

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Saturday, 8th October 2016 at 10.00 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice-Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Professor Anil Monga
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
6. Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi
7. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
8. Professor Emanuel Nahar
9. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
10. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
11. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
12. Professor Keshav Malhotra
13. Professor Navdeep Goyal
14. Shri Raghbir Dyal
15. Dr. Shelley Walia
16. Col. G.S. Chadha Registrar ... (Secretary)

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha, Shri Jitender Yadav, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

- i) Smt. Satya Bhama, mother of Prof. Promila Pathak, Deptt. of Botany & President, PUTA, on September 10, 2016.
- ii) Prof. Jagjit Singh (Retd.), Department of Punjabi, PU, on September 16, 2016.
- iii) Shri Biru Ram Pathak, father of Prof. Promila Pathak, Deptt. of Botany & President, PUTA, on September 29, 2016.
- iv) Shri Parveen Gupta, Senior Scientific Officer, CIL, PU, on August 25, 2016.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Smt. Satya Bhama, Prof. Jagjit Singh, Shri Biru Ram Pathak, Shri Parveen Gupta and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- i) Professor S. K. Sharma, Fellow, Panjab University and former Dean University Instruction, PU, has been nominated as member to the Advisory Committee on Trade & Environment by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India.
- ii) Professor Ronki Ram, Dean (Arts Faculty) and Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Science has joined as ICCR Chair Professor of Indian Studies at Ryukoku University, Kyoto, Japan, from September 2016 for one Semester.
- iii) Professor B.S. Ghuman, Department of Public Administration, has been co-opted as member of the Senate by the Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar for the term from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018.
- iv) Prof. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Fellow, Panjab University and Chairman, UIPS, PU, has been selected for Honorary Membership of the Academic Union, Oxford and the Club of Rectors, CRE, UK, by the Academic Union Council and the Oxford Summit of Leaders Organizing Committee of Europe Business Assembly EBA, Oxford, UK. He has also been invited to join the Summit of Leaders to be held on December 20, 2016 at UK.
- v) Dr. Devi Sirohi, Professor re-employed, at present on leave, Department of History and currently Chairperson of Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights, has been bestowed upon the prestigious Rashtriya Gaurav Award for meritorious services, outstanding performance and remarkable role by the Indian International Friendship Society.
- vi) Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Fellow, Panjab University, Deptt. of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, has been honoured with 'Vidya Shri Award' by the Readers and Writers' Society on 30th September 2016 for her valuable contribution in the field of Education, Administration and Literature.
- vii) Professor Nandita Singh, Fellow, Panjab University and Department of Education, has been honoured with 'Vidya Shri Award' by the Readers and Writers' Society on 30th September 2016 for her valuable contribution in the field of Education and Administration.
- viii) Dr. Shipra Gupta and Dr. Devinder Preet Singh of Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital have been honoured by the Indian Dentist Research and Review Association (IDDR) with coveted 'Golden Tooth – Outstanding Young Dentist of the Year 2016' award for their contribution in non-dental fields besides contributing towards the dental fraternity and society in their respective specialties. They became the first Periodontist and

Orthodontist, respectively, from our region to receive the award.

- ix) Prof. Ramanjit Kaur Johal has been selected for the 2016 Fulbright-Nehru International Education Administrators Seminar for a period of two weeks in the Washington D.C. Metro area and North Carolina.
- x) Professor Meenakshi Goyal, Chairperson, Dr S. S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, has been selected for Bharat Vikas Award by the Institute of Self Reliance, Bhubaneswar, for her outstanding contribution to the society. The Award shall be conferred on her on 10th December 2016 on the occasion of World Human Rights Day.
- xi) Government of India, Ministry of Science & Technology, Department of Science & Technology, shall provide financial assistance of Rs.58,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty eight lakh) for the project entitled "Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) Upgrade, Operation and Utilization under the guidance of Dr. Sunil Bansal, Department of Applied Sciences in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), for a period of three years, i.e., up to 31st March, 2019.
- xii) Halka Incharge of Guru Har Sahai, has sanctioned an amount of Rs.3,00,000/- (Rupees Three lakh only) through Joint Secretary, Distt. Planning Board, Ferozepur, for commissioning of Water Treatment Plant in the Panjab University Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai.
- xiii) Panjab University won 4 Gold Medals, 1 Silver medal and 1 bronze medal in the World University Shooting Championship held at Poland from 14-18 September, 2016. Ms Vinita Bhardwaj won two Gold Medals, viz., in the Air Rifle Women Individual and Air Rifle Women Team.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the appreciation of the Syndicate would be sent to all of them.

Shri Ashok Goyal, while referring to the Vice-Chancellor statement, said that he had three observations. One is related with Sr. No. (iii) as what is the status of Professor B.S. Ghuman.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Ghuman) is a re-employed Professor.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should have been mentioned as in the case of the other persons and suggested that necessary corrections be made.

Referring to Sr. No. (xii), Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is this designation of Halka Incharge?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had no idea and this information had come from the Principal at Guru Har Sahai.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this Halka Incharge would be appointed by a political party as Halka Incharge of that political party which is not accepted by any Government body. So, if on records of the University, they accept somebody with the designation of Halka Incharge, that would not be a good thing. Instead, they could mention the name of the person who has contributed this money. This should also be corrected after getting the information from the Principal.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Shri Ashok Goyal is saying right, a person who has lost the election as MLA, he/she is made Halka Incharge.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the name of the Halka Incharge had not been provided as yet.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this would be highlighted if they appreciate the Halka Incharge which would be giving the recognition to a non-existent designation which is not even given by Government. He clarified that a Halka Incharge is a substitute of sitting MLA. If a party in power did not have an MLA from a constituency, instead of recognizing the MLA, they appoint to substitute the MLA as Halka Incharge.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has understood it now, it came from the Principal N.R. Sharma, a Fellow and he did not ask him about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the necessary corrections be made.

Referring to Sr.No. (ix), Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the title of the seminar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the seminar is going to be held in Washington D.C. in North Carolina.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this needs to be corrected because Washington D.C. itself is a very big town and North Carolina is a State.

While referring to the sudden demise of Shri Parveen Gupta, Senior Scientific Officer, C.I.L., Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that he was about 45 years of age. His family met him (Shri Lucky) and the family is quite anguished as nobody from the Department went on the cremation or on the Bhog day. He requested that the compassionate appointment be given to the dependent who must have done graduation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had met and talked to the family and they would provide every possible help in consultation with the Director.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know the details of the case as this was highlighted in the media also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he came to know that he (late Shri Parveen Gupta) had passed away suddenly. When the wife of late Shri Parveen Gupta came to him, he listened to her and felt that someone who was a Senