that the University has a modern and more effective governance structure, not diluting what this House is doing, bring out certain reforms as they are a premier institution within India as well as globally. Those people are doing their job. The Think-Tank is doing its job. One of the recommendations of the Think-Tank was that they should enhance their income and the only way that the income could be enhanced, in a participative way, it is examination fee. There is no other way. The increase in tuition fee involves a small number of 15000 students and out of them some are already paying a higher tuition fee. So, there is a limit to how much money they could generate through tuition fee. The signal from Delhi is that Panjab University has to continuously make contribution towards the salaries of its employees, teaching as well as non-teaching and worry about its development cost on their own. In the year 2013-14, a sympathetic bureaucrat had said, when they were having a certain income, when he proposed that let the Panjab University contribute Rs.120 crores towards the salaries. The Centre does not give any development grant to the University. This contribution of Rs.120 crore has also to be inflation protected. The University could pay the salary out of this to the employees and the rest would be given by the Government. Since the Government does not give the development grant and asks the University to raise income for the development either by consultancy or increase in the fee. Whatever development is to be done, for that the University has to worry about. But unfortunately, a very wise suggestion which would have solved the problems and they would not have faced what they are facing today, that could not see the light of the day. It was proposed by a Joint Secretary in October 2013. The Central Government changed and that Joint Secretary could not get it carried with the new Government. It could not be translated, as somewhere the file got lost. He (Vice-Chancellor) did not even have a copy of the proposal which that Joint Secretary had prepared. This proposal was discussed with

him when he (Vice-Chancellor), Professor A.K. Bhandari and the Finance and Development Officer met the Joint Secretary. Since then, they are struggling with it. How they are struggling is all known to the members. He has concluded that a very difficult situation has once again emerged due to limitation in the release of funds by UGC. The University today faces challenge even to release the due salaries with the periodic enhancement of DA rates, as approved by the Central Government from time to time. The situation would get even more difficult once the 7th pay revision for the University teaching and non-teaching employees would get notified by the UGC and/or U.T. Administration, Chandigarh. It could not be that the teachers of the Government Colleges in UT would get the full salary, the grant-in-aid Colleges teachers would get the full salary, the teachers of PEC get full salary, teachers of the Government Medical College would get the full salary and the University should be left behind. The University would also have to pay the full salary for which some way out has to be thought of. Through this document, a plea is being made to the MHRD to address this critical situation by helping devise a mechanism for timely release of appropriate grant to the University by the Central Government in a pre-determined manner. So, in plain English, this summarizes it and he proposed to make this write-up, he has already given to the HRD Minister, the Chancellor, the UGC and everywhere this document has been given. So, he proposed to submit this document also to the two-Bench Court which has asked him to come and make a presentation on behalf of the University on the difficulties that they are facing. He would try to send it 2-3 days before 20th October, and depending on whether the Judges give him 10-15 minutes, he would recall the story that he has told to all the members here. Then he read out what he had said in the Syndicate a day earlier. These are not his words, these are not the words of the members, these are the words written in this document. "Panjab University is an unique institution. Alumni of the University get emotional when they visit the institution. It was informed by the Deans/Directors of the University that old students on their visit to the campus touch the ground with their heads. On asking they say, 'My son, these buildings are not merely built with bricks and mortar, they are bones of our ribs'. Many of the members who are senior in age to him must be knowing it. It is not known as to how many universities command this kind of respect from its past students. Thus, this uniqueness of the University should be guarded, respected and appreciated. It should be accepted, recognized and institutionalized, if necessary through an amendment of Panjab University Act. This should be done to remove misperception and misapprehensions. Secondly, the way the University has been recreated indicates that the migrants to India from erstwhile Pakistan did not establish a new University. Rather, they re-established Panjab University for them. This is uncommon but it shows their deep love & affection for the institution. Thirdly, the distinguishing feature of the University is that it did not owe its origin only to the state patronage but was a product of the initiative and efforts of the people of undivided Punjab. It might be the only University which has been first built by the people and recognized by the State later. Fourth, the national character of the University, within its expansive arms everybody is welcome. The students' profile, the profile of the teaching and non-teaching staff, as has been mentioned at Para 6 above, vouches for the truth. Lastly, it is unique in being 'Inter-State Body Corporate' also."

XXXI**ZERO HOUR**

- (1) Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that he had come to know from the newspapers that the recommendation of the Selection Committee relating to appointment of the Chief of University Security has been rejected by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 8th October 2016. In fact, the post had been advertised 2-3 times. He enquired since the post was advertised before the meeting of the Board of Finance wherein a decision was taken that as the University is facing a financial crunch, no new recruitment should be made and if any need-based appointment is to be made, the same should be got approved from the Board of Finance, if the selection has been made on merit and as per University and UGC rules, how the appointment could be rejected. As the advertisement was made 2-3 times, it is a need-based appointment and the Chief of University Security is absolutely required. Moreover, the current Chief

of University Security has requested a number of times that he should be relieved from this additional assignment. When the post of Chief of University Security was advertised before the decision of the Board of Finance, how the Syndicate could reject the recommendations of the Selection Committee. Moreover, the Board of Finance nowhere said that the process for the posts, which have already been advertised, should be halted. If it is a need-based appointment, it should be approved, and if need be, the matter should be placed before the Syndicate for reconsideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that because of some ambiguity in understanding, it was his impression that the Board of Finance did not say anywhere that the post/s which had been advertised should not be filled up. However, the general view was otherwise. Now the issue has reached at a stage that if they wish to make the appointment of Chief of University Security, it could not be done without going back to the Board of Finance and obtaining its consent. As such, somebody has to take a call to recommence the process from where it has to be reconsidered.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if they see the videography, they would find that there is a clear message in the meeting of the Board of Finance that the post(s), which had been advertised earlier, they do not have any objection for filling up the same. There is a need to fill up the post of Chief of University Security, and that was why the post was advertised. In that background, there is no hitch in selection procedure adopted by the University. According to him, the Board of Finance never objected. They could verify this from the videography, though he does not know what has been recorded in the proceedings.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they wish to appoint the Chief of University Security, the matter is to be placed before the Board of Finance, which is due to meet in the next month.

Professor Anil Monga said that he had also pointed out it in the Syndicate that the exact spirit in which the decision was taken by the Board of Finance has not been reflected in the minutes. If necessary, the matter be taken back to the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, the matter is to be referred to the Board of Finance and then to the Syndicate.

Shri Jagpal Singh said that the matter be taken to the Syndicate again.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the system is that the matter could be considered by the Senate only if the same is recommended by the Syndicate. Moreover, the matter which has been rejected by the Syndicate, could not be raised/discussed in the Senate during the zero hour. Further, firstly, the minutes be circulated to the members and if any modification/rectification is suggested, only then the issue should be reconsidered.

There was a din at this stage. Most of the members felt it should be referred back to Board of Finance. It was agreed upon.

- (2) Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that he wanted to raise an issue about the way the agenda was circulated before them, many people commenting onwards the problem relating to them. He said that he did not want to raise a general issue, but he wanted to refer to a particular specific conclusion that had arisen. He said that there was one item on the agenda, and from the conclusion, it was observed that after the bulky decision was taken, they were presented with the slips like this, which refers to some item, which is difficult for him to locate, he said the item was specifically different to the item which was carried out in the Senate of 24th July 2016. It concerns the enquiry

conducted by Justice Garg into certain irregularities in the appointment of examination superintendents and consequent action taken on that by the Syndicate. That was on the agenda of the Senate of 24th of July, 2016. It could not complete that and it went over to the agenda of Senate meeting of 3rd September, 2016 and even in that meeting, it was not completed and the left over agenda has been brought today and they have been told that they already have the documents, please bring those documents. So he had brought them. He further said that one of the items relating to the report of the Garg Committee, which was accepted by the Senate. He was reading from the extracts from the agenda of the Senate meeting of 24th July. The Senate in its meeting held on 27th September, 2015 considered the Enquiry Report, forwarded by the Syndicate and it was resolved that (1) the report of the enquiry Committee pursuant to a discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26th April, 2014 be accepted. Further a Committee comprising the members of the Senate and Syndicate was constituted to give recommendation to the Vice Chancellor ensuring that no injustice is done to any individual and at the same time the operating system of the University is made fool proof. He said that after this decision, a Committee was set up by the Senate, of which he had the responsibility to chair and two other members are also present in the House, Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi and Professor Anil Monga. That Committee made several recommendations. He said that he wanted to know what happened to that and how this slip has come that came says that the item may kindly be read as to 'note' the recommendations of the Committee instead of to 'consider' the recommendations of the Committee. What the Senate did, is nothing. If it did nothing in September. He said that he tried to find out what the Senate did in September. The September Senate minutes are yet not available, he said that he is totally confused. The fact is that a Committee set up by the Senate had made recommendations, this is incumbent on the Senate to consider those recommendations as to whether these recommendations were wholly or partially acceptable or rejected, whatever. He said that they cannot just say to note it by way of these heaps of papers. He said that this was what had happened and he requested that somehow this item be properly dealt with and report of that Committee be brought before the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, he could not respond and he could only look into it.

- (3) Shri V.K. Sibal said that he had no problem for this interaction, rather he would support it. It is good if he (Vice Chancellor) has been trying to understand what was in the minds of some of our colleagues. But this provision of Zero Hour is not in the calendar, nor it is in the agenda. On Vice Chancellor's submission that there are things which are a convention, Shri V.K. Sibal said that interaction cannot be against the calendar because they are governed by it and they all have collectively set it. He suggested that the way out is that it be not considered as a meeting of the Senate, rather it be considered as a meeting that the Vice Chancellor is having with some members. It be separately minuted and it has nothing to do with the Senate. He said that, that is what he wanted to say that you (Vice-Chancellor) keep compliance with the calendar, and you keep an interaction with members also.
- (4) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that D.P.Ed. course was being run in 3 Colleges affiliated to Panjab University from the session 2007-08, including at Mahilpur and Shahi Sports College. Now the NCTE has decided that to give this course to SCERT but the SCERT is yet to take this course. The SCERT said that they have no such course and they were not given any permission. This course is being run in the Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University even though no permission has been granted by NCTE/SCERT. He suggested that this course should be allowed to be run in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University till the same is being run by Punjabi and Guru Nanak Dev University. Until the NCTE or the SCERT would start giving the permission, they may be allowed to run this course in the Colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that whatever Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal has said is right that this course is being run for the last 7 - 8 years although the SCERT have not yet started these courses. Year after year, the Colleges have been getting the temporary affiliation in the routine and the Colleges were making admissions on the basis of letters issued. Since the Colleges have already made admissions to this course and keeping in view the future of the students, this year they should be allowed necessarily, but for next year, the SCERT commences it or not, the decision should be taken in time by December 2016/January/February 2017, the Colleges should be informed not to make admissions and in this way the course could be stopped and by this time, in the mid time, the courses could not be put to a halt.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that though the permission is to be granted either by the NCTE or SCERT but they have not prepared the syllabi and they were already running these courses, they should allow the Colleges to continue with this course. He said that when the NCTE or SCERT would not allow the course, they would stop the course. He handed over some documents to the Vice-Chancellor on the floor of the House.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang pointed out that till the notification is issued by the regulatory body, they should allow the Colleges to run the courses this year.

- (5) Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that the Convocation of Dept of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS) was held on 1st of October 2016 and Gymnasium Hall is the important building of the University. The University authorities had decided the Gymnasium Hall as the venue for the Law convocation. She pointed out that, being the Dean of the Law Faculty, she felt that in the early morning of Monday, despite of the hot climate, the AC plant was not functional in the building. She said that ours is a big University and so important function was being held where the Justice J.S. Khehar, who is going to be next Chief Justice of India, had happened to be the Chief Guest to address the convocation. She enquired that they were having such a huge infrastructure in the XEN office, was their no responsibility or accountability of the XEN office to check whether the cooling system was functional or not. She further stated that the date was taken with the consent of the Vice Chancellor and they did not get any cooperation from the administrative staff.

The Vice Chancellor said that the counting of votes for Senate was going on and this complaint was not proper to be made before him. He (Vice Chancellor) said that he had given the date of first of October and it was anticipated that till that time the counting process would be completed. But the way the things evolved, it could not be complete by that time.

The most of the members raised the voices that as to whether there required a technical support in the counting and there was no connection in the functioning of the Air Conditioner and the counting process.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Gymnasium Hall is such a huge volume that the Air Conditioner of Gymnasium Hall is not so efficient and it is not the capacity of the A.C. to serve to such large gathering.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath continued that she was answerable to those honourable judges who had come to attend the Convocation. She asked that even though there is a huge infrastructure and the staff, the air conditioning was of poor quality, then why she should be there to earn defame. She further said that she was so embarrassed when the visitor/ participants remarked that if that would not have been the function of Mrs. Anu Chatrath, they would have left the function in between.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the XEN office was answerable for that.

The Vice Chancellor said that the gymnasium hall has so huge a volume and the present air conditioner plant is not so efficient that it could give air conditioning for such a huge gathering. He further said that University is a poor institution, this should be understood by them, to have such a huge hall air conditioned, they need extensive air conditioning support. Unfortunately such an efficient and expensive air conditioning support is not available in the University. He further said that he himself was there, he also knows.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that day before the convocation, the plant was functional and on the day of convocation, it was not functional and again, after the convocation, it was functional.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the things remain functional when there were 20 to 100 people inside the Hall is different than when there are thousand of people are inside. He said that thousand hot bodies were there, and to be in comfortable state, it needs the temperature to be of 25 degree Celsius. As per the Stephen's Law, thousands bodies which are to be cooled, their large volume is to be cooled.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath intervened saying that she is not in line with the arguments given. She said that in fact 650 students were there for the rehearsal a day before the convocation and on that day the air conditioning system was functional. She said that a Committee should be constituted to check that such occurrence is not repeated in future.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University is cooperative to the maximum within its resources to have grand success of the law convocation. He further said that she (Anu Chatrath) cannot judge and make issues to hold the University as such. She could have told him (Vice Chancellor) privately and he could have done it. Trying to raise the issue and run down the officers of the University, who had actually worked is not appropriate.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that one senior officer of the University should inspect the venue of such a big programme one day earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was the duty of the academic staff members to go into all these things. When the counting was going on, all the staff including the Registrar was busy there, it was not possible to have paid attention towards convocation preparations.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that XEN was not the part of the counting event.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot hold the XEN office guilty on this or that count. Most of the time, the XEN office is cooperative and further said that no department of University would be allowed to hold convocation in the Gymnasium Hall in future and the convocation could be held in the Law Auditorium and that is the answer to this thing.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said it was not the question of law convocation only but it also happened in the main convocation also. She said that it meant that the main convocation would be held in the Law Auditorium.

The Vice Chancellor said that the main convocation is held in the month of March when the temperature is not as hot and humid as it is felt in the month of September. When it is hot and humid, it is the humidity that causes the problem not the temperature. The air conditioning plant, in addition to first reducing the humidity, has to reduce the temperature.

- (6) Shri Jarnail Singh stated that some students in the self-financing courses are on the merit and are in the line and the University had fixed some last date. He said that the cases of Regional Centers or of Departments, he had come to know after coming here that these were being allowed on individual basis. He said that by allowing admission to them, the University would generate revenue and the students are on the merit and this would not be a backdoor entry. He said that this should be allowed within two or three days as this was very urgent.
- (7) Shri Jarnail Singh stated that the second issue is that this issue has many a times been raised in the Syndicate that there are two specific courses, and the Board of Studies of the Departments are bent upon that they would not prepare the syllabi. He said that the Dean of University is apprised of the situation. The Departments are arrogant. He said that if there is any UGC approved course and some College wants to run the course, the University has to help that College. The University should not bar that course merely pin-pointing that a particular person was running that college. These are the academic courses being run for the last three-four years. The courses are BPES and MPES. He said that it brings bad name to the University. He stated that the location of the College falls within the jurisdiction of Panjab University and the College authorities are saying that if the Panjab University would give them in writing, by any way, then they would take permission from the Punjabi University. He said that the syllabi should be got prepared from the department and in case the department is not ready to draft the syllabi, then it could be borrowed from some other University. He requested for redressal of the academic issue.

To this, Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, Dean of University Instruction, stated that he had already talked to Shri Jarnail Singh. He further said that there is a college and this college wants to run two courses. The concerned department was requested to draft the syllabi. The Department in its meeting of Board of Studies has very clearly put in black and white that they would not frame the syllabi of these courses. He said that when this came to his knowledge, he assured the Secretary of that college, who met him, that the University is bound to get the syllabi prepared and he was asking that the courses should be made functional this year also. He (Dean of University Instruction) said that he told to him that they were trying their best and they will get the syllabi prepared by November and from the next academic session, the course could be made functional. This all, he has assured to Shri Jarnail Singh also.

- (8) Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that in Punjab, in the self financing courses which are being run, the most of the admission is of SC students and the students are not able to pay examination fee. He said that a government notification has come that in private colleges too, the examination fee from the SC students be not charged and the fee reimbursement be made from the government to University accounts directly. He said that a presentation from the college side has come and this should be considered.

The Vice Chancellor said that alright, that would mean that the money would arrive from the government later on. He said that Professor Anil Kumar shall help him in the matter.

Most of the members voiced in favour of doing it after examining it.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he is not sure whether the government will reimburse the examination fee. It should be confirmed.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have their colleagues, and they will be asked to take up the matter with the Punjab Government.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that this issue relates to Colleges and it is not related with the University. He said that in the first instance the College should deposit the fee and then the College should collect it from the government.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point was that the University need revenue and they can work out a mechanism that revenue comes a little late but that revenue assurance that it will come from this or that agency, that needs to be recorded, only then it could be done. He further said that he has Professor Anil Kumar is with him to check it and respond in the interest of the students to the extent possible. The Vice Chancellor that he cannot give any assurance but he would not like to deprive any student of SC category from writing the examination provided that the money comes from somewhere and some states.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that the examination forms of those students should be entertained and when the scholarship money comes, that could be charged at that time. However, result could be withheld for non-payment. The government has clearly said that fee be not charge from those students. He said that it is their suggestion.

The Vice Chancellor said that he should not be asked to respond immediately. Let him check it and he would look into it and try to ensure that nobody is deprived of writing the examination once a student has taken the admission. He said that the matter should be left to him but he cannot assure unless he is able to see through it. He further said that he would do something.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that as has been said by Dr. Jagpal that all the fee of SC/ST students of the affiliated Colleges is not reimbursed by the Government. He cautioned that by this way the Colleges would stop giving examination fee to the University. He said that Colleges would take the plea that they would give the fee when it would come from the government side.

The Vice Chancellor said that he should not be demanded to give quick response.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the students should be given the chance for examination, but their results could be withheld. He said that if the payment on the part of the government is not made or the payment is delayed, other arrangement should be made, so that the students should not suffer.

The Vice Chancellor again said that he cannot respond. The things have to be gone through carefully. He had every sympathy with those students and he should try to find some ways that nobody is deprived and more than that he would not like to comment at the moment.

- (9) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there was no distinction between the college teachers and the University teachers regarding CAS promotions. He said that there are certain issues pertaining to the colleges. The first issue is regarding conduct of the pre Ph.D. course classes. The second one is regarding recognised research centres in colleges and third approval of teachers as Ph.D. guide. If they simply take a case at UBS Ludhiana, there are having 35 applications of teachers who want to pursue Ph.D. but because of lot of hurdles, still, that has not been finalized to conduct pre-Ph.D. classes at UBS Ludhiana. He said that these issues are very important so far as the college teachers are concerned because they want to a grade because now as in the coming future, they have to have the same parameters as the University teachers have. He said that those cases which are pending at the University level, in terms of the approval of the research centres, in sciences, University is quite liberal, in one sense, that the Dean, the former Dean in the present team, once application is there,

the Dean, he usually visits the colleges but for the arts, languages and commerce, not even a single visit is there to the college and so far they are not having any approved research centre in these subjects for the last two years. Similarly the research guide cases of our teachers, they are pending in many departments. He said that the time-line may be fixed so that in the coming days all these issues are settled.

- (10) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the second point is that during the last meeting of the academic calendar which was formally conducted under your (the Vice Chancellor) chairmanship in which he (Vice Chancellor) had emphasized that five day week will be implemented from the coming semester. All the modalities were framed by the Committee, approved by the Vice Chancellor and is still pending at the level of Punjab Government. The Punjab Government and U.T. government has already given their consent, later on they have withdrawn it. As far as the Punjab Government is concerned, the modalities were worked out by the University, there was a special meeting of the Senate, in his (Vice Chancellor) words there was an overwhelming response of five day week in the colleges, in the Senate. It was recorded and it was a resolved part. He said that these two issues, keeping in view that they have worked out, till their finalization of all formalities, they should be clinched in a time bound manner.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that as has been stated by Dr. Dalip that five day week has come into force. He said that yet it has not been implemented but in the government colleges the time has been fixed from 9.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m. as per the five day week. Now attendance is marked both the times without lunch break. He further said that it should be made five days week. The government says as the time format has been changed, it should be supposed that the five days week has come into force. Further, he said that he was not aware of the fact despite of his being in Senate, that when the examinations are conducted, both the teaching and non teaching staff are put on duty, the money is deducted from the payments of the non teaching staff. However, they say that they are not entitled for faculty house and they cannot stay in faculty house as and when they visit the University for college assignments. He said that it should be looked into if the non teaching staff is charged of money at par with the teaching staff, they should be allowed to stay in Faculty house as the facility is given to the teachers. He raised the another issue that in most of the colleges, the inspections are over and in many case, inspection teams were formed but they have not visited the colleges, the reason may be any, the colleges have not been given affiliation, the number of colleges is 4-5. He said that whichever team has to visit the college, that should be done at the earliest and if the affiliation is entitled, that should be given. The third issue that he placed before the House is that as in the past, most of the times, it is deliberated in the Senate that some students who could not appear in the examination due to certain reasons in including on medical grounds, special chance could be given to them. He said that they are now about to leave the House and the new Senate would be there, he urged that it would be very kind of the House if the decision about giving special chance is taken within ten days and before the new Senate takes over.

- (11) Shri Munish Verma said that as the special chance has been demanded, it should be allowed in the December and April examinations on the same pattern as is granted in March/April session. He said that the students are facing a lot of problem. He said that he has come to know that a letter has been issued by the University to the B.Ed. colleges that they have not gone through the inspection. He said that the colleges have made the admissions and they should be given a time of 10 to 20 days so that they could deposit the documents after getting the inspections done.

- (12) Professor Shelley Walia stated that he wanted to draw the attention of the Vice Chancellor that more time is consumed on administrative discussion and a few minutes on academic issues. He said that they need to take a critical view.

He said that what he feels was that there was actually a symbolic desire for change. He said that one basic issue that he had brought to the kind notice of the Vice Chancellor two years ago was regarding the Centre for Translation Studies. He said that they have totally forgotten it. He said that he had put up a proposal also, but it seems that it has been buried ever since. He said that on number two, he would like to emphasise that backbone of all teaching, all pedagogic exercises rests with the tutorial system. He said that the DUI is here. He said that they do have tutorials but they are not primary pedagogic exercise. It is more of the lecture hall teaching. If they look at the University's best tutorial system, that seems to be working out the system where you do get involved in speaking, writing, seminars and conferencing. Thirdly, he said that he would like to draw the attention of the Vice Chancellor to the issues which he has been emphasizing, reiterating that the publication of some of the good Ph.D. thesis in the University. He said that every department is involved in research but finally those Ph.D. theses picked up in the Library. He said that it was the Dean who had, in fact, to ensure one or two presentations are picked up from each department and the Press takes up those presentations. He said that it would be a wonderful exercise because then they can publish good research that is being done in the University. He further said that he wanted to draw the attention of the Vice Chancellor to one very important issue that the English Department was facing. He said that they have English Proficiency Course that has been started this year. It was started about four years back and he himself initiated it but it is now taken off because ICSSR is saying that 6 to 7 lacs rupees is requested to start it. The English department has more than 100 Ph.D. students, it has 240 M.A. students, it has an M.Phil. course and now it has EP, English Proficiency course. He said that he would like to request to him that there is a room which is lying on the top floor of the block, Bhai Vir Singh Studies, it is locked for the last eight years and nice big room lying vacant and lying empty with reptiles. He said that he just wanted to request to the Vice Chancellor that if possible, the English department could be given that room for use because now they have hundred Ph.D. students who have to sit somewhere and that floor is already occupied by the English department and one more room for the Department is required which is the largest department of the University. He said that this could be considered. He suggested that whenever the Bhai Vir Singh Chair is revived, the office could be changed to Guru Teg Bahadur Bhawan.

- (13) Professor Shelley Walia continued saying that Ph.D. students in the University are facing a lot of problems and he would like to point out two basic problems. The first one is about the title of the Ph.D. He said that if just an article is to be changed in the title, say, 'a' is to be changed to 'the', the students have to wait for 6 to 7 months for Joint Research Board to come and say Yes, you can substitute 'the' for 'a'. He said that on this he wanted to suggest that if he was talking in terms of policy decision, he is suggesting that the pre RDC, when the administrative academic committee is meeting, if the student say that he does not want to use the word a or the, the student should not be made to wait for the JRB to take place after 6-7 months, it should be absolutely immediate procedure by which we can change the title of the thesis.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be given to the DUI, it has to be followed up. He further said that he cannot be expected to keep responding on such things.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he was not even asking for his (Vice Chancellor) response. He is bringing it into the notice of the DUI and rest of the academics here, they have had a forum where hours are spent, the Senate is not necessarily an administrative body, the Senate is not necessarily academic committee, Senate is not necessarily for promotions, appointments, or re-employment. He said that the Senate is also for a person to actually bring about some kind of important academic issues that seems to concern them especially for full consideration of the academic issues and particularly as the

DUI was there, he could link about it also. He said that what about the RDC meeting which takes place in the month of February and did they know seven months have past, for the JRB to take place, and then the students are to wait for 7 months for their registration. He said that he is saying that it can be verified for exact truth of it. He questioned as to whether once the title and the synopsis is approved by the RDC, why the student should not get the letter, he should immediately get the letter, why he should be made to wait for JRB. He said that this was a kind of system that they were following. He further said that he did not know that for the last hundred years, why they have not thought of changing it and he would request the DUI, in fact to think about it. He suggested that the RDC which is a capable body to decide whether the title could be changed or not and or whether the student is registered. Why he should be made to wait for JRB?

The Vice Chancellor said that the Dean of University Instruction is a person who arrives for a very small interval of time. So these matters must get addressed by the University Professors in academic bodies of the campus. He said that he did not think that these matters should not come to the Senate meetings. Addressing to Professor Shelley Walia said that it might be the personal view of Professor Walia.

Professor Shelley Walia said he understands that these ideas come up at the departmental level, but at the department levels, they do not get passed, thinking that this is not done and this is not the practice and they are the department and this is the policy decision. He suggested that let this decide that the title should not be sent to the JRB.

The Vice Chancellor said that an agenda item should be sent to the Syndicate and then it could be taken as the Policy decision. He said that Professor Shelley Walia is a very experienced Senator and he knows that things cannot be done in such a way.

Professor Shelley Walia again stated that his idea was only to draw the attention of the House so that some action is taken.

- (14) Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha said that the interest on the Provident Fund of the year 2013 in respect of the teaching and non teaching employees of the University have been recovered whereas that money belongs to the employees. There is a set procedure in the University that the money of the Provident Fund Account is invested and the quotations are called from the banks and the money is deposited in the bank/s whosoever offers the highest rate of interest is given the funds for investment. After that whatever amount is earned on the invested amount, the amount of interest is divided proportionately among the Provident Fund holders. He further said that the team of CAG which visited the University in the past had said that the University cannot give more interest to its employees than as prescribed by the central government. His question is, as to when the money belongs to them, and they have invested it and if they earn higher rate of interest, then it has necessarily to be divided among the employees but on the directions of the CAG team or so far as his knowledge is concerned, that the Parliamentary Accounts Committee (PAC), which had rejected our case. He said that his submission is that the authorities should again take up this issue, since ours is an autonomous body and the money belonging to the Provident Fund of the employees, whether it is of faculty members or the non teaching employees, is invested and he requested that the recovered money should be transferred back to the Provident Fund Accounts of the employees. He said it is not understood as to why the CAG or the government, has been running after the University that the actual earning on our own money is being questioned by them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot answer that and further added that he had done his best to pursue it as far as they could do, but they have failed.

Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha questioned, as to, in which accounts the recovered money would go.

The Chancellor said that they want the money to be recovered.

Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha continued enquiring that after the recovered, where the money would go.

The Vice Chancellor said that probably it would go into the income of the University. He again said that they cannot do anything, he tried his level best.

Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha said that the Finance and Development Officer, who is sitting in the House, should tell as to in which account the money would fall.

It was clarified that, that money relates to the PF account and it would go to the PF account as such. He explained that there might be chances that the banks would give lesser rate than the rates of the Provident Fund interest as notified by the central government. In such a situation, that money would be utilized so that there is a matching with the government. He further said that in the past actually, many a times, they had got the lesser rate of interest as compared to the Government rates.

Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha again raised that issue, that as is the trend of the investment market, the rates of interest of banks are lowering, in such a situation, whether the government would give us the minimum rate of interest fixed by it to maintain the parity.

It was clarified that, that is the maximum limit, the government states that this is the maximum limit.

The Vice Chancellor said that all organizations which manage their own PF accounts, they run this risk that they would get lesser rates of interest. The government decides these things as a part of negotiations but those who manage their PF fund, they earn and distribute. If they manage to earn more than the government decides, the government says No, they cannot pay. However, if the organization is unable to earn that much interest as decided by the government, that is treated as bad luck of the organization. He said that this was what the law of the land has become. He cited an example that he happened to remain a member of an institution which has always paid on PF for the forty years, one percent less than what the central government paid. He said that when they (central authorities) are asked to take the money of the Provident Fund in their hands, the reply is that the PF should be managed by the organization itself. We are told that not to increase our burden but we (University) cannot pay more than what they (government) are paying. He further said that in some matter, it could be considered as misfortune but so far as the withdrawal from the PF is concerned, it could be said as fortune as it is very convenient to withdraw the money as and when required without complying with so many formalities. It is possible only because the funds are managed by us locally. In governments, because of strict laws, one has to face so many difficulties to get the money released from the PF accounts.

- (15) Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he had sent a video to the Vice Chancellor and the Registrar about the construction material being used by the Construction office in construction of houses in Sector 25 and the boundary wall of Sector 25 residential area. After that a committee was constituted by the Registrar in which he (Ajay Ranga) himself and three four members including PUTA

representative and XEN office officials, were there. The report of that Committee was submitted to the Registrar about the deficiencies and the video recording of the same, is with him. He said that the representative/supervisor of the concerned builder was before them and he had admitted the deficiencies in the work before the Committee members as to what was the size of the wall, what type of iron has been used, as to what gauze was permitted and he used of what gauze. He said that he can show the video to the House. He further said that they have written in the report that substandard material has been used in the construction of all building. But despite of that he received a report from the Registrar office and the Construction Office that the private agencies have been asked to conduct an inspection and submit report. He said that his question is that, in the UIET, there are tools to measure the compression and questioned as to why he has been sent a report after examining by the private agency. He further said that they are having Punjab Engineering College (PEC) with them, there are people of Civil Branch, Mechanical Branch, they have requisite mechanism and instruments. But despite of that, repeatedly, for the last year, from February to till date, he kept on demanding time and again, that what action has been taken on the substandard material used in the buildings as the building has been made ready and are about to be handed over, but no action has been taken as yet. He said that it is his request that he should be informed as to why action has not been taken. He said that there were technical and non technical members in the Committee and despite of that he should be informed about the action taken. Raising the another issue, he stated that in UILS, there is a strength of 1200 students and Rs.90,000/- fee is paid by each of the student and that department is contributing more than rupees 11 crores to the University. But the students have no space to sit. After every alternate day, there happens to be a strike. He said that they had got a plan and design prepared for the extension of the department, the money has already been spent. He said that his request to the authorities is that permission should be given at the earliest for the construction of the class rooms so that student have a space to sit.

- (16) Dr. S.S. Randhawa said that there is a person Jaswinder Singh, Punjabi Lecturer at Nihal Singhwala. At the time of the start of the constituent colleges started by the Panjab University, he had been appointed at Nihal Singh Wala Constituent College. After that due to some problem, his transfer was made by the University to Sidhwal. But after that a committee was constituted by the Vice Chancellor comprising of Dr. Sandhu, Kuldeep Singh and under the Chairmanship of Dean College Development Council. The Committee decided that Mr. Jaswinder be asked to rejoin at Nihal Singh Wala and the Principal, Dr. Kuldeep Singh also have his acceptance that Shri Jaswinder Singh should join at Nihal Singh Wala. He said that what happened to Shri Jaswinder Singh is that, he has not been given the appointment as yet because he had come on contractual basis in the year 2011-12 and in his appointment letter, it has been written, he would be replaced only by a permanent person. In spite of no arrival of any permanent employee, he has been relieved and permanent employee has not yet arrived in the college. He said that he should be given appointment as he is passing through a critical time because of illness of his parents and he is sitting at home. He said that the condition is very serious and he should be re-appointed as per the Panjab University rules and regulations and to the most, the Principal has been demanding him.
- (17) Principal N.R. Sharma said that he would like to speak regarding Constituent Colleges. He said that once again, the Government has given them two more colleges this time. But in the year 2011, when these colleges were started, the Government had given resources to Nihal Singh Wala, Sikhwala and Balachaur Colleges, but to the fourth college at Guru Harsahai resources like Library and Sports infrastructure etc. were not given due to some judicial/legal problems. He said that what the Coordinator did is that by taking furniture, books, sports and other items from these three colleges, the fourth college at Guru Harsahai was made to run. He requested that about these two

colleges which the Government has given, the Government should be made to know that their fourth college, which has already been running, has not been given any resource for the last five years. Neither any books nor any racks etc. in the library have been provided. Even the furniture from the Sikhwala, Balachaur and Nihal Singh Wala has been taken to run the fourth college.

- (18) Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu said that they had adopted in the last meeting of the Senate the 3rd and 4th amendments of the UGC. With the adoption of these amendments, they might need a new proforma for the direct recruitment as well as for promotions under CAS. If a Committee in this regard has already been constituted and the work is going on, then it is good and it should be expedited because the promotion of so many persons is due and those persons could apply well in time. In addition, the University has to submit a list of journals to the UGC for approval. If the list of journals has been submitted to the UGC, then it is good otherwise it should be sent. If some kind of help in this matter is needed, the PUTA is ready to help.
- (19) Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would not take much of the time except to convey his heartfelt thanks, though late, but more than 20 admissions were made in the Department of Laws because he had raised the issue in the meeting held on 3rd September during zero hour that the NRI seats which were reserved in the Department of Laws were not converted before the last date of admission. He expected and he was assured in the Senate that from now onwards it would be taken care of. But nothing was done and he wrote an e-mail to the Vice-Chancellor on 20th September, i.e. after 17 days of the meeting of the Senate, but there was no response. He again wrote on 22nd September and he got a response from the Vice-Chancellor that he is out of station and would clarify after return. When he did not get any response, again on 23rd September, he sent an e-mail and when he did not get any response to that e-mail also, he sent an e-mail on 26th September thereby expressing his concern as to how the things were being taken so lightly. But after having said that, though he did not get any response to his e-mail of 26th September, but the desired response, of admitting the students against those NRI seats after converting into general category, was achieved. But he had raised on the 3rd September that even after the last date of admissions, as Shri Jarnail Singh has raised a very pertinent point, i.e. 20th August, the admission had been made in this University. He did not know under which provisions, the admissions were made. So much so that those seats which were supposed to be converted into general category and the issue was raised on 3rd September, even after 3rd September, instead of converting those seats, those seats were filled against NRI category, again he did not know under which provisions. So much so that even when the seats were converted into general category along with that decision two more seats under NRI category were filled up. That is probably on 29th September or so. He did not know whether in the Panjab University Calendar, there is any such provision that after last date which is fixed by the Syndicate, any admission could be made. If yes, then they need to tell the public that there is a provision and there is discretion with some officials that even after the last date, the admissions could be made. But if there is no such provision, in future, let them stick to the rule because the public who is approaching the office of the Dean of University Instruction, the point blank answer was that no admission could be made after the last date of admission. But if some fortunate people were able to approach the office of the Vice-Chancellor, the admissions were made even after the last date. Though he is supposed to know what the provisions of the University are, but he confessed that he has not been able to lay any hand on any Regulation or rule where the admissions could be allowed after the last date fixed by the Syndicate. He is once again thankful that instead of replying to his query and after making the admissions after converting the unfilled seats, a Committee has also been constituted to look into the reasons as to why those seats were not converted before the last date of admissions which necessarily means that they admit that

those seats were supposed to be converted before the last date of admission. If that is the scene, he thought, to fill those seats by way of bringing NRI students to fill those seats even after the last date, probably is wrong. He did not know where and how the decision has been taken even against the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, who has banned the NRI sponsored category seats till 2008, in spite of the fact that the Hon'ble Supreme Court had given the judgment in 2005, they till 2008 kept on admitting NRI sponsored students also in Panjab University till a contempt notice was issued to Guru Nanak Dev University, Punjab Technical University and others, though Panjab University was not issued any contempt notice but they saved themselves short of that and stopped admitting students under NRI category. He remembered that broad guidelines, after taking the legal opinion duly vetted by the Syndicate and Senate, were also framed, rules were framed which are printed in the Handbook of Information also that who are the persons who are entitled to be admitted under NRI category. He has been given to understand that in 2015, a student, who was not covered under that category which is as per the rules, was to be admitted and taking a legal opinion from a Retainer other than the one who had framed the rules for them in 2008 and 2010, it was said that they could admit the students by taking an affidavit from the person who is sponsoring that he is the guardian and the student was admitted. Subsequently, there was an issue under consideration whether they could frame this rule, that never got the approval of the Syndicate. But, accordingly even in the Handbook of Information, 2016 which says that there is no such provision where the NRI sponsored candidates could be admitted. But he is really sorry to say that against the law of the land, against the decision of the Senate, against the decision of the Syndicate, against the provisions of the Handbook of Information of Panjab University itself, he thought that at least 100 such students had been admitted which could attract wrath of the Court if somebody goes to the Court. He is not asking for any immediate response but would like the Vice-Chancellor's serious attention to be given to this that whether or not admission after the last date fixed by the Syndicate could be made by anyone or not. Second, whether or not NRI sponsored category candidates are allowed to be admitted or not and who has drafted the affidavit where it says that under the column 'relatives', one could write as uncle or aunty and the person who has been going to school from class 1 to 12th, going to College from 1st year to 3rd year having degree from Chandigarh, overnight has become an NRI for the purpose of admission under NRI category. Another thing which he did not know that where from it has been invented that for admission to NRI category, every student has to go through Dean, International Students, meaning thereby that not only the person has come under the NRI sponsored category, overnight he/she has become an international student also because it is the Dean, International Students who certifies that everything is in order and the student is covered under international student. That, according to him, is not only irregular but illegal also. After having said all that, hoping that it would draw the Vice-Chancellor's necessary attention and at least in 2017, they would not follow if something is wrong and if everything is right, he would like to be enlightened so that he could convince himself.

- (20) Shri Ashok Goyal said that on 3rd September, he had raised a very serious issue. Dr. Ajay Ranga has raised an issue which again is very important which is about XEN office, that is about deficiency in construction material. He had been raising an issue even in Syndicate as the Vice-Chancellor tried to convince Mrs. Anu Chatrath that if she had any such information or if she had any such apprehension, she should have shared it with the Vice-Chancellor in private but she should not have raised the issue in the Senate, he would assure the House that he did not raise any issue in the House till he brings it to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor or to the concerned official in private and when the desired result does not come, he thought, anybody and the Vice-Chancellor would really appreciate that he has no option but to raise the issue at the proper forum. In the last meeting he said that on 30th July, he met the Vice-Chancellor in the chamber of the Registrar, in front of the Registrar, he had

brought it to his (Vice-Chancellor) notice about some irregularities and illegalities being followed in the University purchase system and University contract award system. He specifically told that the present Dean Students Welfare (DSW), against whom allegations have been made by one of the re-employed teachers, he did not believe in those allegations till he investigated at his own level and after investigation, he told the Vice-Chancellor that the contract of internal housekeeping of International Hostel has been awarded to none other than the real brother of the DSW and on 30th July his simple question was that he did not want to go to anything else except that let it be told whether he (the contractor) happens to be the real brother of the DSW or not. But, the Vice-Chancellor in his presence told the Registrar to call the Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO) and on Monday itself to expedite it and get the report immediately submitted. The Registrar in his presence said that on Monday, he would sort it out and at least they would come to know whether it is a fact or not. He had said that if the Registrar feels any difficulty, he is there to assist the CVO, the Vice-Chancellor or the University office. But when nothing was done even till 3rd September, he raised it in the meeting on 3rd September that now he is making a statement under oath in this House that he (contractor) is Mr. Vishal Goyal, the real brother of the DSW while the DSW was also sitting in the House. He did not believe in talking at the back of somebody. The Vice-Chancellor, as if any issue relating to the Dean of University Instruction (DUI) comes, he wants the DUI to respond, if any issue relating to DSW comes, the Vice-Chancellor expects the DSW to respond, he did not know why on 3rd September, the Vice-Chancellor did not ask there and then in the House itself that whatever Shri Ashok Goyal is alleging, is it correct or not. But that amounts to accepting that it is a fact. Before that, outside the Syndicate hall, in the month of May, he told the Vice-Chancellor that whatever allegations have been put by the complainant against the DSW, he has verified that at his end, the Vice-Chancellor may look into it as it is a very-very serious allegation that the award of rate contract for one year for supply of water coolers, LEDs, air-conditioners has been given to none other than the first cousin of the DSW and his name is Mr. Vinay Jindal s/o Mr. S.P. Jindal who is DSW's mother's real brother, whose son has been awarded this contract. He knew that if he is making a statement, he is liable for penal action also if he is proved to be wrong. But, if Shri Ashok Goyal as an individual, without having any paraphernalia at his command, if he could get such an investigation done resulting into the huge level of bungling which is being done and it has been brought to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor, who has got such a big paraphernalia at his command including the CVO, it has taken 6 months and nothing has come out till now. He knows that it would not come out also because the University does not have any such mechanism whereby the investigation could be made vis-à-vis the outer agencies where the investigation could be made vis-à-vis those who are the suppliers and where from they would come to know that whether somebody is related or not unless and until the person against whom the allegations are being made, he accepts or not. He understands that the DSW has accepted that 'yes' as far as award of International Hostel is concerned, the awarded of the contract is his real brother. That he understands, it has been accepted. But, another information which he has is that he (DSW) has denied having relationship with the person, the owner of Electro Power, he (DSW) has denied having any relationship with that person. What is the power with the Committee which the Vice-Chancellor has appointed and the Vice-Chancellor is saying that they are waiting for the outcome of that report, wherefrom they are going to justify or to prove that he (DSW) is related or not. So, to maintain the name and fame of this University, he once again requested the Vice-Chancellor to please hand over this case to the CBI and he would come out with so many more facts which he did not want to come at this stage because as he said earlier that he believes in bringing all the facts to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor in private first and only then sharing it at public forum.

- (21) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that first of all, he would like to say something on the issue of re-employment that as per the financial status of the Panjab as of now, and it is going to become a liability as well. Presently, it is for 65 years, when the 65 stood confirmed, they will start for demanding 65 to 70 years and thereafter when 70 is confirmed, they will start demanding 75. It could be such that as happened in Latin America once, there came a revolution in the University of Colorado that the retirement of Professors was till death, lest they start demanding that thing. In his opinion, to check such happenings, they shall have to fix a rider somewhere, in case they want to deliver something to the coming generations. He said that he is much confident and have a deep concern on it that if the University is short of any human resource, then they could be given the work compulsorily. If there are the persons who could perform extraordinarily, there is a platform available for them that they could give them the position of Professor Emeritus. He said that it happens that for one post, there come hundred of applications and much of the time is consumed to filter them and this type of practice is applicable in any other University. He said that it is his opinion that it should be reviewed and in the House, majority is of the teachers sitting here. He further said that he could claim this with confirmation that the retired teachers are getting their service continued after 60 years because of their greed, by arranging pressure from PUTA, they are getting this wrongful done. He further said that he is deadly against any type of extension and this practice should immediately be stopped. The formal education which is given for 20-22 years to the students, when they become eligible for Assistant Professor, should they wait for further five years more. He said that in place of one Professor, 5 to 6 new Assistant Professors could be accommodated. He claimed that he could say with full confidence that the new Assistant Professors, so appointed, would perform vigorously as compared to the old Professors. He urged the Vice Chancellor said that his view should be given a thorough thought. As per the prevalent employment cycle, if calculated for a period of 30 years, they would be able to give employment to 500 instead of 1000. He said that the after-effects of this practice on the society which are likely in the time to come, he is making aware of that to the Vice Chancellor. He suggested that the policy of reemployment should be redrafted after giving a serious consideration to it and the issue should have a lengthy bare debate as the issue relates to the career of thousands and lacs of students. This is the question of the expectation of the parents who have made their wards to reach this stage by arranging education for them for 20-22 years.
- (22) Raising another issue, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that as he had already stated this so many times earlier that the representation of the Students Council in the Senate should be there. According to him, this is a appropriate and right time and the appropriate forum, from where he is speaking and the Vice Chancellor is the right person who should have a hearing of it and should act on it because initially, he (the Vice Chancellor) was convinced with him. He said that when he was there in the University, there was no PUTA President, and also the PUSA President happened not to be there. In the first instance, the PUTA President entered the Senate followed by PUSA President and it is a matter of sorrow that till date they could not bring the Student Council office bearer to the Senate. He said that he did mean to say that at least, they should have a sense of their two three responsibilities. As per him, there are three components, teachers, non-teachers and most important is the students who are missing in between. He said that India being a largest democracy of the world, it became their moral responsibility and they are facing lack of leadership in the country, they need to create a good leadership and the student leadership should be made a part of the governance who could play a role in the administration. He recommended that since the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor as to whom he would like to recommend for the Senate would count in the office of the Chancellor, he personally requested the Vice Chancellor and the whole the House to nominate a student representative in the Senate.

- (23) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he wanted to bring to the notice of the Vice Chancellor 2-3 academic issues. There was also a discussion in the Syndicate also that the M.Phil. is a dying course. He requested that the proceedings related with it be sent to the Dean of University Instruction.
- (24) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that to bring fairness in the admission criteria for Ph.D., the marks of B.A./M.A./M.Phil. and interview should be given equal weightage so that there is no favouritism. What is happening is that a student who has good academic qualification and qualifies a test, JRF or NET but a clause is imposed that if there are 100 candidates out of which only 10 have to be selected, they are to be filtered through interview and impartiality is not being adopted. To make it more transparent and to safeguard the interests of the students, the marks of B.A./M.A./M.Phil. and interview should be given equal weightage and overall merit be prepared so that the students are not shunted out only on the basis of interview marks.
- (25) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there is a complaint against one of the officers related with the XEN office in which huge amount is involved, huge anomalies are involved in it and lack of procedures which were supposed to be followed.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa to give the papers to him which would be attended to and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa passed on the papers to the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that since the University is already facing financial crunch, they should spend the government money in such a way as they spend while constructing their own houses and running their own houses and do no wastage of money. He requested the Vice Chancellor to look into the representation which he has got and would get it examined from the members of the House which the Vice Chancellor might think could effectively participate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that a Committee could be formed to examine the construction work done by the XEN office during the last 5 years.

- (26) Professor Rajesh Gill said that while she was campaigning during the elections, she came across lot of resentment from many of the colleagues, i.e., the Professors of the University. According to them, when the Selection and Inspection Committees are constituted, there are certain people who are picked up and nominated on these Committees. Some of the Professors said that they had served in the University for about 20-25 years and had never been a part of such Committees. She requested the authorities that some kind of rotation system should be developed where everybody could be deputed so that there is no such resentment.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the College teachers should also be involved in such Committees.

- (27) Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that it being the election year and there being the shortage of staff in the College branch, the affiliation letters have not been sent to so many College on the basis of which the Colleges make the admissions. The College branch has also been time and again saying that there is a shortage of manpower in the branch. There have been some deficiencies on the part of the Affiliation Committees also as there are so many parallel works going on due to elections. At some of the places, the Affiliation Committees could not reach in time to some of the Colleges and the meetings of the Committees were held so many times. The Colleges have made the admissions

and their returns are not being accepted by the Panjab University. He requested that the affiliation letters be sent as early as possible.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested that the last date for submission of returns by such Colleges should also be extended.

XXXII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-40 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-40. That –

- (i) recommendations of Hostel Committee dated 11.03.2016 regarding amendments/ rate revision for the Handbook of Hostel Rule for Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, for the session 2016-17, be approved.
- (ii) the recommendations of the Committee dated 31.03.2016 with regard to rate revision for the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girls' Hostel, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, for the session 2016-17, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 47)

XXXIII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-41 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

C-41. That –

- (1) A fine of Rs.2 lac be imposed on the Colleges, which have to submitted their application for affiliation/extension of affiliation beyond the stipulated date;
- (2) to start with while going to the Colleges for this course, if the Inspection Committees feel those who are already not paying full salaries and do not intend to pay, do not recommend affiliation/extension of affiliation to them; and
- (3) instructions be given by the Dean, College Development Council, to the Inspection Committee.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 82)

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that there is a procedure that the last date for getting the affiliation fee is the 1st November and the same is the normal date. After that there is Rs.25,000/- late fee and Rs.50,000/- and with a fine of Rs.1, the last date is 10th January of that very particular year. Now, they have brought in a provision of Rs.2 lac and had titled it "Fine". From this, a message goes that the Colleges could apply up to some another date. His submission is that they should make another category that if somebody wants to apply, he/she would have to submit the application up to 30th January of the year with this much of fee, but it should not be called fine. It could be called late fee. The second para relates to non-payment of full salaries to the staff. There are three columns of observations in their Inspection *pro forma*, i.e., infrastructure, books and academic resources the College has. He thinks that it would be more appropriate if this (the second para) is included as fourth observation in the *pro forma*. This second para should be the part of observation of the

inspection *pro forma* as fourth para, so that a mandatory message goes to all the teams that they have also to say "Yes or No" to this. It should not be instruction only, but a part of the observation *pro forma*. Secondly, the University had fixed timeline of 10th January for the Colleges and it has also been pointed out by Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu that letters of affiliation have not yet been issued to the Colleges, the University should also fix timeline for itself. They clearly know that they would not receive any application after 10th of January and these cases (cases with a late fee of Rs.2 lacs) are very rare ones. Therefore, the University should also fix timeline for itself that up to which date they would issue the letters to the Colleges as to whether the affiliation has been granted or not. If the Colleges are waiting for the letters of affiliation in the month of October, then it is very unfortunate. In nutshell, he suggested that timeline for the University should be fixed, and second para should be made a part of the observations, and Rs.2 lac should be called late fee instead of fine.

Professor Mukesh Arora stated that whenever they go to the Colleges Branch for various types of works, including issuance of letters of affiliation, even being Senate members, they are told they would not issue the letters as sufficient staff has not been provided to the Branch. He is not saying alone, they could get it verified from the other members.

To this, Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said, it is true.

Professor Mukesh Arora remarked where should they go? He has brought this to the notice of the Vice Chancellor so that he could take some action. Even the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) does not do anything and several times, he even does not attend to their phone calls. He suggested that if the manpower is less, additional staff should be provided to the Colleges Branch, so that the work is done. Though one of the Colleges was got inspected a month ago, the letter was issued to the College on 5th instant. The inspection was got done on 2nd September and the College was written to recruit the staff on 5th October. After one month, what the College would do? He urged that it should be taken seriously; otherwise, they receive a reply that since the sufficient staff is not provided, they are unable to perform the job.

Dr. Dalip Kumar remarked that it is a serious issues and the Branch should be given proper manpower.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that as suggested by Dr. Dalip Kumar that timeline should be fixed by the University for itself, the NCTE this time has done that the Colleges would receive a letter by 1st April whether affiliation would be granted to them or not. Whichever meetings for recognition they are holding now, the same are for the year 2017-18 and not for the year 2016-17. They should also evolve such a system.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu stated that perhaps Dr. Dalip does not know that no date has been fixed after 10th January. The Vice Chancellor might remember that this fine of Rs.2 lac has been imposed only on those Colleges, which have applied for B.A./B.Ed. Integrated Course because they had earlier applied for NOC and they were taking the date of NOC as the date of affiliation. When the Dean, College Development Council and the affiliation Committee told those Colleges that since they have not applied within the stipulated date, the fine is being imposed on them. It was also observed that the date of NOC should be taken as the date of application and since the fulfilled all other formalities, they should be granted affiliation for the course; otherwise, nowhere a fine of Rs.2 lac there, but, if they still wanted to reduce this fine from Rs.2 lac to Rs.1 lac also, he is agreeable to that. However, whatever his Fellow colleagues are saying is correct that there is a problem in the Colleges Branch. Even if the Inspection Committees make clear-cut recommendations, those gain dust in the branch for months. As the letters are not written to the Colleges, they are a harassed a lot and they approached the Fellows. They could not submit their returns as they do not have letters of affiliation. Even if there are certain minor shortcomings on their part, the same should be ignored this year. From next year, they should be strict, and all the Inspection Committees should visit the Colleges by March, so that the reports/cases of

affiliation are placed before the Senate in its March meeting and the Colleges are issued letters of affiliation in the month of April.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he just wants to draw their attention that this issue was discussed in 2015 also. Now, what Dr. Dalip Kumar has raised, it had been raised by so many members at various times. They are talking of NCERT, their own regulations do not permit any application for extension of affiliation beyond 1st November and for affiliation for new College beyond 1st October and the whole procedure has also been given. It is as per regulations that before 31st March, they have to say "Yes" or "No". In fact, the framers of the Constitution has taken so much care of the Colleges that it is only after they say "Yes" or "No", after three or four months when the admissions are to take place, if certain deficiencies are there, sufficient time is given to the College(s) for making the appointments and development of infrastructure. Could any rule be framed in violation of the regulation/s? He could understand any rule, which is in complementary, but there could not be any rule in violation of the regulations and regulation says 1st October and 1st November. He remembers, before the Vice Chancellor took over in the year 2006, there was only one College, which had applied for affiliation beyond the stipulated date which is mentioned in the Calendar, and only that College after heated debate in the Syndicate and Senate was given permission by the Vice Chancellor that alright it is a single case, let them have a liberal view. After 2006, a case of a College came where they could not have gone beyond that, the College went to the Court. The Court could give any direction. The Court gave direction and thereafter, they amended their rules instead of amending the regulations because the regulations could be amended only by the Government of India. However, they amended the rule that with a late fee of rupees so and so, the last date is this and with a late fee of rupees, the last date is this. The application which is supposed to come on 1st October or 1st November for which 5 or 6 months time is given, and if they take six months from 10th January, it would automatically become 10th July, but they could not change that the whole process of affiliation is to be completed by the 31st March of the year. If they have made 1st November to 10th January, then they could make 3 months more from 10th July. Now, they have entered the month of October and the time is not far when they would be reaching the end of the academic session. Why he is reminding in 2016 because the Vice Chancellor was well receptive at that time and it was decided that let them work in such a direction that in 2016, they would stick to the regulations, but instead of sticking to the regulations they are trying to go beyond even 10th January. However, Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu is right that there are peculiar circumstances, that for the first time, the 4-Year Integrated course has been started and there were certain nitty-gritties. But now is the high time to see the veracity of this rule of having the applications invited up to 10th of January. In his view, that rule needs to be completely scrapped because that rule could not stand the scrutiny of law. Secondly, take it for granted that it never happened before 2006. Once everybody knows that the last date is 1st October only and not 2nd October, no fine, no penalty, etc., they would not find even a single applicant who would be submitting the application beyond the prescribed date as was happening before 2006. So keeping in view the sentiments of the House, a Committee be constituted to look into the issue in detail and see that the Colleges are not allowed to suffer in any manner. Sometimes the allegations are made on the basis of the groups that as if he would get something done and the other person says that he would get it stopped because they are not sure what the regulations and rules say. So far as the practical problem of the Colleges Branch is concerned, he does not know and this is for him (Vice Chancellor) to get it investigated, but on the surface of it, it looks justified that keeping in view 200 odd affiliated Colleges, they have to assess whether the Branch has got sufficient strength to deal with the Colleges because they have not raised their hands once, twice, but 10 times that it just not possible for them to deal with the files. They could suspend them, dismiss them, hang them, but it is not possible for them to attend to the cases. He has been given to understand that somewhere they have also given in writing, which of course, is the behaviour which has to be met by the College Principals and their representatives, but they are at the receiving end and just could not do anything. Even when the Senators are being told in the same terms, they could well understand that either there is something seriously wrong with the functioning or the allocation of staff or there is no will to work. In either of the case, he thinks they need to look into the cases seriously because they should not forget that

besides the Teaching Departments of the University as the Vice Chancellor had said in the last meeting that Colleges are the most important component of the University so far as finance is concerned. If the financial backbone of the University is not to be taken care of in a desired manner, then probably they have to do introspection, could they call themselves a responsible Governing Body. So he is asking the question to himself and is not blaming anybody. As such, they need to sit together and see how the things could be improved and also to see that there is no such fine, penalty, etc. as these are meant only to discipline the students, who are younger in age and these are not meant to discipline the Institutions, which are to impart education. In view of this, he thinks what they were supposed to do in the year 2015 to be implemented in 2016, at least he hopes that they would be able to do it to be implemented in the year 2017. He would definitely like to have his (Vice Chancellor's) response after the item is discussed.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean of University Instruction to follow it up.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-41 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXXIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-42 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-42. That the recommendations of the Committee dated 11.04.2016 to suggest enhancement of Rent/License Fee, Water Charges of Campus houses at Chandigarh as well as of Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 79)

Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha stated that they are increasing maintenance and water charges of the Campus houses by 10%. However, neither the houses are being maintained by the XEN office properly nor the houses are being whitewashed nor painted by them before five years. If any work is to be got done from them, every campus resident has to incur the expenses from his/her on pocket. At the most, they provide the labour. His submission in this regard is that if they wish to enhance the rent, instructions should be issued to the XEN Office that the houses at the campus should be maintained properly. Secondly, the water never reaches at the second floor and so far as the double storey houses are concerned, water does not reach even at the first floor. Since he has grown up at the Campus, he knows that earlier the water used to come the entire day, i.e., 24 × 7, whereas now the water is not available after 8.45 a.m. Although they are enhancing the rates taking a cue from the U.T. Administration, the facilities which they were already enjoying are being withdrawn. He pleaded that till these facilities are not restored, the rates should not be enhanced, and it is his request to the Chairman as well the House. Firstly, it should be got ensured from the XEN that the houses are maintained properly and water would be supplied properly at all the floors, only then enhancing of rates should be thought of.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would setup a meeting which insists on maintenance. However, if they did not approve the proposed enhancement in rates till proper maintenance of Houses and water supply is not ensure, till that time the proposal would automatically become redundant. So it is better to let these rates approved and set up the meetings block by block and they would make it sure that there is a proper monitoring. If it does not happen, since he (Shri Trikha) is a member of the House, he could give a report after a period of three months.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that similar Committee(s) should be formed for Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-42 on the agenda**, be approved.

Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha recorded his dissent.

XXXV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-43 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-43. That the recommendations of the –

- (i) Standing Committee dated 11.12.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to (i) oversee the effective implementation of policies and programmes of Government of India, U.G.C. and State Government for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and (ii) to suggest follow-up measures for achieving the objectives and target laid down in respect of these reserved categories, be approved; and
- (ii) Committee dated 21.12.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to supervise the work of Scholarship/stipends/free-ships to be conferred to the SC/ST students, under various schemes, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 98)

XXXVI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-44 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-44. That as recommended by the Committee 18.03.2016, 5% amounting to Rs.13,73,965/- earlier deducted penalty, be remain as such and the balance 5%, i.e., Rs.13,73,965/- penalty, be waived off.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 99)

Initiating discussion, Shri V.K. Sibal stated that this is a proposal, which arises from the contract given by the University to K.K. Gupta Company. The Company was supposed to finish the work by 30.12.2010, but the Company finished it after 10th June 2015. So there is delay of nearly 5 years, and the only reason given for reducing the penalty of 10% imposed on them to 5% is sympathy, and that sympathy seems to be big misplaced because the reason given is that the person, who was looking after this contract, Mr. Tejasvi Gupta, died somewhere before 18th March 2016, whereas the last date for completing the project had already passed. So he does not see it as a very convincing reason. It seems to be a case of misplaced generosity. If the penalty of 10% was imposed, then there is not rationale ground for reducing the same from 10% to 5%, particularly when the University is facing the financial crunch.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that, in fact, he (Contractor) is asking for waiving off Rs.13,73,965/- because he is saying that 5% penalty he has already paid. When the Vice Chancellor said that let it remain to 5%, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that, as pointed out by Shri Sibal ji, the justification given is not a convincing one for the delay of five years. Since they have also to allot the future contract, if these kinds of penalty clauses are not there, the contractors would not complete the work in time. Five years delay is not small thing, whereas one week or one month's delay could be condoned.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the total penalty was 10% and 5% he has already paid. He (Contractor) says that the 5% of the penalty should be waived off because of the death. Further, the Committee had recommended 5% and the Contractor died. Thereafter, the Son (Contractor) also died about two months back. So he says whatever penalty he has already paid, they should be satisfied with that and the remaining 5% be waived and this is also the recommendation of the Committee as well as of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he thinks that they should go by the recommendation of the Committee as well as of the Syndicate, but this should not be cited as a precedent.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he wishes that such a situation is not faced by anybody, but in rarest of the rare of the case such a situation comes, he thinks precedence or no precedence, they have to consider the case on case basis.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-44 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXXVII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-45 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

C-45. That –

- (1) M.Com. (Business Economics) be allowed in any of the College which so desires subject to extension of affiliation as per rules and monitored by DCDC/D.R.(C).
- (2) MBE be changed to M.Com. (Business Economics) from the session 2016-17 and M.A. (Business Economics) be withdrawn from the prospectus of PU-CET (P.G.) 2016.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 103)

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired are they running this course now?

The Vice Chancellor said that it is still being run.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that let him confess that he has not gone through this Item. However, the Item says the nomenclature of M.Com. (Business Economics) and MBE should also be changed to M.Com. (Business Economics).

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, Dean of University Instruction, clarified that only the nomenclature has been changed from M.B.E. to M.Com. (Business Economics).

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what was the eligibility for admission to M.B.E. If the admission criteria for M.B.E. and M.Com. are the same, then there is no problem in changing the nomenclature or if this course is running for a particular time, and in future, they are not to run it, because of the UGC mandate they have to change the nomenclature, then also it is fine. However, if it is to be run in future also that M.B.E. be replaced with M.Com. (Business Economics), then have they taken care of the eligibility criteria also, because in M.Com. (Business Economics), only that person is eligible to be admitted, who fulfils the criteria to be admitted to M.Com. and not that person who is eligible to be admitted to M.A. He thinks that this must have been taken care of. If it could be responded right now, it would be better, and if not, the Dean of University Instruction should be authorized to look into it because he is Dean of University Instruction and is the man of Commerce also and knows each and every aspect of the matter.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-45 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXXVIII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-46 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-46. That the following Fee Structure and eligibility criteria prescribed by Direct Admissions of Students Abroad DASA - A Scheme of Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India for admission of Foreign/ National/PIO/NRI seats under DASA 2016-17 in UG course for the session 2016-17 in UIET and Dr. SSBUI CET, P.U, be approved:

- (i) Tuition fee of \$ 4000 for Foreign National for 1st and every subsequent semester.
- (ii) Nationals of SAARC Countries are eligible for 50% Tuition fee waiver and will have to pay \$ 2000 towards 1st and every subsequent semester; and
- (iii) For children of Indian Workers in Gulf Countries, the fee is at par with Resident Citizens. The fee of USD 700 has been charged towards Tuition Fee by DASA for one semester and will be adjusted in the first installment as applicable to resident students of UIET and Dr. SSB UICET.

In addition to the above Tuition Fee, Other charges will be applicable as per the fee structure approved by the Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 38)

XXXIX. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-47 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

C-47. That –

- (i) the recommendations of the Committee dated 8.4.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the issue of scrapping of entrance test for M.Ed. admissions in the next session in order to facilitate filling of seats in the Colleges and University Departments, be approved; and
- (ii) the affiliated Colleges be allowed to make admissions to postgraduate courses, admission to which is based on OCET, without OCET, but they have to ensure that first the admission is given to the candidates, who had at least appeared in the OCET; and thereafter, on merit.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 11)

Initiating discussion, Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she was looking at this item and there is a proposal to scrap the Entrance Test for M.Ed. admission. She was just wondering that now they have been moving towards the Entrance Test for professional courses, and it is strange that here for M.Ed., they are going to scrap the Entrance Test and they allowing all the Colleges to admit to their M.Ed. Programme on their own. Are they not compromising the quality and what is the rationale for scrapping the Entrance Test? She thinks that they have to reconsider it.

The Vice Chancellor stated that as he says, this year's statistics was the number of applicants was much smaller than the number of seats.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she has read that in the Committee note, but when she looked at the proceedings of the Syndicate, everybody is talking about additional seats. Meaning thereby that they were asking for additional seats, which is in contradiction. So the item which was discussion in the Syndicate, people have talked about grant of additional seats.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu stated that Professor Rajesh Gill is right. He thinks that now it more necessary because the NCTE has perhaps exempted NET for undergraduate courses. As such, one with M.Ed. is eligible without NET for teaching undergraduate courses. Therefore, Professor Rajesh Gill is right. At that time it was argued that due to less seats, they should allow them, but there is contradiction because on the one hand, they are saying that since the admission seekers are less, the Entrance Test should be scrapped and on the other hand, they are demanding additional seats. Now, another think is attached with it that tomorrow they have to teach the B.Ed. class also. Therefore, if good and meritorious students come with the Entrance Test, it would be better. Therefore, the Entrance Test for admission to M.Ed. course should be retained.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it seems that now, the B.Ed. course has become of two years. In Ludhiana Colleges where one gets admission with great difficulty, there also the seats are lying vacant due to becoming this course of two years. Therefore, according to him, the scrapping of Entrance Test for admission to M.Ed. course should be approved.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the quality of teachers should not be compromised.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that this year the scrapping of Entrance Test for admission to M.Ed. course should be allowed and next year, it should be reviewed.

Principal N.R. Sharma stated that so far as additional seats are concerned, question does not arise for grant of additional seats because the NCTE does not permit grant of additional seats at their own level. Secondly, there are two-three reasons for scrapping the Entrance Test for admission to M.Ed. course. First, Entrance Test is held only if the ratio of 1:9 is crossed, i.e., if the number of students against a seat is nine or more. However, here even one applicant is not there against a seat. Under these circumstances, question of Entrance Test does not arise; rather, it was a total wastage of money.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he does not think that there is a condition of 1:9. However, it could accepted that if the number of applicants is more than the number of seats, only then the Entrance Test could be conducted. However, he does not think that there is a condition of 1:9. If there is any document in this regard, the same should be shown to them.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that right now, he has no such document, but if even a single applicant is not against a seat, how the Entrance Test could be held.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that these are the professional courses and professional people are running them. Therefore, Entrance Test is must.

The Vice Chancellor said that so far as threshold ability is concerned, that needed to be checked.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he would like to tell that so far as Entrance Test is concerned, instructions are issued that the Test should be made as difficult as they could, so that a large number of applicants get failed and are not able to get employment. He asked that if only one candidate came for admission against a seat, why should they charge Rs.2,000/- him/her for the Entrance Test.

The Vice Chancellor reiterated that threshold ability has to be checked. This is what the maintenance of standards is.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that second para is very important, and they should follow the same in the case of M.Ed. also. Where is the confusion about this?

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the Punjab Government had also conducted the Entrance for B.Ed. course this year, wherein also about 6,000 to 7,000 students appeared, but later on the Government also made the admission to B.Ed. course open. As such, the purpose of the Entrance Test was defeated and the students are saying that they had wasted Rs.2,000/- as the other students, who did not appear in the Entrance Test, have also got admission to B.Ed. course. Now, what is the fault of those, who paid the Entrance Test fee of Rs.2,000/- and appeared in the Entrance Test?

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that Dr. Vipul is right, but they could not compare B.Ed. course with other ordinary courses. This year due to extension in the duration of the course, less students have come, but tomorrow the students, who would pass the M.Ed. examination, would be eligible for Lecturership.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if B.Ed. has been made of two years, the Entrance Test has rightly been scrapped because the eligible candidates are not available and it is a one-time exception. Next year, they could conduct the Entrance Test. Secondly, there is another problem that the B.Ed. course has been made of two years and he would like to bring to their notice, especially the Controller of Examinations, that the 3rd Semester is focused 100% teaching and there is no examination, why they are charging examination fee from the students form the same, when they have not to conduct the examination?

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he 100% agrees with Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, but since this year admissions have been made, it should be allowed.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang suggested that the examination fee for the 3rd Semester should be waived off as there is no theory paper in that Semester.

It was clarified that the semester is the part of the degree.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it might be part of the degree, but the students are supposed to pay what they conduct for them. When they are not conducting the examination, how could they charge for the same?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that though they have not to conduct the examination, the result is to be prepared by the University.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the University is to conduct the examination, they should charge the examination fee, otherwise not.

At this stage, a din again prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor said that let they not take the decision like this. They should look at this thing.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang suggested that a Committee should be formed to examine the whole issue.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay fine".

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the second part is approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as far as he remembers this difficulty was expressed because of introduction of this new M.Ed. 2-Year course. Though he thinks that the Entrance Test has been conducted in Punjab, he does not know whether the same has also been scrapped or not. However, here it was argued that they have got much lesser number of applicants, so for this year, as a special case, the Entrance Test should not be conducted. If they see the title of the item also, it was issue regarding scrapping of Entrance Test for admission to M.Ed. course in the next session, and resolved is that – (i) xxx, and (ii) the affiliated Colleges be allowed to make admissions to postgraduate courses, admission to which is based on OCET, without OCET, but they have to ensure that first the admission is given to the candidates, who had at least appeared in the OCET; and thereafter, on merit. Meaning thereby, that in other courses also, the admissions could be made without the Entrance Test, but the Vice Chancellor is saying that checking of ability at the threshold is must, but now they are going to make it open for all the courses because they apprehend the applicants with clearing the Entrance Test are much lesser than the number of seats available in the Colleges. So they start admitting them without on the basis of merit of the qualifying examination. The idea was only to see that the candidates meet the condition this year, and the decision to which, of course, he is also a party, is resolved and recorded as such, but it was said, “The Vice Chancellor said that the Dean, College Development Council would make a summary and it would be put along with the agenda papers of next Syndicate meeting”. This relates to the Syndicate meeting dated 31st July 2016, and accordingly, the summary should have come in yesterday’s meeting of the Syndicate. Anyway, it has not come, but the spirit of the Syndicate was only to take care of the difficulties being faced by the Colleges running M.Ed. course during this year. So in the light of this, of course, whatever has been done, is done, but it should be looked into in its entirety keeping in view the difficulties of the Colleges as well as the students and the quality of education to be imparted.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that recommendation 2 needed to be corrected in the manner that admissions to M.Ed. course could be made without OCET, but they have to ensure that first the admission is given to the candidates, who had at least qualified the OCET and not appeared.

However, certain other members, including Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Dalip Kumar, said that only the word ‘appeared’ is required; otherwise, the seats would remain vacant.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that since the admissions have been made this year, it should be reviewed next year.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-47 on the agenda**, be approved.

XL. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-48 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-48. That Ph.D. programme be opened to the students from various disciplines who have cleared UGC-NET in their own discipline or Ph.D. Entrance Examination in Swami Vivekananda Studies conducted by Panjab University. These candidates will have to do Course work in Swami Vivekananda Studies or if they want to do it in their own discipline then they will have to also pass the certificate course in Vivekananda Studies over and above Master’s Degree. Panel of Supervisors need to be prepared immediately.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 31)

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that this is about Ph.D. Course Work in Swami Vivekananda Studies and it says that the students, who have done Master’s Degree in any subject, could enrol themselves for Ph.D. in Swami Vivekananda Studies and they

could do Course Work in their own discipline or in Swami Vivekananda Studies. If they do Course Work in their own discipline, then they have to a Certificate Course. They have many other courses going on in the University, which are inter-disciplinary, where the fate of the students is very-very confusing and the students are not absorbed anywhere so far as job prospects are concerned, for instance, Gandhian Studies, Women Studies, etc.

The Vice Chancellor said that the job prospects are not only the teaching job. There is a very small fraction of people who get jobs in the teaching.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that jobs in teaching are very small prospect. At least, it is their responsibility to ensure that a person, who does masters and Ph.D. by spending so many years, has some access to the teaching apart from the others.

The Vice Chancellor said that teaching jobs are such a minuscule number. The courses are not run to train people just to get teaching job.

Professor Rajesh Gill proposed that they should frame a policy and a Committee could be constituted for the evolving a uniform policy for all such inter-disciplinary courses because person do masters in one subject and Ph.D. in another, but his/her eligibility is not determined on that basis.

The Vice Chancellor said that eligibility is a matter, which only comes for teaching job. Eligibility is not an issue as more people are employed outside the teaching profession.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if they do not want them to be eligible for teaching job, then it is a different story.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though what Professor Rajesh Gill has proposed, is in different perspective and he agrees with him (Vice Chancellor) that Ph.D. is not done only to attain eligibility for teaching job, which is mandated by UGC. However, practically they are following this only. If a General in Army wants to do Ph.D. in Defence Studies, are they not asking him to undergo Course Work?

The Vice Chancellor said that the Course Work is a different thing.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, as per the UGC, the Course Work is only for the purpose of eligibility. There are so many bureaucrats, who want to do Ph.D., but of course, not to get jobs. There are certain Universities, including IGNOU, though he does not know and is just hypothetically talking on the basis of the experience which he has gathered from other Universities, which have waived off the condition of the Course Work for Army Officers and Bureaucrats. As such, a person who is not interested for becoming eligible for the teaching position(s) and is at the age of 60 years or 65 years, and is placed at a very high position, whom they know very well that he is not eligible.

The Vice Chancellor said that they discussed it in the Syndicate, but could not go across.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that at that time, they said that this is the mandate of the UGC and nowhere it has been violated. Now, he (Vice Chancellor) himself is saying that Raipur University has also waived off the condition of Course Work. So they could also see whether that possibility could be explored. Secondly, another thing, which is being done, is that if somebody is doing Ph.D. from Panjab University, but he/she is not in a position to attend the Course Work at Panjab University. He/She says that he/she could do the Course Work at a neighbouring University as the same suits him/her, could he/she bring a Certificate that he/she has done the Course Work from said University. He thinks that could be considered.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is okay with it.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this way, they would also be meeting the condition of UGC. Basically, it is to smoothen the process of Ph.D.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to bring an agenda item to the Syndicate as it is a good thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that otherwise also, the first proposal which he was making for special category, wherein at the most they do not need to give them the Certificate that this Ph.D. is in accordance with the UGC norms, because he is interest only in Ph.D. and not the eligibility for teaching job.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should check this from the UGC, maybe at an unofficial level.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that several persons have started going to the teaching after the retirement.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that they would not become eligible.

Professor Anil Monga said that several Bureaucrats and Police Officers are interested to do Ph.D., but they could not enrol themselves as they have to clear the Entrance Test.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are so many, who have even cleared the Entrance Test.

Continuing, Professor Anil Monga said that since they do not want to enter into the teaching profession, they should conduct a separate Entrance Test for them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to bring an agenda item to the Syndicate on the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he knows a Brigadier, who had cleared the Entrance Test, but before he could join, he was transferred to Russia.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would take care of it and he requested Professor Dinesh K. Gupta to follow it up.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-48 on the agenda**, be approved.

XLI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-49 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-49. That Shree Atam Vallabh Jain College, Hussainpura, District Ludhiana, be allowed to discontinue B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) course from the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 57)

XLII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-50 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-50. That the roster recommended by the Committee prepared as per guidelines of DOPT, Government of India, for the teaching positions, i.e., Professors and Associate Professors at all levels in all departments, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 61)

XLIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-51 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-51. That the recommendations of the Committees dated 05.01.2016 and 15.01.2016 relating to the changes in Handbook of Hostel Rules and revision/changes in the fee structure of the hostels, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 40)

XLIV. Considered the following Resolutions proposed by Professor Keshav Malhotra, Syndic/Fellow (**Item C-52 on the agenda**):

- A.** “that the Regulation under Section 13 Sub-Section 1(b) and 1(C) of the Panjab University Act be so amended as following:
1. Five senior most Professors for a term of four years or till he/she retires or is in the job (by rotation).
 2. Three senior most Associate Professors for a term of four years or till he/she retires or is in the job (by rotation).
 3. Two senior most Assistant Professors for a term of four years or till he/she retires or is in the job (rotation).

EXPLANATION

At present, the assured representation of the University teachers in the Senate is insignificantly meagre - only 4 out of the total strength of 91. Keeping in view the fact that most of the business transacted in and by the Senate relates to the crucial issues pertaining to the governance and growth of University Campus.

Through nomination of the University teachers in the category of “Ordinary Fellows” the democratic participation of the University teachers in the governance of University will be assured.

- B.** “that the Regulation under Section 13 Sub-Section 1(b) and 1(b) and (c) of the Panjab University Act be so amended as follows:

13 Ordinary Fellows:

- 1(b) Four shall be elected by Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University from amongst themselves, provided that at least one member each from the Arts, Science and Professional Departments shall be elected.
- 1(c) Four shall be elected by Associate Professors and Assistant Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University from amongst themselves, provided that at least one member each from the Arts, Science and Professional Departments shall be elected.

EXPLANATION

- (i) At present, the assured representation of the University teachers in the Senate is insignificantly meagre - only 4 out of the total strength of 91. Keeping in view the fact that most of the business transacted in and by the Senate relates to the crucial issues pertaining to the governance and growth of University Campus.

- (ii) There is no gainsaying the fact that, although over the years, number of teachers in the departments of professional subjects (other than Arts and Sciences) has increased tremendously, yet no assured representation has been given to the teachers (of departments of professional subjects) in the Senate. Hence, the anomaly ought to be rectified.

NOTE: The Vice Chancellor has referred the matter to Governance Committees headed by Justice B.B. Prasoan and Shri Satya Pal Jain”.

NOTE: The Syndicate at its meeting dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 54) has resolved that the above Resolution along with the explanatory note and discussion proposed by Professor Keshav Malhotra, Syndics & Fellows, be referred to the Senate for consideration.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 54)

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that it should be referred to the Committee on Governance Reforms.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Okay, fine”.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that they should discuss it thoroughly before referring it to the Committee on Governance Reforms.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Okay, they would discuss it”.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the 1904 Universities’ Act only permitted 10 persons to come from the Graduates’ Constituency and what kind of 10 persons they used to. The persons like Mahatma Hans Raj used to come from the Graduates’ Constituency. They used to be very senior teachers who used to contest election and 58 were nominated. He had a look of those 58 persons, who were nominated in the year 1904 as well as in the year 1944. He has seen both the lists. Out of them, a large fraction was Principals of the Colleges. Whichever were the prominent Colleges, their Principals were there in the list. When Lahore to Simla happened, 58 were reduced to 36 and while reducing them to 36, they introduced the constituencies of “eight Principals and eight teachers” and “three Principals and three teachers” and from the Faculties were made 5+1 (six). Then for the University teachers, when this clause was introduced, the number of teachers was very small and they were not even 20. The only thing which they introduced in the University teachers was 2+2, i.e., two Professors (one from Arts and one from Science, etc.). So this is how, it has happened. When it comes to Faculties, they could see that the total Faculties’ matrix, the total number of University teachers is 220. He has compiled from what was the number when the University commenced and he has that data. Then he looked at the number from the first Annual Report of the University, 1961, which was got prepared by Professor A.C. Joshi. Out of that, he culled out as he could not get the data from the office, but from that he culled out as to how many University teachers were the part of the faculty. In fact, it was a very small number. Then this number starts increasing and the data of 1980 he could get from the office and this number started saturating. In the Faculties also, from where six members come, the University teachers are roughly about three to four and upper limit is four. So the University teachers’ representation in this Senate is *prima facie* not very large and they must accept, though they could argue about it, but large number of things that get discussed in this House or the Syndicate, most of them pertain to issues of the University Campus, i.e., establishment branch of the University, etc. So University teachers need to have somewhat larger representation. One could argue that

there is no need of recommending all these things. The Chancellor is conscious that the University teachers have to be given representation. Last time, the Chancellor tried to address to this concern of the University teachers by giving in this list of 36, somewhat larger number of teachers and lesser number of people from other constituencies. Chancellor has to have University teachers, and he is also under pressure to have women, persons from reserved categories, minorities and also to give some representation to what he sees as getting expertise (academic expertise) from their neighbourhood and in that category, there were five senior people, who are sitting in the front row, and they are getting benefitted from such people. So whether they put it to the Chancellor or don't put it to the Chancellor, the Chancellor is already taking care of this thing. Right now, this is a concern. He (Professor Malhotra) has given an algorithm and this algorithm could not be introduced without making certain changes, and that is the reason, it has been sent to Committee on Governance Reforms, but the recommendations of the Governance Reforms would get implemented in 2020, but nothing could be done now. Now, they could debate whatever they wish to, but nothing could be done this time.

Professor Mukesh Arora stated that he along with Dr. Dalip Kumar had moved a Resolution about two years back that the Professors of the Colleges should be made members of the Faculties. Though action on the Resolution proposed by Professor Keshav Malhotra has immediately been taken, no meeting of the Committee constituted to consider the Resolution proposed by them has been allowed to take place for two years. He added that if any meeting of the Committee was fixed and notified, the same was postponed on one pretext or the other. Even when the meeting was got fixed at his (Vice Chancellor) instance, later on the same was also got postponed. They do not know whether their Resolution is getting the dust for the last two years, whereas action on this (Resolution proposed by Professor Keshav Malhotra) has immediately been taken.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that since March 2015, no meeting of the Committee constituted to consider their Resolution has been held by the Chairman of the Committee (Professor B.S. Bhoop). When he (Dr. Dalip) requested him (Professor Bhoop) he told him that he has been highly pressurized. That issue also needed to be looked into and they could not distinguish between the Professors of Colleges and the University. At least, they should be made a part of the Faculties as per the norms. He enquired as to why they are not holding the meeting. They do not know the reason for not holding the meeting of the Committee. They also do not have any apprehension as to what would be the result/outcome of this Committee, but the meeting of the Committee should be conducted in a time bound manner. If the Chairman of the Committee is not willing to conduct the meeting, he (Vice Chancellor) could appoint another person as Chairman in his place, so that the meeting of the Committee could be held in a time bound manner.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu stated that so far as nominations are concerned, nominations of College Principals and teachers are being made, but 50% or more nominations are of the University teachers. The four seats (Faculties), to which he (Vice Chancellor) is talking about, therein the maximum voters are University Professors and they have the right to choose their representative(s). Perhaps, they (University Professors) might be in less number in the Combined Faculties. Hence, they could not say that the University teachers have only four seats. In fact, besides Faculties, they have two Professors and two Readers/Lecturers. Therefore, when the system was evolved, it was evolved after due consideration. There are about 3 lac students and their representatives are only 15. The University is one Institution and from its outside, only 11 Principals and 11 teachers came. Although the University is one Institution, and there are at least 12-14 nominations and others are elected by its teachers. In the Syndicate also, he has told that out of the 15 members in the Syndicate, there are 5 members from the University alone. How are they saying that the representation of the University teachers is less? According to him, the representation of the University is already on the higher side. Therefore, it is not required. Since nomination is the prerogative of the Chancellor, such recommendations should not be made. They are already making Dean of Student Welfare, Dean of University Instruction, President

(PUTA) the members of the Senate and besides them there are more representation to the University teachers. Since maximum representation is from the University Campus, the proposal under consideration is not required.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that through this Resolution, discrimination has been avoided. It has been argued that 10-12 nominations of University teachers have been made by the Chancellor, but he wants to tell that the Chancellor has made these nominations according to the seniority.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Resolution has come to the Senate and they should decide that it be dropped. He added that his proposal is that this Resolution be not accepted.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he seconds the proposal made by Shri Jarnail Singh.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Jarnail Singh.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thinks that unnecessarily the controversy is being raised.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue should not be seen as Colleges versus the University.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that ultimately/practically it has taken the shape of Colleges versus University. He thinks that he is the only person, who could talk neutrally because neither he belongs to the University nor to the Colleges. Without going into the data, he agrees with Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu as he has blind faith in him that already there are so many and he believes that, though the Vice Chancellor says it is not that number, but since he is friend of Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu, he believes in him. He says that let them presume that there are 10 persons from the University, who have been nominated by the Chancellor. What is wrong in it? If they say while nominating 10, he (Chancellor) has the proposed criteria. Or if they want to reduce it from 10 to 8 or 8 to 5 or 5 to 2, at least there should be some criteria because all the Professors working in the University, especially the senior-most, he does not think they deserve nomination. In fact, the idea is that while nominating teachers from the University, as they say, this proposal had also gone from the Senate that President (PUTA) should be nominated. This Resolution was also sent by this Senate only that President, PUSA, be nominated. And today only in the forenoon, this proposal has also come that President of Panjab University Campus Students' Council should also be nominated. When they say all these things, they do not remember at that time that this is the prerogative of the Chancellor. Now, he wants to recall that the Vice Chancellor a few months ago had already announced publically that this year, the President of Panjab University Campus Students' Council would be member of the Senate and they would try and they might try even for two students out of the Panjab University Campus Students' Council. Whether they succeed or not is a different matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that he only made the office of the Chancellor aware that Maharashtra's Universities Act has two representatives of students.

On a point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that either he (Vice Chancellor) should not recommend any name.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he had not recommended; rather, he only made the Chancellor's Office aware that Maharashtra's Universities Act allows two students representatives.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he endorses what Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa says.

The Vice Chancellor said that but he (the Chancellor) has not asked him in that context this year.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that for the Senate of 2016-2020, if he (Vice Chancellor) recommends the names of any persons, the first name should be of one of the students' representative.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that he has not been asked, but the discussion he had taken when the students' agitation was at its peak, and it was being demanded that the students must be represented. He took up this matter with the officers in the Chancellor's Office. He does not meet the Chancellor very frequently and most of the times, his meetings are with the Secretary to the Chancellor. The Chancellor is a very busy person and he could not give meetings to the Vice Chancellors of so many Universities, whenever they ask. As such, most of the times, he meets the Secretary to the Chancellor. In one of those meetings, he made the Secretary to the Chancellor aware that the students have this desire. Next time, when he met, he (the Secretary) told him (Vice Chancellor) that the matter was discussed with the Chancellor and the Chancellor has said that he took this option of having the Dean of Student Welfare as an ex-officio member on the premise that the Dean of Student Welfare would solicit the opinion of the students and he would articulate. In that spirit, during the course of four years, they said that the students could give in writing, whatever they wish to, to the Dean of Student Welfare and the Dean of Student Welfare would read whatever the students wanted to be articulated while the students representative are listening to it. In that context, he had made aware the Secretary to the Chancellor that the Maharashtra's Universities Act permits two students to be made members of the Senate. So it is only in that context he has said that if they want to call his (Vice Chancellor) recommendation to this thing, they could do so, but he has not made a recommendation that sense that he has been asked that which people should be in this Senate, and he has given the names. He has not been asked for any input and he has not given any input. However, he is just sharing with them that this information that the Maharashtra's Universities Act permits two students to be made members of the Senate and this information is there with the Secretary to the Chancellor. Whether the Chancellor takes cognizance of it or not, he could not comment. All that he could tell them is that the University, which was left in Lahore, had been experimenting with many things. For instance, they abandoned the Universities Act, 1904 and they at some stage made all the Professors of their University as the members of the Senate and at that time the number of Professors was not very large. Two years down the line, they changed that thing. In the year 1972, they also experimented that there would be two students' representatives in the Senate. They even experimented that the students would be a part of the Syndicate also, but they have abandoned it. So they have been trying various variants and people have been experimenting this thing that all the Professors of the University should be members of the Senate. So there are so many variations. At one time, the Senate had become too unwieldy, and they again shrank it. He agrees that this is a thing which they put to the Committee on Governance Reforms, and from Governance Reforms Committee, the output has not come for consideration by them. He urged the members to take it in that spirit only and let it go.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that otherwise also even if Professor Keshav Malhotra wants, he could sent this proposal directly to the Chancellor, and there is not difficulty, but it is there only because the Governance Reforms Committee might also say that it is not practicable. So let the recommendation(s) come from the Committee on Governance Reforms.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu stated that firstly he would seek apology from his friend Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, who is saying for the last quite some time that there should be representative of the students in the Senate. He is also saying for the last about 8 years that, according to him, the 15 representatives from the Registered Graduates' Constituency, are, in fact, the representatives of the students. This year

also, 2-3 or more students have fought the election and the registered graduates have not elected them. Besides, he is also saying for the last about 8 years that there are about 3,000 teachers of about 200 affiliated Colleges. In addition to this, the President of Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union, is the teacher of Panjab University, Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University and he has also remained President of Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union. His worthy friends, Dr. Jagwant Singh and Dr. Kuldeep Singh also remained the President of Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union. They always have been saying that if the President of PUTA, President of Panjab University Campus Students' Council, and President of PUSA, could be made members of the Senate, why not the President of Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union, who is the President of all the teachers of Punjab. Similarly, there is a President of Government College Teachers Association. If such proposals are to be sent for nomination, then their interests should also be kept in view because they are the representatives of large number of teachers. However, nobody never ever raised this issue, whereas the persons representing the Registered Graduates represent the students. In fact, they should come to the Senate after getting elected from the Registered Graduates' Constituency. Similarly, there is a Principals Federation and the President of Principals Federation represents more than 200 Principals, but nomination for his/her is not there.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he wants to make a submission. As Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu has said that the 15 persons, who have come from the Registered Graduates' Constituency, are the representatives of the students, but they are not the representatives of the students; rather, they are the representatives of ex-students, because the students have yet to become eligible to cast their votes. Similarly, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is not a representative of the students.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that he would like to state that because Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu has talked by naming him. Dr. Principal Sandhu has said that whosoever is coming from the Registered Graduates' Constituency, is the representative of the students, and in this context he wants to say that the persons concerned irrespective of whether he/she is Vice Chancellor or simple graduate or ex-Professor or ex-Principal, they all could contest election from the Registered Graduates' Constituency. Basically, in this manner, the alumni have been made part of the University. Hence, they could call them the representative(s) of the alumni. However, if they call them the representative(s) of the students, then it would be wrong. Who is representing the 15,000 students who are studying at the Campus? The students have their day-to-day problems and issue, who and where are those being addressed? Whenever the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate are held, dharnas are stages, effigies are burnt and memoranda come. All this happened because neither they involve them nor there is any representation to the students.

On a point of order, Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa get discussed all the problems being faced by the students because he belongs to students' organization. He added that those who are working for the cause of the students, have not been elected to the Senate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it is enough. When he (Vice Chancellor) has apprised the Chancellor's Office that Maharashtra's Universities Act, permits two representatives of the students on the Senate. Now, they should move ahead.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that President of Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers' Union and President of Government College Teachers Association should also be taken care of.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that his request is and there is a need of the hour that in place of Dean of Student Welfare, the President of Panjab University Campus Students' Council should be made a member of the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he is, personally, not in favour of Dean of Student Welfare being a member of the Senate because it unnecessarily get this office

into grouping and so on, but the grouping is inevitable. However, he is in favour of Dean of University Instruction being a member of the Senate as well as of the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the action taken by the Vice Chancellor in referring the matter (above-said Resolution proposed by Professor Keshav Malhotra) to Governance Committees headed by Justice B.B. Prasoan and Shri Satya Pal Jain, be approved.

XLV. Considered the following Resolution proposed by Dr. Charanjit Sohi, and Shri H.S. Lucky, Syndic/Fellow (**Item C-53 on the agenda**):

“that all the existing Principals who have been re-appointed in the aided Colleges, after the age of superannuation, for one year, their term of appointment be considered for two years.”

EXPLANATION:

It is observed that in some of the Aided affiliated colleges, the Principals have been re-appointed after superannuation, for a term of one year and in some other aided affiliated colleges, the Principals have been appointed, for a period of two years at a time. This is discriminatory in nature.

NOTE: The Syndicate at its meeting dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 55) has resolved that the above Resolution proposed by Dr. Charanjit Sohi, and Shri H.S. Lucky, Syndics & Fellows be forwarded to the Senate with the remarks that it be accepted with modification that the Principals, who are to be reappointed in the aided Colleges in future also, after the age of superannuation, their term of appointment be also two years.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 55)

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that this Resolution should outrightly be rejected because it is against the spirit of working, which is there in the College fraternity. He has already said in the previous meeting of the Senate that they had very kindly granted Research Centres to the Colleges, and people in the Colleges are working very hard. The UGC has also imposed 400 points criteria for appointment as Principal and many teachers in the Colleges, who have been appointed for the last 25-30 years, have been working very hard to achieve the target of 400 points. If this Resolution is approved, adopted and implemented, though partly it has already been implemented in the Colleges, the teachers would be demotivated and they would not work harder to attain 400 points because the incumbent Principal would be allowed to continue. He would welcome this Resolution, if it is changed a bit that only those Principals should be given the extension, who have obtained/attained 400 points, otherwise not. It means they are not providing a levelled field to the teachers, who are working in the Colleges and the Principals, who have already been appointed in the Colleges. They might not have 400 points or they might have only 200 points, but still they could continue, but anybody who has 400 points and wants to join a College, he/she would not be able to become Principal because the Management of the College would not like him/her to be because they have full confidence in the incumbent Principal, and they would definitely say “None found suitable and let him/her continue”. He had said last time too, that they advertised three posts and they perhaps get nine-ten candidates, who were eligible for appointment as Principal in their Constituent Colleges, and they have appointed them. They could have also given extension to certain retired Principals and asked them to join there, but they never did it. These three persons were working in the Colleges and when they attained 400 points, they become eligible and now they have been appointed as Principals. If they could give this levelled field at the University level, in which everybody is equivalent, then people are appointed there, why did they debar those people, who are working harder in the Colleges and the only promotion they had in the Colleges is Principal. He added that in the Government Colleges, certain teachers had become Professors, but in the aided Colleges, they have not even been made Professors. As

such, all the Assistant/Associate Professors do not get a chance for promotion. The only avenue available for promotions to the teachers is to become Principal and that avenue is closed if this is continued. When Shri Ashok Goyal proposed the resolution, he admits that they could not have qualified teachers, but when the new UGC regulations came into force, people started working really hard to achieve 400 points. Now, they would be get demotivated if such a Resolution is adopted because they felt that even if they fulfil the requirement of 400 points, they would not get a chance to become the Principal as the Principal who were already working in the Colleges would get extension and after the retirement they are not eligible for the post of Principal. However, if they refer to Regulation 7 at page 172, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, it says that no teacher could be granted extension beyond 60 years in affiliated Colleges. So could they pass any Resolution which is against the Regulation/s? In the previous item Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa has passionately said that the age of superannuation of teachers, which they are extending from 60 years to 65 years, is also not proper. It is a fact that if they continued like this (increasing the age of superannuation), when would the younger generation get jobs. Either it should be implemented uniformly or for none.

Professor Mukesh Arora stated that if a person is working as Principal in a College for the last two years and his/her appointment has also been approved by the University, and later on he/she decides to relinquish the Principalship and reverts back to Associate/Assistant Professorship, when he/she apply for the post of Principal in another College, he/she is rejected on the plea that he/she has not attained 400 points, even though his/her appointment as Principal had earlier being approved. If 400 points are required to be obtained by such persons, then 400 points are also required for all those who are/were to be granted extension as Principal for 1-2 years. Citing an example, he said that Shri Vishav Bandhu Sudhir had worked as Principal at R.S.D. College, Ferozepur for 2 years and his appointment has also been approved. However, later on when he realized that he might face some problem in Pension/Provident Fund, he joined back Arya College. Now, when he again applied for the post of Principal, he has been rejected on the plea that he has not obtained 400 points. He pleaded that either the requirement of 400 points should be for all or for none.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the understanding was that when a Principal reaches the age of retirement, the post will be advertised and if there is some delay or this and that, the senior-most person would be appointed as a in-charge and the post would be advertised, and if the College is large as told by Dr. Dinesh Talwar, there is enough number of teachers in the College having 400 points, then how come that the position is not being filled up. How come the verdict is there that none found suitable? In such cases, the verdict 'None found suitable' should not be coming. If there are so many teachers who have 400 points as he (Dr. Dinesh Talwar) has articulated, then the verdict should not be that none found suitable. If the verdict is not there that none found suitable, then the person should be appointed. He had even suggested that if no one is found suitable for the first time, the post should be re-advertised. Perhaps, the advertisement might not have been seen or the advertisement might have been ambiguous or the time given for submission of applications might also be too less, due to which people might not have applied. Either they should devise a mechanism that they have really exhausted the option "none found suitable". Only when they have really exhausted the option "none found suitable", they should let the existing Principal to continue. When they are asking somebody, initially decided to allow them to continue for two years and later on they reduce the period from two years to one year. So he thinks that the Resolution has come that instead of keeping it for two years, one year, and so on, it should be kept in a uniform way by making it two years. But the initial thing is that they should be seen to have made a sincere effort that they should have not situation of "none found suitable". Problem arises that a cozy relationship gets built up between the Principal of a long standing and the management, and the management think it unfair to lose somebody of seniority and stature of a person who has built the College. He has come across one such College recently, which has the highest NAAC rating amongst all their affiliated Colleges, and the Principal has been there for 25 years and he is a very distinguished Principal. If none is found suitable, they want to continue him, and no Vice Chancellor would say that he should not be allowed to continue. The post was advertised and none was found suitable, to which the people of the University

are also signatories. As such, this surprises him in some sense that there are/were no applicants. Actually, he is surprised that there are no applicants, especially when there are so many College teachers, who have 400 points. Why there is a situation that 'none found suitable'. In fact, this situation should not be there. He also knows the practical difficulty, which is that the people, who have high academic credentials, they are in grant-in-aid positions, where they are getting full salaries and when they apply for the post of Principal in other Colleges, which do not belong to their management and that management is neither ready to protect his/her salary nor to give full salary. That is the reason for none found suitable situation. The practical problem is that they are not paying full salaries to the teachers and also to the Principals. This is the reality and they have no practical way of enforcing the University's Regulations that full salary should be given. They protect the salary in the University of the persons who come from outside, but there is no way of enforcing that if a teacher of grant-in-aid Colleges goes to another College as a Principal, his/her salary should be protected.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that if the person goes from grant-in-aid College to grant-in-aid College, then his/her salary is protected.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are many Colleges, which are not covered under the grant-in-aid scheme of the Government. So there they faced this problem.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that in the last meeting, Shri Ashok Goyal had pointed out a case in which an interview was conducted in a College, and the result was declared as "none found suitable". In fact, there were 7-8 applicants and no one was found suitable. Later on, the same candidate was selected only within span of two months in another College affiliated to Panjab University and fortunately or unfortunately, the Selection Committee was the same. Isn't it astonishing that in one College he was not found suitable because they wanted to continue with the existing Principal and in another College he was found suitable? As such, this is hurting them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could control this microscopic. They could themselves see what this University is. In this University, the Vice Chancellor sits in Chandigarh. Out of 192 affiliated Colleges, if they leave aside Chandigarh Colleges, there is no College which is within 100 kilometers of this University. He do has a desire to visit the Colleges of the University, but his desire is a desire, because practically it is not possible for him to make that many trips away from the University. Had all the Colleges been in the same location, and if he had the same advantage, which is enjoyed by his counterpart at Amritsar had who could quickly visit the Colleges while performing his own job, he would definitely been visiting the Colleges more frequently. He could go only to the local Colleges and is not in a position to visit the Colleges which are located at far off places. So this is another practical problem of the Vice Chancellor to even establish rapport with management of the Colleges. The Vice Chancellor must establish rapport with the good/large Management of Colleges but the Vice Chancellor is not in a position to do this. This is the difficulty, which they have. Now, how could they overcome this difficulty? They could overcome this difficulty, if all the members of this House assume the responsibility which is there with the Vice Chancellor. It means that all the members of the Senate should raise themselves above the narrow grouping, which they have. When they look after the Calendar of the University, they should forget their grouping, but it is easier said than done.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she does not agree Dr. Dinesh Talwar because the Selection Committee could never be same in both the Colleges.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Talwar clarified that the University experts and the nominees only were the same and not the entire Selection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would limit himself only to the practical difficulty expressed by the Vice Chancellor for visiting the Colleges located outside Chandigarh. What Dr. Dinesh Talwar has said, he does not know as to what is in his mind. He is saying the same management and the College is in Chandigarh, had two different Selection Committees having same Vice Chancellor nominee. In one of the interview, one

particular candidate was found ineligible (not suitable) and subsequently within a short span of time, the same Vice Chancellor nominee finds the same candidate to be eligible. If such a thing brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor, he thinks the Vice Chancellor needs to take a serious view of it instead of saying that he could not go into the microscopic. He knows that it is very difficult practically to take care of such a situation and the concern which he (Vice Chancellor) has shown that how come it is possible for such large Colleges having such large number of qualified teachers to be appointed as Principal. Either they do not apply or if some of them had applied, how come it is possible that none found suitable situation has come. It was in the spirit and at that time the Vice Chancellor had also appreciated that under any circumstances they would not allow the Colleges to suffer, especially the large size Colleges which bring name and fame to the University. In case they are not able to find Principal, then the existing Principal would be given a chance, and the proposal which was placed before the Syndicate was for one year only. The Committee, of which he was also a member, had recommended extension for one year and after one year the post would again be advertised. If they still feel that nobody is available, extension could again be granted for one year. However, such extension/s could only be granted up to the age of 65 years, keep in view the regulations of the UGC and the scheme of re-employment which they had in the University. At that time also, the issue was raised why the same scheme be not applied to the lecturers of the Colleges also? He does not know whether it is recorded or not, but he is the one who had suggested, "Yes, the same rule should be applied for a particular position and if the post has been advertised and nobody is found suitable to teach the subject, there is no problem to grant extension to the existing teachers also. However, if the applicants are available, then probably at the cost of those who are available, to grant of extension to the incumbents would not be fair/justifiable as they could not generate un-employment. Subsequently, Shri Jarnail Singh must be remembering that he was completely opposed to the idea and after a long debate, a decision was taken that alright, it should be year to year basis. The original proposal was for one year and after long debate it was converted into two years. However, in the next Syndicate it was again brought down to one year as they are a democratic body, they have every right to be wiser any day. If a post has been advertised and if somebody, as per the advertisement, has been appointed only for one year, could there be any possibility of extending that term of appointment from one year to two years without advertisement. This is the basic point, but in one of the cases, he has been given to understand that even the appointment made for one year has not been approved by the University. Now, the appointment which was made for one year, as per the decision of the Syndicate, was never approved by the University because of the observation made by the Vice Chancellor, which he shared with the House today that how come it is possible that for such a large College none found suitable situation has arisen and he (Vice Chancellor) did not approve. If the University has not approved somebody as a Principal, he wonders that how come that Principal has been allowed to continue as such and how the University has been corresponding with that Principal during the intervening period and how each and every correspondence has been accepted, including his signatures as well as the returns under his signatures. Still more serious is that now he has been given to understand that the person who has not been approved even for one year, the approval for two years together has been given. If such a thing is brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor and if he also looks into it deeply, he would like to tell him that the whole Senate would stand by him and see that no such discrimination is done. Now if somebody has been appointed for one year, the post needs to be re-advertised. As per the Resolution under consideration, if the post was to be advertised again, the appointment was to be made for two years. If this was agreed to, but if resolution is for one year and the post has been advertised accordingly or even if in the intervening period it has been advertised the Syndicate has taken the decision that appointment henceforth has to be for one year, then it has to be for one year only. Notwithstanding the fact that approval for one year was also not given, and that the post was not even advertised after completion of one year, the approval for the second term has also been given. If that is the case, he wonders why the people from the Colleges would continue to seek approval from the University. They would simply in their record say that they have appointed such and such person for another two years, they do not require anybody's approval because the University is otherwise also entertaining. So keeping in view that they have to keep again one thing in mind that with whatever spirit

they had taken the decision, that spirit should not be lost. He urged the Vice Chancellor to look into that if somebody has appointed for one year, no continuity be allowed unless and until the post is advertised again and the opportunity is given to all to compete and if 'None found suitable' even at that stage, it is for the Vice Chancellor to assess as to why the situation has arisen like this, and if he is satisfied, then there is no problem if the continuity is allowed. He further stated that Panjab University is the only University which is struggling as far as status is concerned. Whether they are a State University or Central University or Inter-State Body Corporate? They are not sure – what their status is? There is an institution in Punjab, which in the name of minority, is neither calling the representatives of Punjab Government nor calling the representatives of various Universities as far as appointments/selections in their Colleges are concerned because they say they are minority organization and they are not supposed to call the representatives of University, and in their cases, he thinks that there is litigation in the Court also. However, as a result of that Guru Nanak University and Punjabi University, which fall in Punjab, they are not giving approval to the teachers appointed by them on their own. Probably, some grants are also not being released by the Punjab Government only on account of this stand that they would not abide. Panjab University, which does not fall in Punjab, and who does not know what their status is, in spite of fact that no representative from Punjab Government is called by them while making appointments in affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, is giving approval to those teachers. This also to be looked into because he came to know about it only 15 days back, and that too generally he does not lose the debate, but he lost that debate, and he said that it is just not possible. They said that what is he talking about those Universities, the Panjab University is granting them approval in spite of the fact that their nominees are not there? If their nominees and subject experts are not there on the Selection Committee, on what basis they are giving the approval. This also needs to be seen. So they only have to send a message across that for them all the affiliated institutions needs to needs the same kind of treatment and they take care of best of the Colleges the way they deserve, but they are here to take care of the weak Colleges in the same manner as to bring them at par with the of the Colleges. However, here the message is that those, who are able to manipulate and manoeuvre, succeed and those, who do not have godfathers, suffer only because the Vice Chancellor could not afford to concentrate on those 200 Colleges. For that he (Vice Chancellor) needs the support of the members of the Senate irrespective of the fact whether he gets the desired support of the office or not. He is sure that if the members of the Senate, rising above the groups, start supporting the Vice Chancellor to act strictly in terms of what their Calendar says, he thinks then the situation might improve. However, his simple request to the Vice Chancellor is that, please do not show their helplessness by saying that he (Vice Chancellor) could not go into the microscopics. As a Scientist, he (Vice Chancellor) knows it very well that there are some random sampling process. They do not go into the microscopic details regarding all the Colleges, and instead they have random sampling of all categories of Colleges, which is possible. He is there to assist them with a view to bring improvement and efficiency in the system and not by way of pick and choose.

The Vice Chancellor said that, alright he would take a call, but he (Shri Ashok Goyal) did not incorporate with him, when he said that let they make a compendium of all those decisions which they have taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he would not share here, but the meeting which he had with him (Vice Chancellor). He still remembers, it was 2 hours and 20 minutes on 1st of October 2015, and he just wants to remind him that in that meeting he (Vice Chancellor) had told him that don't be mistaken, he has only best interest of the University in his mind and he had said that he had also the same principle in his mind. At that time, he (Vice Chancellor) had given a call, but he had promised something that took it is his words that it is going to happen on 1st February 2016. Taking "I mean it", and he (Shri Goyal) said that he does not want any assurance. He knows what he (Vice Chancellor) says, he mean it. However, he (Vice Chancellor) had said, "No, No", he just wants to remove any kind of misunderstanding from his mind, what he is saying "I mean it" and he waited for 1st February 2016. He does not want to share what was the issue, but he (Vice Chancellor) did not fulfil his promise, which he never sought from him (Vice Chancellor). The promise was made on his (Vice Chancellor) own, and that

too, to remove the misunderstanding, if at all there was any in his mind. Of course, it was not. So many months have passed, but there was no response. Now, he (Vice Chancellor) should tell him, the Vice Chancellor whom he is ready to serve in the interest of the University for 24 × 7 days, if he (Shri Goyal) does not have this much of confidence, that what he has spoken to him verbally and orally, whether he would be able to achieve that or not. What does he do? And for his (Vice Chancellor) information, he has done without his (Vice Chancellor) knowledge, if not more than 5 to 10%, at least 2% job on that front also. But he does not have the courage to share with him (Vice Chancellor) because unfortunately, if he (Vice Chancellor) allows him to say that somehow or the others because of one reason or the other, he has always been misunderstood. His only problem is that he does not believe in justifying and clarifying because the moment he feels that he is justifying and clarifying, he feels as if he is weak and guilty. If he has not done anything, why should he go and clarify? He thinks that he expects that whatever he says, he (Vice Chancellor) should take it on face value unless and until he (Vice Chancellor) is able to prove the same otherwise, but if he (Vice Chancellor) is not trying to take his words with open mind and he has already having suspicion in his mind, then probably he would not be able to convey what he wants to and he (Vice Chancellor) would not be able to receive what should be received by him because he would like to receive what he wants to and he would keep on saying as honestly as he is trying to say and finally he comes to know that he has been misunderstood. In that 2 hours and 20 minutes meeting, he told him how much it was exploited by some of the members of the Senate. Only to know what transpired between the Vice Chancellor and Shri Ashok Goyal, who rarely comes to the University and never goes to the office of the Vice Chancellor, and he was sitting with the Vice Chancellor for 2 hours and 20 minutes. What happened? Just because Vice Chancellor did not want the discussion to be interrupted, he told the person out side then nobody should come inside. They say such a high level closed door meeting whether it is meeting or a high level conspiracy. This is what the people started talking. He is sure that the Vice Chancellor did not share with anyone as to what transpired between them. Of course, he could say that he never told it to anyone and even today he is not telling, but he could tell about 110 stories, which have been made out of that meeting by those who claim themselves to be the closest to the Vice Chancellor. He has never claimed and he has never tried to clarify also because he believes that his conscious is clear and he does not need to justify anything. Again after having faulted on 1st October after he (Vice Chancellor) has given him (Shri Goyal) a call and also regretting for the fault, if he feels so, he is again offering that for the welfare of the University, his services are available for 24 × 7 days without any kind of monetary or other consideration.

Ms. Anu Chatrath remarked that it has been proved today that there is a lot of love between the Vice Chancellor and Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Mukesh Arora stated that he is thankful to Shri Ashok Goyal, who has also said that the teachers should be given full salary. However, he thinks that the teachers' salary comes to about Rs.1.5 lac, but if the teachers are available at the salary of Rs.21,600/-, nobody would be willing to appoint them on a salary of Rs.1.5 lac per month.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the teachers have difficulty because those who are in grant-in-aid position, the grant-in-aid position granting agency/agencies are not going to pay anything more than Rs.21,600/-.

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed.

Professor Mukesh Arora remarked that here all say that there should not be groupism, but when they go outside, groups are formed.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he has passed four years and few months and another 18-20 months are left. He could learn from the past experience and try to make some changes and that is all, that he could try, so that his successor finds a little more congenial place to serve this House. It is a very complex place, where the Vice Chancellor is supposed to be the Executive. He is supposed to do the executive

work, conduct the meetings, remember everything which they said, even though all of them would proceed to their homes after the meetings, but he has to dictate the minutes because the existing staff has limited competence. They are well aware that this University does not have even 30-40% staff, which they had hired on regular basis. Most of the staff is somehow on the job as they are hired them only for 89 days. Though the services of some of them have been regularized, the remaining staff is still working as such. Neither they ever given them training nor they have any motivation to work hard. They all are serving the University under the compelling circumstances. Unemployment in this country is to such an extent that people think 100 times even to leave the job of 89 days. Even if they have the abilities, they did not give them any training. They have not evolved any mechanism. So he has to work with such a staff, even though they are hard working. They never make any complaint because they are on 89 days. Nobody says that he/she would work only for 8 hours. Several persons work even for 12-18 hours a day even though they are appointed only for 89 days. He has to work with this staff and has to correct the minutes of all the meetings of Syndicate and Senate but so many mistakes still remain. So it is a very difficult job.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that on the one hand the Vice Chancellor himself is saying that he (Vice Chancellor) points out so many mistakes, but in the other hand, when others (members) point out the mistake, he (Vice Chancellor) says that they are here only to point out the mistakes. However, the sole purpose of the Vice Chancellor for pointing out the mistakes is only to correct them.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the point is unfortunately or fortunately all proceedings of this House in written form are uploaded on the website. If things are not properly recorded then it's a bad advertisement of the governing body of this University and as he told him (Shri Ashok Goyal) which is the history, which is older than the establishment of the University in 1882. The proceedings of this University have been lost somewhere, but they have been recorded since the year 1869. The first meeting of the University College Senate it happened and he mean it that it is December of 1870. Everything is uploaded on the website and might be somewhere in the archives in Pakistan. Some of the proceedings might not be available but if they search one could find these. But everything is in the public domain, so they have to be very careful. He also came across a compendium of all the decisions of the Panjab University, Lahore up to the year 1947, and a kind of compendium that he and Shri Ashok Goyal were supposed to prepare that kind of compendium which was made in Lahore in 1947 and today he has a copy of it. So he thought of a Committee and this job would be done on behalf of this University. A compendium of all decisions taken on behalf of the Syndicate and Senate of this University should be made because it would help the system because the arbitrariness, inconsistencies would get reduced. If it could be done by the people in 1947 and today's age it must be done because they have so many retired Registrars of the University. So he thought that they may request all the retired Registrars of this University to join in this project because they would have conducted the meetings. This is the thought he had and did not want to share it. They must reach out to all the ex-Registrars, Deans of University Instruction who have participated and implemented these decisions in some form or the other. So they divide the job in bits and pieces, make the teams and collate the information and then eventually over a period of time to make this compendium and that be made available to everyone. So this is the thought that he has.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in a meantime, they should start following one thing that whenever a note is put up to the Registrar, the Dean of University Instruction or the Vice Chancellor, let the person, who is putting up the note instead of saying for the orders of (i) or (ii), say that as per the existing provision which are in vogue as on date, this is the position which could be done, so that at least what they are doing today is not in contravention of Rules and Regulations. From the office noting, he sees that they do not guide at all, reason is not that they are not doing so intentionally because the officer says why are they trying to dictate him/her as to what decision he/she has to take? They should only tell as to what are the possibilities and it is for him to see as to what is to be approved. He (officer concerned) has to put those options only in view of the provision/s which are in vogue; otherwise, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) says that there are

certain provisions which are against that, which relate to 2015, but there are another provision which relates to 2010. The person concerned quote the said provision and he (Vice Chancellor) in good faith says that since the regulation/rule has been quoted, it should be done. However, the certificate is not there, that this is in vogue also, because what has been amended in 2015 naturally override 2010. So that is how wrong decisions are taken and then he (Vice Chancellor) says that he did know about it as he has no time because MHRD/UGC were putting pressure on him. The Vice Chancellor is right, but at least these instructions could be issued that a certificate should be given by the dealing official that this is in accordance with regulation/s/rules in vogue.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that this Resolution was moved only because there were certain anomalies and in the meeting of the Syndicate, they discussed all the pros and cons and came to the conclusion that it be recommended to the Senate that this Resolution be accepted. He, therefore, proposed that this resolution should be accepted.

Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi said that it is for information of all those, who are saying that this resolution should be rejected outrightly, that there are 192 Colleges and only 68 Principals for there. Hence, there is a need because 124 Colleges are without Principals. As such, it is very much justified.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it means that the statement made by Dr. Dinesh Talwar that the candidates having 400 points are waiting to become Principals, is wrong.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that he just took an example of Panjab University Constituent Colleges wherein three posts of Principals were advertised and all were filled in. He enquired if the posts of Principals could be filled in Panjab University Constituent Colleges, why could the posts of Principals in affiliated College be not filled? In fact, the posts of Principals in affiliated Colleges are not filled up because the Colleges/Managements do not want. Therefore, to say that he is not factually correct, perhaps, is not justified.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he is against of any kind of extension because it blocks the way for freshers to come in. The Vice Chancellor had just a few minutes before seriously said that the unemployment is there to such an extent that even a person working on 89 days basis thinks 100 times to leave the job. Any kind of extension had a big adverse effect on the society. They should make contribution to stop any kind of extension in employment.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that whatever he had suggested relating to the Principals should also be taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That the above-said Resolution proposed by Dr. Charanjeet Kaur Sohi and Shri H.S. Lucky, Syndics & Fellows, be accepted, with modification that the Principals, who are to be reappointed in the aided Colleges in future also, after the age of superannuation, their term of appointment be also two years.

XLVI. Considered the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-54(i) to C-54(viii) and C-54(x) on the agenda**, and

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) Ravi Inder Singh be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), at University Business School, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **06.03.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, 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:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(i))

- (2) Dr. Nishi Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **12.05.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 - 67000 + AGP Rs.9000/- 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 duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance with UGC Regulations, 2010.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(ii))

- (3) Dr. Jagtar Singh be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Biotechnology, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.04.2016**, 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:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(iii))

- (4) Dr. Gaurav Verma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.03.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 - 67000 + AGP Rs.9000/- 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 duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(iv))

- (5) Dr. Manu Dogra be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) at U.I.E.T., Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **05.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 - 67000 + AGP Rs.9000/- 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 duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(v))

- (6) Dr. Rupak Chakravarty be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Library & Information Science, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **28.06.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 - 67000 + AGP Rs.9000/- 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 duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(vi))

- (7) Dr. Monica Munjial be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at Centre For Social Work, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **18.06.2013**, in the Pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(vii))

- (8) Dr. Gargi Ghoshal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **21.09.2014**, in the Pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(viii))

- (9) Md. Taukir Alam be appointed Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2016-2017, in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/-, as per University rules.

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

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

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016, Para 2(x))

XLVII. The information contained in **Items R-(1) to R-(43)** on the agenda was read out
viz. –

R-1. In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Pratibha Nagpal, Professor Department of English & Cultural Studies, on contract basis up to 28.02.2021 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years), w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/ regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58) 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 Allowance.

NOTE: 1. Rule 4.1 appearing at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under: -

“4.1 The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

2. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009 will be applicable.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(ii))

R-2. In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. I.B. Prasher, Professor, Department of Botany, on contract basis up to 17.02.2021 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years), w.e.f. the date he joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/ regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58) 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 Allowance.

NOTE: Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page

130 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009 will be applicable.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(iii))

R-3. That the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) has approved the re-employment of Dr. Arvind K. Sharma, Professor (Retd.), Department of Music, on contract basis up to 05.01.2018 i.e. the date of 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.

NOTE: Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009 will be applicable.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(vi))

R-4. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Naresh Kumar, Assistant Professor in Punjabi (temporary), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshehar, w.e.f. 29.10.2015 (A.N.) and his salary for the month of October, 2015 i.e. upto 29.10.2015 will be adjusted & he will deposit two days' salary in lieu of not giving one month notice under Rule 16.2 given at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 as he has been paid salary upto September, 2015.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(ii))

R-5. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Manu Bansal, Assistant Professor (temporary), University Institute of Engineering & Technology (U.I.E.T.), P.U., w.e.f. 18.02.2016 (A.N.) and he will deposit one month salary in lieu of falling short of one month notice period w.e.f. 19.02.2016 to 03.03.2016, as he requested for resignation on 04.02.2016, under rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(iii))

R-6. In pursuance of the judgement of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 6580 of 2016 and CWP No. 2595 of 2016, respectively, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Dr. Jyoti Rattan as Associate Professor (General) in the Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+AGP of Rs.9000/- (subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011).

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(i))

R-7. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Ravinder Kumar, Assistant Professor in Punjabi at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. 30.01.2014, under Regulation 6 at page 118-119 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I,

2007, as he has been confirmed as Associate Professor at University of Delhi w.e.f. 30.01.2014.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(iv))

R-8. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Gurpreet Kaur, Assistant Professor (Temporary) in Anesthesia, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, w.e.f. 02.04.2016, as she has given one month notice from 01.03.2016 to 01.04.2016, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(v))

R-9. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Ved Prakash Dindoriya, Assistant Professor, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, w.e.f. 28.03.2014, under Regulation 6 at page 118-119 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, as he has been confirmed as Associate Professor at University of Delhi w.e.f. 28.03.2014.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxviii))

R-10. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-fixed the pay of Dr. Vishwa Bandhu Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, at Rs.20610+6000 (GP) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining as Assistant Professor i.e. 19.03.2013 as proposed by the Accounts Branch.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(iv))

R-11. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of Professor Anil Monga, as Dean Alumni Relations for another year w.e.f. 01.03.2016, on the same term and conditions.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(v))

R-12. That the Vice Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Medical Officer (on contract), BGJ Institute of Health, P.U. be retained for further period of three years w.e.f. 02.04.2016 (as his previous contractual term is up to 01.04.2016) or till he attains the age of 65 years (i.e. up to 16.09.2018), whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(vii))

R-13. That the Vice Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Charan Singh, Sr. Technician (G-II), Department of Bio-Physics as Senior Scientific Assistant/ Scientific Officer (G-I), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Department of Bio-Physics. His pay be fixed as per University Rules.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(x))

R-14. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has allowed one eligible candidate (SC Category) to be called for interview, recommended by the Screening Committee for the

post of Associate Professor-1 (Reserved for SC Category) in the Department of Geography advertised vide Advt. No. 4/2014.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xiv))

R-15. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate, that a letter dated 02.03.2016 of the Under Secretary, UGC, New Delhi, pursuant to letter dated 04.12.2015 of Deputy Chief Commissioner, Court of Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities, Department of Empowerment of Persons with this Disabilities, New Delhi, regarding reservation not less than three per cent (3%) seats to the persons with disability (PWD) for admission in higher educational courses such as M.Phil. and Ph.D. as per Section 39 of PWD Act, 1995, be adopted.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 91)

R-16. In partial modification to office orders No.6508-20/Estt.-I dated 02.08.2013, the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has promoted Dr. Monika Randhawa, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to (Stage-3) under CAS w.e.f. 04.04.2012 i.e. actual date of her eligibility instead of 21.12.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course on 20.12.2011.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxvi))

R-17. To ratify that Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, be treated as on duty w.e.f. 15.01.2014 as he has been performing all the duties of Assistant Professor while retaining the Ramalingaswami Fellowship as well.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(i))

R-18. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following as Laboratory Instructors on purely temporary basis at U.I.E.T. (whose present term of contractual appointment for the academic session 2015-16 expired on 30.04.2016) in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules as under and has also allowed to charge/pay their salary against the vacant posts of Technical Officers/Workshop Instructor/Senior Workshop Superintendent/ Deputy Librarian as mentioned against each in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology as before:

Sr. No.	Name	Post against which salary to be charged
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore (I.T.)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan (M.E.)	Technical Officer
3.	Ms. Seema (Biotechnology)	Workshop Instructor
4.	Mr. Lokesh (C.S.E.)	Senior Workshop Superintendent
5.	Ms. Sunaina Gulati (C.S.E.)	Deputy Librarian

- (i) w.e.f. 02.05.2016 to 05.07.2016 or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier; and
- (ii) for next Academic session 2016-17 w.e.f. 08.07.2016 to 31.05.2017 i.e. upto end of semester Examinations, (after one day break on 07.07.2016, 06.07.2016 being holiday) or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xxiii))

R-19. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Dr. Aditi Sharma, Assistant Professor in Law to work as Student Welfare Incharge (Hostel) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, effective from the date she has actually joined as such i.e. 21.01.2016 (AN), on the same terms and conditions, according to which Dr. Shiv Kumar Dogra, Assistant Professor in Law has worked as Student Welfare Incharge (Hostel).

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(iv))

R-20. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed afresh Dr. Sanjeev Verma, Associate Professor in Orthodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital w.e.f. 17.02.2016 for 11 months i.e. upto 16.01.2017 (with one day break on 16.02.2016), purely on temporary basis or till the post is filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 (a) at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he is working earlier.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(vii))

R-21. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has reappointed afresh the following faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.:

- (i) Dr. Shally Gupta, Professor in Oral Pathology, on contract basis w.e.f. 09.03.2016 for 11 months i.e. upto 08.02.2017 with one day break on 08.03.2016 (break day) & 07.03.2016 (Holiday) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier.
- (ii) the following faculty members purely on temporary/contract basis as mentioned against each w.e.f. 11.02.2016 for 11 months i.e. up to 10.01.2017 with one day break on 10.02.2016 (break day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation & Nature of Appointment
1.	Dr. Maninder Pal Singh Gill	Associate Professor in General Surgery (Temporary)
2.	Dr. Satya Narain	Associate Professor in Oral/Maxillofacial Surgery (Temporary)
3.	Dr. Prabhjot Cheema	Sr. Lecturer in Anatomy (Contract)
4.	Dr. Rajdeep Brar	Assistant Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology (Contract)

- (iii) the following faculty members purely on temporary basis mentioned against each w.e.f. 09.03.2016 for 11 months i.e. up to 08.02.2017 with one day break on 08.03.2016

(break day) & 07.03.2016 (Holiday) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation with Specialization
1.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma	Associate Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology
2.	Dr. Ikreet Singh Bal	Associate Professor in Public Health Dentistry
3.	Dr. Simranjit Singh	Senior Assistant Professor in Oral Pathology

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(ix))

R-22.

That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the minutes of Selection Committee dated 07.01.2016 for appointment of following as 'Programmers' purely on contract basis, on Basic Pay +GP+DA thereon (Rs.15600+5400+DA), initially for the period of 89 days (i.e. w.e.f. the date they join duty) & further extendable as per requirement (for working six days a week) or till the posts are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, with the stipulation that the appointments are being made purely on contract basis and for the period & salary as mentioned above or whenever the incumbents to regular posts join, whichever is earlier. It is understood that they will have no claim whatsoever for regular appointment after expiry of their term of contract appointment & their appointment shall be terminable without any notice. Their contract appointment shall come to an end automatically on the completion of term of contract appointment as stated above. However, they may apply for regular appointment, subject to their eligibility as & when the posts are advertised for regular appointment:

Sr. No.	Name of Programmers	Place of Posting
1	Mr. Subodh Bansal	Computer Unit
2	Ms. Jasmine Ahluwalia	College Branch
3	Mr. Harsimran Singh Dhanju	R&S Branch

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(x))

R-23.

That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has promoted:

1. Shri Naveen Kumar Pathak, Sr. Assistant, Estt. Branch-II, as Superintendent on temporary basis (personal to him) in the Pay-Band of Rs.15600-39100+Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- with initial pay Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted him at Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahar w.e.f. the date he joins his duty.
2. Shri Sandeep Kumar, Sr. Assistant, P.U. Ext. Library, Ludhiana, as Superintendent on temporary basis (personal to him) in the Pay-Band of Rs.15600-39100+Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- with initial pay Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted him at

University College Sikhwala, District Muktsar, w.e.f. the date he joins his duty.

3. Shri Narinder Kumar, Sr. Assistant, Estate Branch, as Superintendent on temporary basis (personal to him) in the Pay-Band of Rs.15600-39100+Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- with initial pay Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted him at Govt. College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur, w.e.f. the date he joins duty.

The above arrangement is subject to the submission of an undertaking by them to the effect that they will not seek benefit of this temporary promotion when they returns back to Chandigarh and Ludhiana and shall have no claim or right whatsoever for promotion as Superintendents at Chandigarh and Ludhiana before whatsoever for promotion as Superintendents at Chandigarh and Ludhiana before their regular turn in accordance with the gradation list and if they wants to be posted back at Chandigarh and Ludhiana, then they will be reverted back to their substantive post and their services as Superintendent at Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahar and University College Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and Govt. College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur will not be counted towards their seniority in the cadre of Superintendent.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xi))

- R-24.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Ramesh Kumar, Sr. Technician (G-II), Department of Microbiology as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Department of Microbiology. His pay be fixed as per University Rules.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xii))

- R-25.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of the following persons, as Senior Technical Assistant / Technical Officer (G-1), in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 +GP 5400 with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date they report for duty, against the following vacant post at Computer Centre and Department of Computer Science & Applications. Their pay will be fixed as per University Rules:

Sr. No.	Name of the Incumbent	Promoted as	Centre/ Department
1.	Ms. Anu Arora Senior Technician (G-II), DCSA (Presently working in AC Joshi Library)	Senior Technical Assistant/Technical Officer (G-1)	Computer Centre
2.	Shri Swapan Middye Senior Technician (G-II), DCSA	Senior Technical Assistant/Technical Officer (G-1)	Department of Computer Science & Applications

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xiii))

R-26. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Balbir Singh, Senior Technician (G-II), Central Instrumentation Laboratory (CIL) as Senior Scientific 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 he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Central Instrumentation Laboratory.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xiv))

R-27. To ratify the following addition in the Syndicate decision dated 20.09.2015 (Para 3):

Decision of the Syndicate dated 20.09.2015 (Para 3)	Modification/Addition
That, as per LPC issued by her previous employer consequent upon her placement in Senior scale, the pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bio-informatics, be re-fixed at Rs.29070/- (Basic Pay Rs.22070/- +Rs.7000/- AGP) with next date of annual increment on 01.07.2011 i.e. Rs.29950/- (Basic Pay Rs.22950/- + AGP Rs.7000/-) in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.7000/- AGP.	That, as per LPC issued by her previous employer consequent upon her placement in Senior scale, the pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bio-informatics, be re-fixed at Rs.29070/- (Basic Pay Rs.22070/- +Rs.7000/- AGP) w.e.f. the date of joining i.e. 27.10.2011 with next date of annual increment on 01.07.2011 i.e. Rs.29950/- (Basic Pay Rs.22950/- + AGP Rs.7000/-) in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.7000/- AGP.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xx))

R-28. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of Syndicate, has approved the recommendation dated 25.01.2016 of Board of Control, Department of Chemistry with regard to the modification in eligibility criteria for admission to the M.Sc. (Hons. School) course in Chemistry which is to be included in the Prospectus and Handbook of Information.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xvii))

R-29. In term of Syndicate Para 22 (revised) dated 01.05.2016/15.05.2016 that the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Senate, has approved the confirmation of Dr. Sipra Sagarika, w.e.f. 02.02.2016 Department of Sociology in her post as Assistant Professor.

NOTE: 1. Subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 26081 of 2014

2. A copy of order dated 6.9.2016 is enclosed.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 22)

R-30. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the assignment to the Faculties to the following Fellows mentioned against their names:

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta Dean of University Instruction Panjab University, Chandigarh	1. Business Management & Commerce 2. Education
Shri Jitender Yadav, IAS Director of Higher Education, U.T., Administration Room No. 312, 3 rd Floor U.T. Secretariat Sector-9, Chandigarh	1. Languages 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology
Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha President Panjab University Non-Teaching Staff Association (PUSA)	1. Languages 2. Law 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Education

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xi))

R-31. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the BOF/ Syndicate, has sanctioned the double payment of honorarium to:

- (i) the supporting staff as well as Centre superintendent who performed the duty at outstation for P.U. (CET) 2016 examination.
- (ii) the staff members who performed duty more than 12 hours during the CET Exam-(UG) held in 2016.
- (iii) the staff who will perform duty in any entrance test conducted by the Panjab University as and when the duration is more than 12 hours w.e.f. 11.06.2016 (till further orders).

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xi))

R-32. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Regulations/Rules for the B.C.A. (Semester System) implemented from the admissions of 2014-15 as recommended by the Administrative Committee dated 21.01.2015 of the Department of Computer Science and Applications.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xii))

R-33. That Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the fee structure of the new course of M.A. in Comparative Study of Religions in the Department of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies from the academic session 2016-2017.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xvi))

R-34. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the fee structure for Bachelor of Library & Information Science course, as earlier approved for Master of Library & Information Science course (1st year) in the Department of Library & Information Science from the academic session 2016-2017.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xvii))

R-35. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Board of Control dated 14.01.2016 that UIET and Dr. SSBUI CET will join Direct Admissions of Students Abroad (DASA) (A Scheme of Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India) for admission of Foreign/National/PIO/NRI seats under DASA 2016-17 in UG course for the session 2016-17 and has also granted permission to write to Director, NIT, Sri Nagar for inclusion of seat matrix of UIET and UICET in the Admission Brochure of DASA.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xxii))

R-36. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Committee dated 19.02.2016 that the admission to LL.M. (One year) course in all the Regional Centres, UILS and Department of Laws of Panjab University, on the basis of minimum requirement of 55% marks for General Category and 50% marks for SC/ST Candidates would continue. This criteria shall also be applicable to the LL.M. (Two year) course of the Panjab University from the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xii))

R-37. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendations of the Faculty of Arts:

1. from the academic session 2016-17, Master of Library & Information Science (Two-Year Integrated Course) be converted into Bachelor of Library & Information Sciences (Semester System) and Master of Library & Information Sciences (Semester System) as two separate degrees of one year duration each.
2. the Regulations/Rules for Bachelor of Library & Information Sciences (one year duration) (Semester System) w.e.f. the academic session 2016-17, be approved. However, Regulation **9** relating to medium of instruction and examination be approved with the stipulation that the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor for the purpose finally recommend the approval of the same for further approval by the other/higher statutory Bodies.
3. the Regulations/Rules for Master of Library & Information Sciences (one year duration) (Semester System) w.e.f. the academic session 2017-18, be approved.
4. The number of seats for the said courses be approved as under:
 - (i) B.Lib.I.Sc.: 40 seats along with 5 additional seats for NRI along with other additional seats as decided by the University from time to time.
 - (ii) M.Lib.I.Sc.: 20 seats along with 5 additional seats for NRI along with other additional seats as decided by the University from time to time.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xiii))

R-38. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the revision of rates/remunerations of Flying Squad Officers/Inspectors, Zonal In-charge, Chief Coordinator/Superintendents and Supervisory Staff (Annual/Semester Exams)-2016 onwards.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xvi))

R-39. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate, that every Research Scholar (JRF-Ph.D. student) is required to be present in the University Department or an approved Research Centre for a minimum period of 36 weeks, including the course work. They be allowed to take-up a job after taking leave from the University or an approved Research Centre.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 101)

R-40. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to:

- (i) transfer bank balance of Rs.29,49,205.26 from the Depreciation Fund Account No. 10444978037 to the Development Fund Account No. 10444979664.
- (ii) transfer the total STDR's of Rs.2,48,00,000/- in hand from the Depreciation Fund Account No. 10444978037 to Development Fund Account No. 10444979664.
- (iii) close the Account No. 10444978037 and Cash-book of the Depreciation Fund.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xviii))

R-41. That the Vice Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to refund the affiliation fee of Rs.4,50,000/- to the President, Ghubaya Educational Society, Jalalabad, District Ferozepur, after deducting processing fee of Rs.25000/-, who had applied to the University for opening three new colleges along with fee of Rs.4,75,000/- and later on withdrew/back off to open them.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxi))

R-42. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted voluntary retirement to Ms. Kiran Kashyap, Superintendent, USOL, from the University services, w.e.f. 30.06.2016 (A.N.) and has sanctioned the following retirement benefits:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxvii))

R-43. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, the power to condone the delay up to six months beyond the period of eight years for submission of Ph.D. thesis, under exceptional circumstances, on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded, be delegated to the Dean of

University Instruction. If need be, the relevant Regulations/Rules/Guidelines be amended accordingly.

(Syndicate dated 18.10.2015 Para 6 & 7)

The Vice Chancellor said that if any member has any issue, please permit him (Vice Chancellor) to attend to his/her concerns.

Referring to Sub-Item (R(4)), Dr. S.S. Randhawa pointed out that he (the Vice Chancellor) has accepted the resignation of Dr. Naresh Kumar, Assistant Professor in Punjabi (temporary), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate. Quoting an example, he said that the Vice Chancellor has waived off the condition of one month's notice period in the case of Mr. Punit Maudgil, Assistant Professor in Computer Science of same very College, i.e., Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, and a month's salary was released to him. Although Dr. Naresh Kumar has also requested for waiving off the notice period through the Principal of the College, the University is not waiving off the same. He requested that the notice period of Dr. Naresh Kumar should also be waived off.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

The Vice Chancellor further said that if any person has any concern, he should be authorized to attend to the same.

This was agreed to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to share with him (Vice Chancellor) something technical, so that they did not go wrong anywhere.

The Vice Chancellor said, sure, he could share with him whatever he wanted to.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Items R-(1) to R-(43) on the agenda**, be ratified, with the modification that the notice period of Dr. Naresh Kumar (R-4), Assistant Professor in Punjabi (temporary), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, be waived off.

XLVIII. The information contained in **Item I-(1) to I-(96)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

I-1. That the Syndicate has felicitated to the following: –

- (i) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) for having secured Second place amongst Pharmacy Institutions in the 'National Institutional Ranking.
- (ii) Prof. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Fellow and Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) on being selected for a prestigious International recognition, 'The Name in Science Award', by the academic union, European Business Assembly, Oxford, UK.
- (iii) Prof. Ronki Ram, Fellow and Hon. Director, ICSSR (NWRC), on being invited by the British Council, New Delhi, to participate in the Warwick International Programme in the Leadership and Management of Higher Education (IPLM), at University of Warwick, UK.

- (iv) Prof. Ronki Ram, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Sciences on being invited as Chief Guest and Key note Speaker at the 125th Birth Anniversary celebrations of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar by Consulate General of India, San Francisco, California and the Indian American Community.
- (v) Prof. Rajeev Patnaik, Deptt. of Geology, on being awarded by the Government of India with the 'National Geosciences Award 2014' for his outstanding contributions in the field of Basic Geosciences.
- (vi) Prof. Prince Sharma, Deptt. of Microbiology, on being selected for the Glaxo Smith Kline Vaccines Travel Award by a US-based company.
- (vii) Dr Harish Kumar, Associate Professor in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, on being awarded by 'Young Faculty Research Fellowship' for five years by the Media Lab, Deptt. of Electronics and IT, Ministry of Communication and IT, to do research and guide Ph.D. research scholars related to Information Communication Technology (ICT).
- (viii) Professor Rani Balbir Kaur, former Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre, PU, on being selected for 'Sangeet Natak Akademi Award (Puraskar) for 2015'.
- (ix) Professor Chaman Lal Ahuja, former Chairperson, Department of English on being selected for 'Sangeet Natak Akademi Award (Puraskar) for 2015' for his overall contribution/scholarship to performing Arts by the Sangeet Natak Akademi.
- (x) Dr Chandershekhar Prasad, an alumnus of Panjab University, on being selected for Ustad Bismillah Khan Yuva Puraskar 2015 for his contribution in direction by the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi. The Yuva Puraskar will be presented at a special ceremony by the Chairman, Sangeet Natak Akademi.
- (xi) Dr Mamta Joshi, Head of the Deptt. of Music, Post Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, on being selected for Ustad Bismillah Khan Yuva Puraskar 2015 for her contribution in the field of 'Folk Music, Punjab' by the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi.
- (xii) Prof. M.M. Gupta (Re-employed), Deptt. of Physics, on being invited as Key Speaker at the International Conference on New Physics at the Large Hadron Collider hosted by the Nanyang Technological University.
- (xiii) Prof. V K. Jindal (Re-employed), Deptt. of Physics on being invited for a research visit of 3 months to

University of Wurzburg by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 1)

- (xiv) Professor (Dr.) Balram K. Gupta, alumnus of Panjab University and Director (Academics), Chandigarh Judicial Academy, on being conferred upon with Life Time Achievement Award for overall contribution made towards judiciary.
- (xv) Professor Manju Jaidka, Academician and Novelist, Department of English and Cultural Studies, for being felicitated by the Chandigarh Sahitya Akademi with Life Time Award of Recognition.
- (xvi) Dr Seema Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Geology, on being selected for the National Award 'Prof. R.C. Mishra Gold Medal' in Geosciences.
- (xvii) Professor K.P. Singh, Centre of Advanced Study in Geology on being adjudged as second best for writing Technical Paper on "Impact of Climate Change on Water Resources and Water Security in North West Parts of India" by the Central Ground Water Authority, Ministry of Water Resources, River Development & Ganga Rejuvenation, Government of India, for First National Essay Competition under Jal Kranti Abhiyan 2015-16.
- (xviii) Professor Archana R. Singh, School of Communication Studies, on being nominated as a Member of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication Society for a period of two years by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.
- (xix) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor of Pharmacology, U.I.P.S., on being selected for a highly prestigious "UGC Research Award for 2016-18".
- (xx) Dr Kewal Krishan, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, for contributing three invited chapters to the Encyclopedia of Forensic and Legal Medicine.
- (xxi) Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar, Panjab University on his having been co-opted to the Managing Committee of Chandigarh Chapter of the Institute of Company Secretaries of India for the year 2016.

(Syndicate dated 5.7.2016 Para 1)

- (xxii) Mr. Neeraj Chopra, a student of DAV College, Chandigarh, on having won a Gold Medal in the men's Javelin Throw at the U-20 World Championship held at Bydgoszcz in Poland and reportedly to be the first Indian athlete to set a World record at any level.

- (xxiii) Ms. Anayat Kaur of University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, on having won Silver Medal in team event during the International Youth Archery Festival held at South Korea.
- (xxiv) Dr. Ashu Khosla, Assistant Professor, Deptt. of Geology on having edited, along with an American Researcher Spencer G. Lucas, a Volume entitled "Cretaceous Period: Biotic Diversity and Biogeography" on behalf of New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science (NMMNH&S) as its Bulletin #71 and having contributed three articles.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 1)

- (xxv) Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur, on getting recognition of College of Excellence status by the University Grant Commission (UGC).
- (xxvi) Professor S.K. Tomar, Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, on having been nominated by Hon'ble, Governor of Haryana on the Executive Council of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar (Haryana) for a term of two years.

(Syndicate dated 19.8.2016 Para 1)

I-2.

That the Syndicate has noted and approved the following:

- (1) Panjab University has been placed at 12th rank in the MHRD initiated 'National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF)' amongst the Universities of the country. The rankings were released for the Higher Education Institutions by Union Minister of Human Resource Development (MHRD) Smt. Smriti Zubin Irani at New Delhi on April 4, 2016.
- (2) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) has secured Second place amongst Pharmacy Institutions in the 'National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF)' under Pharmacy (Category A-Research and Teaching). Prof. B. S. Bhoop, Chairperson, UIPS, received the Certificate Award from Smt. Smriti Zubin Irani, Union Minister of HRD at a ceremony organized by MHRD at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi on April 4, 2016.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 1(2))

- (3) The Chandigarh Chapter of the Public Relations Council of India honoured Panjab University's Community Radio Station, Jyotirgamaya 91.2 MHz on July 1, 2016, on account of continuously running weekly show, 'Hamari Beti', programme for three years at the School of Communication Studies.

(Syndicate dated 5.7.2016 Para 1(6))

- (4) University Grant Commission (UGC) has selected Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur, for the recognition of

College of Excellence status. The College has been given a grant of Rs.2 crore to be spent over five years for specific purposes. DSCW is one of the only three colleges in the country that have been honoured with this status. We are well aware that this College has NAAC score of above 3.5. I had congratulated the Principal who has come to the University and we had a special press conference to give some recognition to the College, on behalf of the University

- (5) I met Hon'ble MHRD Minister Shri Prakash Javedkar ji along with Shri Satya Pal Jain, Fellow, Panjab University at his residence on August 18, 2016. I renewed the invitation to him to visit Panjab University, Campus during Teacher's Day week and submitted to him an update on the financial concern of the University. I later also met Secretary, Higher Education, MHRD in his office and gave him an update on my meeting with the Hon'ble, Minister. A copy of the update was also submitted to him (Secretary, Higher Education, MHRD).
- (6) A Pay Review Committee constituted by the University Grants Commission for revision of pay of academic staff of Universities and Colleges, will be visiting Panjab University, Chandigarh, on 29th August 2016. They will spend whole day at our campus. They are going to meet Vice Chancellors, Principals, and representatives of the staff. They will have four sessions and at the end of the day they will have a formal meeting. The Committee is chaired by Shri V.S. Chauhan, who is a member of the UGC and also Executive Chairman of NAAC in Bengaluru. He is a Scientist of a great eminence. I have spoken to him and he is looking forward to his visit to the Campus. They have to complete their job within a short period of a time. We have constituted a Committee to put up proposal/s before Shri V.S. Chauhan. He has informally learnt that the UGC has constituted a Committee to strategize their Non-Plan Budget, and Panjab University gets grant from the same Non-Plan Budget. At one point of time, the UGC used to be comfortable with its Non-Plan Budget, but it is no longer comfortable with it. This is an internal Committee, from which they get their grant. So his (Shri V.S. Chauhan) visit to the Campus is important to us from multi-dimensional point of view. So let us hope that something would happen. He has been informally informed that the second installment of this year grant would arrive by Monday."

(Syndicate dated 19.8.2016 Para 1(3))

- (1) Governing Council of the Association of Indian Universities (AIU) at its meeting held on June 30, 2016 considered the notification issued by the University Grants Commission for revision of pay of academic staff of Universities and Colleges. AIU has constituted a Committee to prepare a collective view and place the same before the Pay Committee of UGC. In this regard AIU has sent an email to this office on July 25, 2016 seeking suggestions/comments on the subject mentioned above so as to reach them by 31.08.2016.

- (2) In response to a suggestion from the Syndicate, an email ID 'support.xen@pu.ac.in' has been created for submission of complaints online to the office of the Executive Engineer for various types of works.
- (3) A copy of the communication sent to the Chairman, UGC, after my meeting with the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development, on July 25, 2016 had been sent by email to all the Syndicate members. Such a communication collates together all the documents giving an update on 'Funding situation of Panjab University'. This would be brought to the attention of members of Board of Finance on August 1, 2016. The UGC has nominated Dr. J.K. Tripathy, Joint Secretary (Finance) to attend the Board of Finance meeting on August 1, 2016. The Ministry of Human Resource Development has directed the UGC to participate in the meeting of Board of Finance and also sent the comments to be placed before the Board of Finance.
- (4) Dr. Ashu Khosla, Assistant Professor, Deptt. of Geology, along with an American researcher Spencer G. Lucas, has edited a Volume entitled "Cretaceous Period: Biotic Diversity and Biogeography" on behalf of New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science (NMMNH&S) as its Bulletin #71. Dr. Khosla has also contributed three articles in this prestigious American Journal. The Volume includes Dinosaur papers from India, North America, France, Germany, Spain, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Africa, etc.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 1 (3, 4, 5 and 6))

- I-3.** Appreciation of the Syndicate be placed on record for Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Engineering & Technology on having been honoured with the Outstanding Engineering Institute (North) 2016 award by the ABP News National Education Awards.

(Syndicate dated 5.7.2016 Para 1(2))

- I-4.** That the Vice-Chancellor, has appointed Dr. Sanjeev Gautam, UICET, P.U. as Programme Officer in National Service Scheme (N.S.S.) for smooth & effective functioning of NSS activities, in addition to his own duties.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 65(ii))

- I-5.** That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Ramandeep Kaur Saluja as Associate Professor in Oral Pathology and Dr. Vandana Chhabra as Associate Professor in Oral Surgery at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for one year or till the regular posts are filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, against the vacant posts of the Institute, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600/-+NPA+ allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5(a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to her in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize her

subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 65(iii))

- I-6.** That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Gurpreet Kaur as Assistant Professor in Anesthesia at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for one year or till the regular post is filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, against the vacant posts of the Institute, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/-+NPA+allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5(a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007.

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

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 65(iv))

- I-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor has accepted the resignation of Mrs. Poonam Goel, Associate Professor of Economics (Re-employed) w.e.f. 16.11.2015, on her request, due to her falling health.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 65(v))

- I-8.** That Mr. Harsh Tuli S/o late Professor Naresh Tuli, Department of Geology, be appointed Assistant Professor in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6,000/- at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences (UIAMS), Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for a period of 3 years, under Regulation 5(b) at page 111-112 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 17)

- I-9.** That the appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent Colleges (Sr. No.1 to 49) be approved (post-facto) w.e.f. 07.07.2014, upto the end of first semester of the academic session 2014-15 i.e. 31.12.2014, purely on temporary basis or under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject	Name of the College
1.	Mr. Harjinder Singh	Political Science	Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshehar
2.	Dr. Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi	
3.	Dr. Naresh Kumar	Punjabi	
4.	Dr. (Ms.) Poonam Dwivedi	English	
5.	Mr. Hari Nath	Hindi	
6.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi	
7.	Mrs. Rajni Chauhan	Commerce	
8.	Ms. Sukhjit Nahar	Sociology	
9.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Commerce	
10.	Mr. Hari Krishan	History	
11.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce	

12.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics	
13.	Mr. Inder Bhagat	Computer Science	
14.	Mr. Deepak	Computer Science	
15.	Dr. Resham Singh	Punjabi	P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur
16.	Dr. Hira Singh	Punjabi	
17.	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Punjabi	
18.	Ms. Vandana	Sociology	
19.	Ms. Radha	Economics	
20.	Ms. Shweta	Commerce	
21.	Dr. Hardeep Singh	History	
22.	Dr. Kumud Manohar Meshram	Hindi	
23.	Dr. Harnam Singh	Physical Education	
24.	Mr. Kapil Dev	English	
25.	Ms. Simarjeet Kaur	Mathematics	
26.	Ms. Nishi	Commerce	
27.	Mr. Mohammad Sazid	Commerce	
28.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi	P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singhwala, District Moga
29.	Mr. Jaswinder Singh	Punjabi	
30.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English	
31.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi	
32.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce	
33.	Ms. Monica	Commerce	
34.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology	
35.	Mr. Shaminder Singh	Physical Education	
36.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics	
37.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics	
38.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science	P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib
39.	Mr. Karan Gandhi	Commerce	
40.	Dr. Inderjit Singh	Political Science	
41.	Dr. Sukhjeet Singh	Punjabi	
42.	Dr. Ram Singh	Commerce	
43.	Dr. Sumit Mohan	Hindi	
44.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Punjabi	
45.	Mrs. Navdeep Kaur	English	
46.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Commerce	
47.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Economics	
48.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	History	
49.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Physical Education	

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 20)

I-10.

That the appointment of the following Assistant Professors in U.I.E.T. (Sr. No.1 to 42) be approved (post-facto) w.e.f. 07.07.2014 to 30.04.2015, for next academic session 2014-15, purely on temporary basis or till regular appointments are made, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person	Branch
1.	Ms. Preeti Aggarwal	CSE
2.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Maths
3.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Mgt.
4.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Mgt.
5.	Mr. Geetu	Physics

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

6.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE
7.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE
8.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE
9.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT
10.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT
11.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Chemistry
12.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE
13.	Ms. Aditi Gupta	EEE
14.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Bio-Tech.
15.	Ms. Sabhyata Soni	ECE
16.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Mathematics
17.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Bio-Tech.
18.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Bio-Tech.
19.	Ms. Jyoti Sood	Physics
20.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
21.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
22.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
23.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
24.	Mr. Gurmukh Singh	IT
25.	Ms. Nidhi	IT
26.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
27.	Mr. Himanshu	CSE
28.	Mr. Manu Bansal	IT
29.	Ms. Shweta Mehta	IT
30.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
31.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
32.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Bio-Tech.
33.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro-Electronics
34.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
35.	Dr. Gursharan Singh	Bio-Tech.
36.	Mr. Chander Prakash	Mech.
37.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
38.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
39.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Physics
40.	Ms. Leetika	Maths
41.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Maths
42.	Mr. Gurjinder Singh	Maths

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 21)**I-11.** That –

- (i) the period of Dr. Puneet Kaur, Assistant Professor, UIET absence from duty w.e.f. 23.2.2016 to 3.4.2016 be treated as leave without pay being absence for non-academic purpose; and
- (ii) for the period from 15.8.2015 to 22.02.2016 she be treated on EOL without pay under Regulation 11(G) at pages 139-140 of P.U., Cal. Vol. I, 2007 being EOL availed for academic purpose i.e. to join the position of Senior Design Engineer at P.C. Prints, Bangalore, Karnataka as she was relieved from the said institute and has joined back with P.U., on 4.4.2016.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 23)**I-12.** Since the interim orders dated 31.03.2016, 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 No. (5011 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Subodh Kumar Agrawal, Associate Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years 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.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(ii))

I-13. Since the interim orders dated 31.03.2016, 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 No. (5362 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Parbhat Singh, Professor, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years 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.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(iii))

I-14. Since the interim orders dated 11.02.2016, 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 No. (2775 of 2016) have now been adjourned to 14.03.2015. The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. (Mrs.) Neeta Sharma, Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years 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.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(iv))

I-15. Since the interim orders dated 11.02.2016, 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 No. (2775 of 2016) have now been adjourned to 14.03.2016. The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Indu Bhushan Prashar, Professor, Department of Botany, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years 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.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(v))

I-16. That 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 25.05.2016 with one day break as usual on the same terms and conditions:

1. Mr. Gaurav Kashyap
2. Mr. Abhishek Ghai

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

3. Ms. Lipika K. Guliani
4. Mr. Amit Katoch
5. Mr. Manoj Semwal.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xvi))

I-17. That Professor Sanjeev Puri, Biotechnology Branch, UIET, be appointed Honorary Director, Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP), for a period of three years.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 104)

I-18. That the Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following benefits to Professor Manmohan Singh Chauhan, Department of German, on account voluntary/Pre-Mature retirement, w.e.f. 01.02.2016, under regulation 17.5, at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xvii))

I-19. That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Rural Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, working purely on temporary basis up to 31.05.2016 (with one day break), on the same terms and conditions on which they are working earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person & Subject
1.	Dr. Gurjit Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Mr. Surinder Singh, Assistant Professor in Political Science
3.	Mr. Munish Kumar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science
4.	Ms. Seema, Assistant Professor in Physical Education

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xix))

I-20. That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, P.U. up to 30.06.2016, with one day break on 02.05.2016 (i.e. 01.05.2016) being Sunday, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled up on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xx))

I-21. That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Neha Singla as Assistant Professor, Department of Biophysics, P.U., up to 30.06.2016, with one day break on 02.05.2016 (i.e. 01.05.2016 being Sunday), purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled up on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xxii))

I-22. That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Harsimran Kaur Boparai as Assistant Professor in Anesthesia at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., against the vacant post, purely on temporary basis for the period of one year in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/- +NPA and allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 (a) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

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

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xxii))

I-23. Since interim orders dated 11.02.2016, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh in CWP No. 11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs Panjab University and Another) and subsequent orders passed in CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. 7491 of 2016 (Dr. Raj Kumar Vs Panjab University and Others) have now been adjourned to 03.05.2016, the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has passed the following orders:

- (i) Dr. Raj Kumar, Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, PU be allowed to continue to work as such after 30.04.2016 (the date on which he completes the age of 60 years) till the stay orders granted by Hon'ble High Court remains in force in his case (CWP No. 7491 of 2016: (Dr. Raj Kumar Vs Panjab University and Others) in terms of the interim orders passed by the Court in CWP No. 11988 of 2014.
- (ii) The retirement benefits already sanctioned to Dr. Raj Kumar, Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, PU, which have been conveyed to all concerned vide No. 5623-28/Estt. Dated 21.04.2016, be treated as withdrawn till the stay orders remains in force in his case.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxv))

I-24. That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis, at Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U., up to 30.06.2016 with one day's break on 02.05.2016 (01.05.2016 being Sunday) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(ii))

I-25. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) re-appointed the following Assistant Professors purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date they will start work for the academic session 2016-17 against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier, in the P.U. Constituent College as mentioned below against each:-

Sr. No.	Name	Subject	Name of the College
1.	Dr. Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi	Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshehar
2.	Dr. (Ms.) Poonam Dwivedi	English	
3.	Mr. Hari Nath	Hindi	
4.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi	
5.	Ms. Sukhjot Nahar	Sociology	
6.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Commerce	
7.	Mr. Hari Krishan	History	
8.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce	
9.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics	
10.	Mr. Inder Bhagat	Computer Science	
11.	Mr. Deepak	Computer Science	
1.	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Punjabi	P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur
2.	Dr. Resham Singh	Punjabi	
3.	Dr. Kumud Manohar Meshram	Hindi	
4.	Dr. Harnam Singh	Physical Education	
5.	Ms. Simarjeet Kaur	Mathematics	
6.	Ms. Nishi	Commerce	
7.	Mr. Mohammad Sazid	Commerce	
8.	Mr. Harjinder Singh Bhardwaj	Political Science	
1.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi	P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singhwala, District Moga
2.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English	
3.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi	
4.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce	
5.	Ms. Monica	Commerce	
6.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology	
7.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics	
8.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics	
9.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science	
10.	Ms. Simranjit Kaur	Computer Science	
1.	Dr. Inderjit Singh	Political Science	P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala,
2.	Dr. Sukhjeet Singh	Punjabi	
3.	Dr. Ram Singh	Commerce	
4.	Dr. Sumit Mohan	Hindi	
5.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Punjabi	

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

6.	Mrs. Navdeep Kaur	English	District Sri Muktsar Sahib
7.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Commerce	
8.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Economics	
9.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	History	
10.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Physical Education	

- (ii) approved the appointment of the following as Assistant Professors on contract basis as a special case w.e.f. the date they will start work for the academic session 2016-17 against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/- on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier in the P.U. Constituent College as mentioned against below against each:

Sr. No.	Name of Candidate	Subject	Qualifications	College
1.	Ms Shaffy Girdhar D/o Shri Satish Kumar	Computer Science	MCA	PUCC Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib
2.	Shri Varun Maini S/o Shri Bhagwan Dass Maini	Computer Science	MCA (Hons.)	PUCC, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur
3.	Shri Pawan Kumar S/o Shri Om Parkash	Computer Science	GDCA, M.Sc. MCA	PUCC Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(iii))**I-26.**

That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors, P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, up to May, 2016, with one day's break as usual, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of 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:

Sr. No.	Name of Assistant Professor	Branch/Subject
1.	Shri Kanwalpreet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	CSE
4.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
5.	Ms. Monika	ECE
6.	Mr. Anish Sharma	ECE
7.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
8.	Mr. Gurbinder Singh	I.T.
9.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.
10.	Ms. Ritika Arora	I.T.
11.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.
12.	Mr. Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
13.	Mr. Gurwinder Singh	Mech.
14.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh	Mech.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xxi))

I-27. That Dr. Neha Singla, be re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biophysics, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date she starts work for next academic session 2016-17 commencing from 07.07.2016 against the vacant post, or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. calendar, Volume I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 14)

I-28. Since the interim orders dated 18.05.2016, 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 No. (9306 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Prem Lal Sharma, Professor, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years 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.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(i))

I-29. Since the interim orders dated 26.11.2015, 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 No. (9306 of 2016), has now been adjourned to 13.06.2016. The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Naval Kishore, Professor, Department of Geology be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years 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.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(ii))

I-30. Since the interim orders dated 18.05.2016, 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 No. (9306 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Varinder Kumar Walia, Professor, Department of Zoology be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years 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.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(iii))

I-31. Since the interim orders dated 11.2.2016, 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 No. (2775 of 2016) have now been adjourned to 24.05.2016, Dr. Meena Sehgal, Professor, Department of Psychology has been allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years 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.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(iv))

I-32. Since the interim orders dated 24.05.2016 & 30.05.2016, 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 in CWP No. (10209 of 2016 & 10860 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Jaspal Kaur Kaang and Dr. Swinder Singh, Professors, University School of Open Learning be allowed to continue until the judgment is pronounced by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it. Therefore, their retiral benefits be kept pending till the final outcome of CWP No. 11988 of 2014.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(xxvi))

I-33. In terms of the interim order dated 28.06.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 12763 of 2016 (Dr. Shveta Mahendra Vs. Panjab University and others), the Vice-Chancellor has permitted Dr. Shveta Mahendra, Assistant Professor to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years, as per orders passed by the Hon'ble Court in the similar Writ Petition subject to the outcome of CWP No. 11988 of 2014 (Dr. B.S. Ghuman Vs. P.U. & Others), which has been reserved for pronouncing judgment. Therefore, her retiral benefits and re-employment may be kept pending till the final outcome of CWP 11988 of 2014.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(xxvii))

I-34. That the Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed afresh the following faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 03.06.2016 for 11 months i.e. up to 02.05.2017 with one day's break on 02.06.2016 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600+NPA and Rs.15600-39100+ GP of Rs.6000+NPA+Allowances respectively, as admissible as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Shipra Gupta	Associate Professor
2.	Dr. Lalit Kumar	Associate Professor
3.	Dr. Vishakha Grover	Associate Professor
4.	Dr. Poonam Sood	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Neha Bansal	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Sunint Singh	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Puneet	Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. Rose Kanwaljit Kaur	Assistant Professor

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(v))

- I-35.** That the Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed afresh the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 07.07.2016 or the date of start of the classes for the academic session 2016-17 or till the posts are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, with one day's break as usual, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member
1.	Dr. Gurjit Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Mr. Munish Kumar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science
3.	Mr. Surinder Singh, Assistant Professor in Political Science
4.	Ms. Seema, Assistant Professor in Physical Education

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(vi))

- I-36.** That the Vice-Chancellor has acceded to the request dated 06.04.2016 of Ms. Sudipa Kaur, Assistant Professor (Part-time), UIILS, P.U., Chandigarh and accepted her resignation w.e.f. 06.04.2016 (A.N.).

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(vii))

- I-37.** That the Vice-Chancellor has given the additional charge of the post of Dean College Development Council, P.U. to Professor Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations, Panjab University, Chandigarh, w.e.f. 01.06.2016 till the advertised post of Dean College of Development Council is filled in.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(viii))

- I-38.** That roster for non-teaching positions be prepared as per the Central Government Reservation Policy fixing 15% reservation for the SCs.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 17)

- I-39.** That the following three Demonstrators working on purely temporary basis (whose present term of appointment was for academic session 2015-16 and expired on 30.06.2016), at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, be re-appointed for further one year w.e.f. 02.07.2016 to 30.06.2017, after one day break on 01.07.2016 or till regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the pay-scale of Rs. 10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions. The person possessing Medical/ Dental qualifications i.e. M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practicing Allowance (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic pay +NPA shall not exceed Rs. 85000/- p.m. in the terms of Senate decision dated 29.9.2013 (Para LX) (Item No. 20 III):

1. Dr. Harkirat Sethi
Department of Pharmacology
2. Dr. Anupam Vijayvergia
Department of Physiology
3. Dr. Ravi Kant Sharma
Department of Biochemistry

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 41)

I-40. That as per recommendation of the Committee dated 11.05.2016, Dr. Gurinder Pal Singh, Senior Scientist in USA be appointed as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 16)

I-41. That the post of 'Senior Assistant' in the Public Relation Department be converted into 'Assistant Public Relation Officer' (APRO) as both the posts are carrying the same pay-scale i.e. Rs.10300-34800+GP of Rs.4400/- (initial pay of Rs.17420/-) and after conversion, the post of APRO be filled in with the same qualifications as prescribed by the Punjab Government.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 24)

I-42. That –

- (1) Letter dated 11.04.2016 of Vini Mahajan, IAS, Principal Secretary, Department of Health & Family Welfare, Chandigarh, Government of Punjab, for making provision in the admission form regarding pledging of Organs/Eyes by College Students, be adopted; and
- (2) The following provision/s be made in the original Admission Form of the University and affiliated Colleges:

“I want to pledge my eyes for eye donation after my death. My family members also support my decision.

This is to certify that the above-said information given by me is accurate and I know that my name will be displayed in the list of Eye Donors on the official website as I have chosen to pledge my eyes.”

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 71)

I-43. That –

- (i) institution of “Professor Gurdev Singh Gosal Award for Essay on Geographic Thought”, be approved.
- (ii) the MoU be executed between Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal, Assistant Professor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, R/o H.No. 150, Sector 11-A, Chandigarh and Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh; and
- (iii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form the Judging Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 88)

I-44. That the donation of Rs.21 lakh made by Dr. Urmi Kessar, retired Professor, Department of Arts History and Visual Arts, for institution of endowment for organizing lecture/oration in the area of Arts History and appreciation, including an additional amount of Rs.1.5 lakhs for organizing this year’s lecture/oration”, be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2 & 81)

I-45. That the following membership fee of Community Centre and Staff Club of the University, be made compulsory for the teaching and non-teaching employees up to the level of 'A' class officers to be deducted from the salary. For re-employed employees it be optional:

Pay band-4	:	Rs.100/- p.m.
Pay band-3 (GP ≥ 6600)	:	Rs.75/- p.m.
Rest	:	Rs.50/- p.m.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 105)

I-46. That –

- (i) the recommendations of the Students Aid Fund Administrative Committee dated 31.03.2016, be approved.
- (ii) from the year 2016-17, half fee be charged from the economically weaker students at the time of admission and the financial assistance to be provided to such students out of the Students Aid Fund be finalized by the month of October.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 44)

I-47. That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following MoUs between:

- (i) Panjab University, Chandigarh (India) and The Foundation Le Corbusier, Paris, France.
- (ii) Terminal Ballistics Research Laboratory Sector 30, Chandigarh and Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (iii) Panjab University and Valaya Alongkorn Rajabhat University under The Royal Patrong, Thailand.
- (iv) Antioch University, Seattle, U.S.A. and Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (v) Panjab University, Chandigarh and National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (NIPER), SAS Nagar, Mohali.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xvii))

I-48. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Future Hitech Batteries Ltd. SAS Nagar, Punjab.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxxi))

I-49. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Julius Maxmilian University of Wurzburg, Germany along with Student Exchange Agreement.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxxii))

I-50. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and the University of Hull, U.K.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxxiii))

I-51. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed MoU between Department of Physics and Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF), Panjab University and Cosmic Ray Laboratory (CRL), TIFR, Ooty.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xviii))

I-52. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Sardar Swaran Singh National Institute of Bio-Energy, Kapurthala.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xix))

I-53. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University and Deakin University, Australia.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xxiv))

I-54. That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the meeting of the Research Promotion Cell (RPC) dated 07.01.2016 in respect of the following:

- (i) MoU between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Sarbat Da Bhala Charitable Trust.
- (ii) Recognition of Centre of Innovative and Applied Bioprocessing (CIAB) as a centre for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (iii) MoU between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Dr. H.S. Gour Vishwavidyalaya Sagar (MP).
- (iv) Lecture by Professor V.N. Attri, Chairman, Indian Ocean Rim Association on **“Growing strength of IORA and future roadmap”**.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xvi))

I-55. That an endowment of Rs. 1,04,752/- made by Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini, 7612, Tea Berry Way, Sacramento, CA 95828 (USA)/# 380, Sector-38, Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of Mata Gujri Gold Medal in memory of his mother late Smt. Parkash Kunj and the office be allowed to invest the said amount in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the SET A/c No. 1044978140 and be utilized as under:

- (i) the endowment will be named as Mata Gujri Gold Medal in memory of late Smt. Parkash Kunj; and
- (ii) the Gold Medal should be awarded to the student securing highest marks in M.Sc. (Bio-Physics) and pursuing Ph.D. in

the Bio-Physics in this institution every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 21)

I-56. That an endowment of Rs.1,05,036/- made by Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini, 7612, Tea Berry Way, Sacramento, CA 95828 (USA) / # 380, Sector-38, Chandigarh be accepted for institution of Dashmesh Pita Gold Medal in memory of his grandfather late Sardar Sher Singh Satauria and the office be allowed to invest the said amount in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the SET A/c No. 10444978140 and be utilized as under:

- (i) the endowment will be named as Dashmesh Pita Gold Medal in memory of late Sardar Sher Singh Satauria; and
- (ii) the Gold Medal should be awarded to the student securing highest marks in M.Sc. (Medical Physics) and pursuing Ph.D. in the Medical Physics/Genetics Studies in this institution every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 22)

I-57. That an endowment of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Dr. L.N. Gupta, # 220, Sector-7, Panchkula-134109 (Haryana) (Ex-Professor & Chairman, Department of Geology, P.U., Chandigarh) be accepted for institution of an Endowment named as "Professor L.N. Gupta Merit Scholarship". The Investment of Rs.4,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140 to facilitate to utilize the funds in the department of Geology/C.A.S. in Geology, P.U., to a student of M.Sc. (Hons. School) class with the following terms and conditions:

- (a) The amount of merit Scholarship should be Rs.1000/- p.m. i.e. 10 months w.e.f. July to April.
- (b) The scholarship will be awarded to one student of M.Sc. (H.S.) 1st year (Geology) every year on the basis of B.Sc.(H.S.) Geology result on the recommendation of the Chairman and continue the scholarship to the same student of M.Sc. (H.S.) Geology 2nd year if he or she would be topper in the M.Sc. (H.S.) Geology 1st year. Otherwise, the scholarship would be awarded to the next deserving candidate on the recommendation of Academic and Administrative Committee of the department.
- (c) A student who is awarded the scholarship should not be getting any financial grant from any other source.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 23)

I-58. That the Vice-Chancellor has allowed to close the Account No.2845101000871 related to seminar/ conference etc. opened in Canara Bank, Sector-14, as no expenditure is being made out of this account and the balance of the said account be transferred to Non-Plan Budget.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(ix))

I-59. That –

- (i) an additional sum of Rs.9,88,682/- (Rupees Nine Lacs eighty eight thousand six hundred eighty two only) donated by Dr. Bhavender Pal Sharma, USA, on behalf of Class 1969 batch for the award of four Scholarships @ Rs.500/-p.m. each for 10 months to the students of Department of Chemical Engineering & Technology P.U., be allowed to be invested in the shape of TDR @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year in the State Bank of India, P.U., Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust (SET) Fund Account No. 10444978140, to enable to disburse the payment of scholarship well in time.
- (ii) as requested by the donor, the proposed amendments in the terms and conditions (1 and 2) already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 17.08.2014 (Para 29), be made:

Existing Terms and Conditions	Proposed Terms and Conditions
<p>1. The scholarship be known as “Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship”.</p> <p>2. Four scholarships be paid one each for under-graduate classes of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year of University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology (UICET), on merit-cum-means basis @ Rs.1500/- p.m. each for 10 months.</p> <p>3. The applicant must have cleared all of his/her immediate past semesters Examinations with at least 60 % marks. There should be no backlog from the immediate past semesters. The student’s family income should be no more than Rs.3 Lakhs per year.</p> <p>4 The student should be willing to perform at least 10 hours of Volunteer work of his/her choice. A few examples are as follows but the student is free to perform any positive service to society:</p> <p>a. Volunteer work at the UICET library.</p> <p>b. Volunteer tutoring of Klin worker’s children near the University.</p>	<p>1. Three scholarships be known as “Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship” and three be known as “Amrit Kaur Scholarship”.</p> <p>2. Total six scholarships be paid two of each of the 2nd , 3rd , 4th year Chemical Engineering to undergraduate students (including those with the combined MBA program) on merit-cum-means basis @ Rs.2000/-p.m. each for 10 months.</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p>

<p>c. Volunteer work at the University Library.</p> <p>d. Volunteer work for activities such as a community clean up or off campus.</p> <p>e. Volunteer work at the Sector 25 Government School.</p> <p>f. Tutoring of one or more children from very poor families such as the unorganized sector.</p> <p>g. Any service to help the poor of the society.</p>	
<p>5. The student has to complete the volunteer work by February 28. A one page summary of the volunteer work needs to be e-mailed to Indian Schools Alumni & Friends, USA (INSAF) at sharma7336@gmail.com with a copy to the UICET Chairperson at DCET@PU.ac.in by March 10 of every year.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>6. Upon timely submission of the volunteer work summary, the scholarship recipient will be awarded the Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship Certificate by March 31.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>7. The recipient of this scholarship will be free to accept to any other scholarships.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>8. Professor S.K. Sharma is nominated to be a representative on the scholarship administration committee.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>9. The scholarships will be awarded on the recommendations of a committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 39)

I-60. That an endowment of Rs.10,00,000/- (Rs.8 lac for Founder's Day Colloquium function and Rs.2 lac for Award of Medals) be accepted for institution of Endowment in the name of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge for Founder's Day Colloquium and Award of Medals, with the following terms and conditions:

A Founder's Day Colloquium (Rs.8 lac)

- (i) only 50% of the interest earned on the above said amount be used for this purpose and the rest be left for growth of the fund.

(ii) A colloquium Function at the Dental Institute be organized every year in the month of November to all students of all courses.

(iii) If any payment is to be made, all rules and regulations of Panjab University be observed.

Guest Speaker at the Colloquium, who come from far away places/foreign be provided accommodation at P.U. Guest House for one week duration, if required/needed.

(iv) The function be not clubbed with any other function of the Institute.

(v) Announcement of the function be made in the University news as well as in the newspapers via a University Press release.

B Award of Medals

(i) only 50% of the interest earned on the above said amount be used for this purpose and the rest be left for growth of the fund.

(ii) The name of the awards be "Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital Awards."

(iii) The Awards/Certificate could be named- Vice-Chancellor's Medal/Certificate Principal's Medal/Certificate Dental Surgeons of the Year.

Or similar acceptable/suitable titles (but three different names of the three awards to the three different individual candidates)

(iv) These be consolation awards for the next three final year's students on graduation, who could not get the Gold Medal with the following conditions:

(a) Performance and behavior is certified to be satisfactory by the Principal of the Institute

(b) The candidate is among the top ten percent (10%) in the final year results.

(c) The candidate must have minimum ninety percent (90%) attendance in each of the four year of BDS Course.

(d) The candidate must have passed all the examinations during the four years of the BDS course in Dentistry in first attempts.

(e) The candidates have to attend the Institute Founder's Day Function to receive the Award/Certificate.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 51)

I-61. That the Vice-Chancellor, has accepted the additional donation of Rs.1,00,000/- (One lac only) made by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No.362, Sector-9, Panchkula, for purchase of books/scholarship/tuition fee, to the needy/poor students, out of Student Aid Fund Account.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 65(x))

I-62. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) accepted an endowment of Rs.5,00,000/- made by Professor Brij Mohan Arora, Department of Electrical Engineering, IIT Bombay, Powai, Mumbai, in the name of Hari Ram Arora and Bhajan Kaur Arora Medals for Best Paper Awards in the Science subjects for young researchers (Students, Post-docs, Faculty) up to the age of 38 years and has also allowed the office to invest the said amount in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the SET A/c No. 10444978140.
- (ii) approved the guidelines for institution of the above said award.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xx))

I-63. That the temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh for: (i) M.Sc. (Microbial Biotechnology) I & II -40 seats each class; and (ii) M.Sc. (Biotechnology)-I & II seats each class for the session 2015-16.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 31)

I-64. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of Administrative Committee of Computer Centre, Panjab University, that w.e.f. July 27, 2016, the Computer Centre, Panjab University, be renamed as **“A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Computer Centre, Panjab University”**.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 48(xxv))

I-65. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Dr. H.S. Gour Vishwavidyalaya SAGAR (MP).

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xix))

I-66. That the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, U.S.O.L. will continue to perform the duties of academic In-charge of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies as she is introducing a new two year M.A. programme. However, the DUI will be the Administrative head of the Guru Nanak Sikh Studies.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(x))

I-67. That the Vice-Chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, as Principal on contract basis for a term of two years w.e.f. 01.07.2016 at GGSDS College, Haryana, District Hoshiarpur.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(xii))

I-68. That the Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the Govt. College of Commerce & Business Administration being run in the temporary building in Sector-42, Chandigarh be shifted to permanent building at Sector-50, Chandigarh.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(xiii))

I-69. That the Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016/ 14.03.2016 (Para 42), has accepted the recommendation dated 17.06.2016 of Chairperson, Department of Mathematics for discontinuation of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics and Computing in the Department of Mathematics, P.U., from the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 Para 49(xxviii))

I-70. That instructions be issued to all the affiliated Colleges to hold the interviews for appointment of teachers/Principal in the premises of the College concerned, so that the person must know where he/she is going to work.

(Syndicate dated 31.7.2016 General discussion (9))

I-71. To note that the allegation of the complaints viz. Shri Baldev Singh and Shri S.S. Randhawa, Ex-Principal, SGGs Khalsa College, Mahilpur, made in their complaints respectively, addressed to the Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), Jaipur are unfounded especially with regard to the University being a league with the College Management and it is prudent to append the following documents as a part of reply to the NCTE, New Delhi, pursuant to letter No. F.38-5(26)/2014-15/NCTE/ TE/CDN8040 dated 26.06.2015 received from Under Secretary, NCTE, New Delhi:

1. Fee Transfer
2. Students Return
3. Inspection Reports

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 65(xi))

I-72. That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation approval of the Syndicate has granted Special chance/Golden/Mercy chance, to the students of Undergraduate/Postgraduate courses including professional courses to clear their reappear(s) compartment exams/Improvement of performance/Deficient subject in the examination to be held in June 2016. The examination fee for the special chance would be Rs.10,000/- for Postgraduate students per class and Rs.5000/- for Undergraduate students per class.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 64(xxi))

I-73. That temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital, Sector-26, Chandigarh for B.H.M.S. course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 50 (fifty students per year) for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the CCH and will make admission in the courses/subject thereafter.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 53)

I-74. That temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32 B, Chandigarh for –

- (i) M.D. (Obst. And Gynaecology) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 06 (six students per year) for the session 2016-17, subject to

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

- (ii) M.D. (Radiodiagnosis) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 06 (six students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.
- (iii) M.S. (ENT) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 03 (three students per year) course for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.
- (iv) M.D. (Ophthalmology) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 05 (five students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.
- (v) M.D. (Community Medicine) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 05 (five students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

(Syndicate dated 27.2.2016/14.3.2016 Para 54)

I-75. To note the contents of letters/email received from the following with regard to accept of Chair Professorship:

- (i) letter dated 26.03.2016 received through Email dated 27.3.2016 of Dr. Manmohan Singh, Former Prime Minister of India,
- (ii) Email dated 16.03.2016 of Professor Yoginder K. Alagh.
- (iii) Email dated 25.03.2016 of Ms. Ela Bhatt.
- (iv) letter dated 23.03.2016 of Shri Gulzar.
- (v) Email dated 07.04.2016 of Shri Kailash Satyarthi.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(i))

I-76. That the Vice-Chancellor has ratified the template for the post of Principals in P.U. constituent Colleges.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(viii))

I-77. That the Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the:

- (i) Student Medical Fund Account No.10444978457, be merged to Non-Plan Budget, and the last

available balance, be transferred to Non Plan Account.

- (ii) Expenditure for the payment of Medicines which is to be provided to the Health Centre for the students, be made from Non-Plan Budget by creating a budget for the same.
- (iii) Cash Book of the Student Medical Fund A/c No. 10444978457 be closed accordingly and in future the fee under this head be deposited in current account.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(x))

I-78. To note the contents of the letter dated 06.04.2016 received from Shri Satish Kumar, Under Secretary, University Grant Commission, New Delhi, with regard to observations of Local Audit Department of UT Administration on the recent promotions made by Panjab University under CAS.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xv))

I-79. That –

- (i) the proposal of the Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI) for institution of “Signature Award Gold Medal” to be given to the topper of the University examination of Bachelor’s degree (B.Com.) in the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce as per be approved.
- (ii) the draft agreement for the above-said purpose between the Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI) and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 87)

I-80. To note letter dated 29.02.2016 of the Superintendent(A), Government Rehabilitation Institute for Intellectual Disabilities that Chandigarh Administration vide orders dated 14.08.2015 has changed the name of Regional Institution for Mentally Handicapped, Sector-31 Chandigarh to that of Government Rehabilitation Institute for Intellectual Disabilities (GRIID), Sector-31, Chandigarh with immediate effect.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xxiii))

I-81. That the Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the roll numbers of the students of the ongoing B.Ed. course, G.M.T. College of Education, Jalandhar Bye-Pass Chowk, Ludhiana, be issued as an interim measure keeping in view of the academic interest of the students, as requested by the Chairman of the College vide letter dated 08.05.2016.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 118(xxiv))

I-82. To ratify the decision of the Vice Chancellor, that the full rent (100%) from the shops at Student Centre/Hostels and Departmental Canteens be deposited in the Centrally Operated Estate Fund Account from 2015-16 onwards. The maintenance expenditure of these shops/areas would be met out of the income of Estate Fund.

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xx))

- I-83.** That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32-B, Chandigarh, for the following courses along with No. of seats for the session 2017-18, subject to 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 (General Medicine)	09
2.	MD (General Surgery)	06
3.	MD (Paediatrics)	07
4.	MD (Anaesthesia)	12
5.	MD (Psychiatry)	04
6.	MS (ENT)	03
7.	MD (Dermatology)	03
8.	MS (Orthopaedics)	06

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 117(xxiii))

- I-84.** That the following proposed rates and Honorarium for the Senate Election to be held in the month of September 2016, be approved:

Sr. No.	Item	Rates in the Senate Election, 2012	Proposed rates for 2016
1.	Processing Booth-wise	Rs.0.50 per entry	Rs.0.50 per entry
2.	Proof Reading	Rs.1.00 per entry for two persons	Rs.1.50 per entry for two persons
3.	Checking of eligibility by Superintendent/ A.R.	Rs.0.75 per form	Rs.1.50 per form
4.	Sale of C.D. relating to District-wise vote list	Rs.100/- per C.D.	Rs.200/- per C.D.
5.	Fixed Honorarium to the D.R. & A.R.	Rs.10,000/-	Rs.12,500/-
6.	Fixed Honorarium to the Superintendents (S)	Rs.8,000/-	Rs.10,000/-

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 45)

- I-85.** That the following proposed rates of voter's lists for the Senate Election-2016, be approved:

Sr. No	Constituency	Price in 2012	Proposed rate for 2016
1.	Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	50 paise per page subject to minimum of Rs.30/-	Rs.1/- per page subject to minimum of Rs.40/-
2.	Readers and Lecturers on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	-do-	-do-
3.	Staff of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
4.	Professors, Sr. Lecturers and Lecturers of Affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-

5.	District wise Voter's List	-do-	-do-
6.	Registered Graduates Register	-do-	-do-
7.	Principals of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
8.	Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-

(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 46)

I-86. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 20.4.2015 the Committee has granted temporary extension of affiliation to Kalgidhar Institute of Higher Education, Kingra Road, Near Danewala Chowk, Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib for B.Ed. Course-1st year (Two Units i.e. 100 seats) for the session 2015-16, subject to fulfillment of the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report dated 06.11.2015 and also send the authentic proof of the same to this office immediately.

I-87. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 20.4.2015 the Committee has granted temporary extension of affiliation to Sadhbavana College of Education for Women, Jalaldiwal, Raikot, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab) for (i) B.Ed. Course (1st year)-200 seats & (ii) M.Ed. course 1st year (50 seats) for the session 2015-16.

I-88. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 20.4.2015 the Committee has, granted temporary extension of affiliation for M.Ed. Course 1st year (50 seats) to Babe-Ke College of Education, V.P.O. Dhaudhar, Tehsil & District -Moga (Pb.) for the session 2015-16.

I-89. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 20.4.2015 (Appendix) the Committee has granted temporary extension of affiliation for M.Ed. Course 1st year (50 seats) to Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial College of Education, V.P.O., Dhudike, Tehsil & District -Moga (Pb.) for the session 2015-16.

I-90. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 56), the Committee in its various meetings, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses/subjects the session 2016-17, as under:

Sr. No.	Date of the meeting of the Committee	Name of the College	Name of the Courses/ subjects
1.	17.06.2016	Baba Kundan Singh Memorial Law College, Jalalabad (East), Dharmkot, Distt. Moga.	LL.B. 3 years course 60 seats B.A. LL.B. (Hons.)- 5 years integrated course-60 seats, B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) -5 years integrated course 60 seats, Advance Diploma in Labour Law-60 seats and Advance Diploma in Taxation-60 seats
<p>NOTE: 1. The College has also been informed that above temporary extension of affiliation is subject to the appointment of two Assistant Professors (one in Law & one in Commerce) on regular basis and also appoint a qualified Librarian/ Assistant Librarian on regular basis and also appoint a qualified</p>			

			<p>Librarian/Assistant Librarian on regular basis. Further subject to the approval of BCI and NOC from the Punjab Govt. for starting the above said new courses i.e. B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.)-5 years integrated course-60 seats, Advanced Diploma in Labour Law-60 seats and Advance Diploma in Taxation-60 seats.</p> <p>2. The Principal of the College has further been advised not to make admissions in the above said three new courses for the session 2016-17, without prior approval of the BCI and NOC from the Punjab Govt.</p>
2.	17.06.2016	New proposed College namely - Sai College of Education, Sardulapur, District Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. 1 st year (100 seats) Subject to fulfillment of all the conditions, if any, as per UGC/NCTE/Pb. Govt./Panjab University, Chandigarh.
3.	17.06.2016	J.D. College of Education, Bathinda Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.).	B.Ed.-1 st year- (Two units i.e. 100 seats)
		<p>NOTE: The Principal of the college has been advised that college should appoint 05 more Assistant Professors upto 31.07.2016 as per the requirement of the NCTE Regulations-2104. Otherwise temporary extension of affiliation to B.Ed. 2nd year for the session 2016-17 will not be granted.</p>	
4.	15.07.2016	Govt. College, Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.).	(i) B.Com. II & III (Additional One unit each) (ii) PGDCA-40 seats (iii) B.C.A. I, II & III (One unit each) & (iv) M.Sc. I & II (Mathematics)-one unit each and also granted new course i.e. (v) B.B.A-1-one unit & (vi) B.Sc.1-Agriculture-one unit Subject to condition that the college shall pay full salary to the teachers as per PU/UGC norms.
		<p>NOTE: Further college has also been advised not to make admissions in additional unit of B.Com. I for the session 2016-17, as the college has withdrawn this course.</p>	
5.	02.07.2016	Government College of Arts, Sector 10, Chandigarh.	(i) M.F.A. 1 st & 2 nd year and (ii) Special Advance Diploma in fine Arts for Hearing and Speech impart and Mentally Challenged persons Subject to the condition to appoint regular Principal appoint permanent qualified faculty for the students admitted under the

Senate Proceedings dated 9th October 2016

			Hearing and Speech impaired quota and also to fill sanctioned vacant faculty positions in the College on permanent basis.
6.	02.07.2016	Government Home Science College, Sector-10, Chandigarh.	Post Graduate Diploma in Child Guidance & Family Counseling
7.	02.07.2016	Chandigarh College of Engineering & Technology, Sector-26, Chandigarh.	(i) B.E. (Computer Science & Engineering)-60 seats (ii) B.E. (Electronics & Communication Engineering)-60 seats (iii) B.E. (Civil Engineering)-60 seats & (iv) B.E. (Mechanical Engineering)-60 seats
8.	02.07.2016	Government College of Commerce & Business Administration, Sector 50, Chandigarh.	(i) B.Com. I, II & III (ii) B.B.A. I, II & III & (iii) M.Com. I & II
9.	15.07.2016	DAV Post Graduate College, Sector-10, Chandigarh	(i) B.Com. 2 nd (5 th unit) (ii) B.A.-II (Computer Science-E) (iii) M.Com. II (2 nd unit) (iv) M.A. II (Economics)-one unit & (v) B.A.-1 st year (Women Studies-E)
NOTE: Further the college has been requested to provide the statements of salaries being paid to the teachers to confirm that the college is paying salaries as per P.U. norms.			
10.	15.07.2016	MCM DAV College for Women, Sector-36, Chandigarh	(i) B.Sc.-III (Microbial & Food Technology) (2 nd Unit) (ii) B.Com-III (4 th unit) (iii) M.Sc.-II (Mathematics) (iv) M.Sc.-II (Chemistry) & (v) B.A.-II (Police Administration)
11.	15.07.2016	Goswami Ganesh Dutt Sanatant Dharam College, Sector-32, Chandigarh	(i) M.A. I (English), (ii) M.Com. I (2 nd unit) & (iii) B.Com. 3 rd (5 th unit)
12.	02.07.2016	Post Graduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh.	(i) M.Phil.-Physical Education (ii) M.Sc. Chemistry-I & II Year (iii) M.P.Ed. I & II year (iv) M.A. Punjabi I & II year (v) B.Sc. Microbiology (Elective)-I, II & III (vi) B.Sc. Biotechnology (Elective)- I, II & III & (vii) BCA-I, II & III (2 nd unit) & (viii) BBA-I, II & III (2 nd unit)
13.	15.07.2016	C.G.M. College, Village-Mohlan, Tehsil-Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Sc. I, II & III (Agriculture)-40 seats each, B.A.I, II & III English (C), Punjabi (C & E), Sociology, Hindi, Political Science, History, Physical Education and Economics, B.A. I, II & III (Computer Application) 40 seats each, B.A. III (Music-Vocal) 15 seats, M.A. I & II

			(Sociology) (one unit each), M.A. I & II (Hindi) (one unit each) Subject to the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committees in its report dated 8.4.2015 for the session 2015-16 and dated 29.4.2016 for the session 2016-17. Further the college has been advised to pay salaries to the staff members as per P.U. norms.
<p>NOTE: 1. The college has not complied with certain conditions, the committee has regretted its inability to grant temporary affiliation in the new courses i.e. B.A. I (Mathematics), B.Com. I, B.Sc. I (Medical), B.Sc. I (Non-Medical), M.A. I (History) and M.A. I. (Punjabi) for the session 2016-17.</p> <p>2. The Principal of the college has already been requested to deposit balance affiliation fee of Rs. 70,000/- and affiliation fee of Rs.6,000/- along with late fee of Rs. One lac vide this office letter No. Misc./A-4/2970 dated 25.03.2016 and letter No. Misc. No./A-4/4138 dated 28.04.2016 but the college has not sent the same, till date, so the Principal of the college has again been requested to deposit balance affiliation fee of Rs. 70,000/- and affiliation fee of Rs. 6,000/- along with late fee of Rs. One lac, immediately.</p>			
14.	15.07.2016	Mai Bhago College for Women, V.P.O. Ramgarh Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Com. 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd year (1 unit) Subject to the condition that the College will follow the other instructions/ guidelines with regard to salary as per UGC/PU norms and should pay salary to the teachers strictly as per UGC/PU norms.
15.	23.08.2016	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College Sukhanand, Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.A. III (Fashion Designing-40 seats), B.A. I, II & III (Computer Applications), B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit each), M.Sc. I & II (IT) (one unit each), B.A. II (Fine Arts), B.Sc. I & II (Non-medical)-Computer Applications (one unit each) and new courses i.e. M.Com. I (one unit), M.Sc.I (Mathematics) (one unit)
<p>NOTE: The Committee has further decided that the College be given time for admissions to new courses i.e. M.Sc. I (Mathematics) and</p>			

M.Com. 1 st year upto 10.09.2016 by charging Rs. 2040/- as late fee with permission of the Vice-Chancellor.			
16.	15.07.2016	Guru Nanak National College, Doraha, Distt. Ludhiana	B.Com. 1 st year (3 rd unit) and (ii) M.Sc. 1 st year (Physics)- one unit with the condition that salary to the following four teachers will be paid at par with other teachers of the College: Ms. Kulwinder Karu, Ms. Nidhi Saroop, Ms. Dipali and Mrs. Sonia are not being paid the D.A. as per norms.
<p>NOTE: The College has been requested to pay salary and D.A. to the teachers as per P.U. norms. The College has also withdrawn its request to start M.A. I (Music)-Vocal from the session 2016-17. However, the committee granted extension of temporary affiliation for the courses (i) B.Com. 1st year (3rd unit) and (ii) M.Sc. 1st year (Physics)-one unit for the session 2016-17.</p>			
17.	02.07.2016	GHG Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Distt. Ludhiana	B.A. 3 rd year (Music-Vocal) E, B.Com. 3 rd year (2 nd unit) and BBA 3 rd year (one unit) Subject to the condition that the following named teachers should also be paid salary at par with other teachers of the College with immediate effect i.e. starting from the month of July 2016 under confirmation to the University, failing which, the University will have constrained to take appropriate steps against the college as per the University regulations related to the affiliated Colleges: (i) Ms. Priyanka Singh (ii) Ms. Preeti Saini (iii) Ms. Shelka (iv) Ms. Jagkiran Kaur (v) Ms. Anuradha Bhandari (vi) Ms. Amandeep Sharma (vii) Ms. Gurvir Kaur (viii) Ms. Satinder Kaur

NOTE: The Committee has regretted its inability to acceded to the request of the College for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for new courses i.e. B.A. I (Fine Arts) (E)			
18.		Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh	(i) M.Sc. –Zoology I & II (40 seats) subject to fulfillment of the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee. (ii) The College is also granted temporary extension of affiliation for M.Sc. (Chemistry) I-25 seats subject to fulfillment conditions.
NOTE: 1. The Principal has also informed that Process of appointment on regular basis be initiated immediately and categorically be informed that college will not be permitted for admission to M.Sc. 2 nd in the session 2017-18, failure of any compliance and; 2.to send the appointment letter/s of the teachers, so appointed along with joining report/s.			
19.	23.08.2016	Sant Majha Singh Karamjot College for Women, Miani, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.C.A.-I, II & III (one unit) (ii) M.A.-I & II (Punjabi)-60 seats (iii) B.Com. I, II & III (one unit) for each year and (iv) M.A. I & II (Music Vocal)-60 seats, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
20.	23.08.2016	MBBGRGC Girls College, Mansowal Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.A. III (Sociology) subject to the conditions that the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
21.	15.07.2016	DAV College for Women, Garhshankar Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Com. I (One unit), subject to the conditions that the College shall appoint one regular faculty member as per

			recommendations of the Inspection Committee and pay salaries to all the staff members as per Panjab University norms.
22.	23.08.2016	GTB Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.A. II (Fashion Designing), subject to conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
23.	23.08.2016	S.G.G.S. Khalsa College Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) BCA-I, II & III (One unit for each year) and M.Sc. I & II (I.T.)-40 seats for each year (ii) B.P.Ed. I & II (50 seats) each and D.P.Ed-II 50 seats (iii) M.Sc.-1 (Mathematics 20 additional seats i.e. 40 to 60), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
24.	23.08.2016	Sant Hari Singh College for Women, Chella- Makhsuspur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A.I, II and III English (General & Elective), Hindi, Economics, Political Science, History, Punjabi (General & Elective), Home Science, Computer Science, Physical Education, (ii) BCA-I, II and III (One unit), and (iii) B.Com. I, II and III (one unit), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
25.	23.08.2016	S.D. College, Hoshiarpur	B.C.A- I, II & III (one unit for each year) and B.B.A. I, II & III (One unit for each year), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed

			out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
26.	15.07.2016	Government College, Hoshiarpur	(i) B.Sc. (Agriculture)-4 years course and (ii) B.C.A. I, II and III (one unit)
27.	23.08.2016	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College of Education, V.P.O. Sukhanand Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 st year & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
28.	23.08.2016	Bawa Nihal Singh B.Ed. College, Bawa Nihal Singh Street Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (Three units i.e. 150 seats each), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of temporary extension of affiliation will stand withdrawn.
<p>NOTE: The Principal of the College is required to submit the approval of the NCTE regarding three units in B.Ed. course instead of four units already granted by the NCTE vide its letter dated 20.05.2015. Further the College is also required to send the copy of undertaking in which principal have requested to the NCTE to decrease the units of B.Ed. course from Four units to Three units given to NCTE, be sent to the University immediately. The College is required to deposit balance affiliation fee of Rs.2000/-.</p>			
29.	23.08.2016	Govt. College (Girls) Jalalabad(W), Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	(i) B.A. I, II & III (Physical Education, Political Science, History, Mathematics, Economics, English (Elective), Punjabi (Elective)) (ii) B.Com. I, II and III (one unit), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as

			pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
--	--	--	---

NOTE: A Committee comprising Shri Ashok Goyal (Chairman), Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Principal B.C. Josan, Shri Raghbir Dyal, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Principal S.S. Sangha, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and D.R. Colleges (Convener) constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 56) to check the inspection report/s thoroughly and verify their compliance/s and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, has granted/not granted affiliation/extension of affiliation to the above colleges.

I-91. That Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh has allowed to admit 40 students in M.Sc. I (Chemistry) instead of 25 for the session 2016-17, keeping in view the circular No. Misc. 8105-8224 dated 29.06.2012 and also the discussion in the Syndicate meeting held on 31.07.2016.

I-92. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.05.2016 (Para 56) the Committee has advised the Principal Maharaja Ranjit Singh College Burjan Bye Pass Malout Abohar Road Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib not to make admissions in the 1st year of the following courses for the session 2016-17 as the college has failed to fully complied with conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee even for the session 2015-16:

- (i) B.A. I English (C &E), Political Science, Mathematics, Physical Education, Public Administration and Computer Application
- (ii) B.Com. I
- (iii) B.C.A. I
- (iv) P.G.D.C.A.
- (v) B.Sc. I (Agriculture)

NOTE: The Principal of the College was requested to deposit of late of fee of Rs. 1 lac vide letter dated 23.3.2016 followed by reminder dated 12.4.2016 but the college has not deposit the same and has again been requested to deposit the said late fee immediately.

I-93. That the Vice Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the Syndicate, has granted temporary affiliation to new proposed College namely – Rayat-Bahra College of Law, Bohan, District Hoshairpur for B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 1st year (5 years integrated course) -120 seats for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College shall submit the building plan duly approved by the Chief Town Planner, Punjab and shall appoint the teaching staff as per recommendations of the Inspection Committee.

- I-94.** That the nomenclature of the College mentioned at Sr. No. 5 in Senate proceeding dated 5.12.2015 (Para XLII)(I-13) be read as under:

Existing	Proposed
Mata Baljinder Kaur Memorial Educational Society, Jalal Road V.P.O.- Samadh Bhai, Distt. Moga	Mata Baljinder Kaur Memorial Kaler International College, V.P.O.- Samadh Bhai, Distt. Moga

NOTE: The name of the College was mentioned in the Senate proceeding dated 5.12.2015 Para XLII pursuant to letter dated 12.10.2015 issued by the D.R. College. But the Principal of the College has pointed out that the correction be made in the name of the College.

- I-95.** To note the detail of payment of Honorarium and TA/DA to the members of the Committee constituted in respect of the case of paper leakage Three year LL.B. Entrance Test is as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Member	Financial Year	Honorarium	TA/DA
1.	Justice B.B. Parsoon	2015-16 & 2016-17	Nil	Nil
2.	Shri I.S. Chadha	2014-15 & 2016-17	Nil	Rs.1400/- Rs. 2000/- Rs.800/-
3.	Professor D.V.S. Jain	2015-16 & 2016-17	Nil	Nil
4.	Shri V.K. Sibal	2015-16 & 2016-17	Nil	Rs.800/- Rs.800/-
5.	Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari	2015-16 & 2016-17	Nil	Rs.1000/- Rs.1000/-

Justice Anand, Enquiry Officer regarding the enquiry case of Dr. Neelam Paul:

Total 14 sitting @ Rs.1725/- per sitting.

Honorarium Paid = Rs.24150/-

TA/DA = Nil

- I-96.** To note the document titled "The Panjab University: Its origin progression and financial requirements for its sustenance" (Appendix) submitted to the MHRD.

When Professor Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice Chancellor to let him go through the items of information, the Vice Chancellor said that he could come to him and he would attend to the issue. When Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is technical, the Vice Chancellor said that he would attend to his concern and there would be no issue at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would also like to say something, but if he (Vice Chancellor) thinks that he could say the same to him afterwards, he has no objection in doing so.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would attend to their concerns in the interest of the University as well as the individual(s).

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he would like to speak on **Sub-Item I-(38)**.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would attend to his (Dr. Randhawa) concern. He said that since he has sought authorization from the House to attend to their concerns, he assured that he would see that injustice is not done to anyone.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that there is an item relating to Professor Naval Kishore, former Dean, College Development Council.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he would talk to him (Vice Chancellor) on this issue later on. When Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Vice Chancellor) could not bring that item for information, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the item relating to Professor Naval Kishore is to be brought for consideration as it is the mandate of the Court, and that is what he wanted to bring to his (Vice Chancellor) notice.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if they wanted, they could see the item right now.

To this, Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that if the item pointed out by Professor Keshav Malhotra is to be seen, then several members wish to speak on Item I-(38).

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that, previous day also, they had suggested that the charge of Dean, College Development Council should be given to somebody else and the Controller of Examinations should be relieved from the additional responsibility.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that they have finished the job assigned to this Senate. As such, the new Senate does not come with a baggage. When he arrived four years ago, there was a huge baggage. In the first two meetings, they had around 130 items and they have to have two very-very long sittings.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that so far as item I-38 is concerned, it should be noted that nowhere, including in any of the University, reservation is there in promotions. Reservation is only at the initial stage and the same is being given here also. Therefore, this item should not be ratified/noted under any circumstances, and if need be, it should be checked whether reservation is there in promotions.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay, fine".

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to the suggestion made by Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu that it should be checked whether reservation is there in promotions, enquired as to what would they do after checked the same.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu clarified that the reservation would not be provided in promotions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is what he wants to say.

The Vice Chancellor said that this Item, i.e., I-(38) come back to the new Senate for re-consideration. He further said that those items, against which concerns would be conveyed to him by the members, would be taken to the next Senate.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in the Items for Information, against which no written objection(s) is received from the members, be treated as noted, and the

items, against which written concerns/objections are received from the members, including **Item I-(38)**, be placed before the next Senate.

At this stage Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is the last meeting of the Senate and they do not know, who would be nominated to the next Senate and who not. So, through the Vice Chancellor, he would like to express his apology with folded hands before all of them if he had ever hurt anybody's sentiments during the last four years, which includes Vice Chancellor also.

(Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.))
Registrar

Confirmed

(Professor Arun Kumar Grover)
Vice-Chancellor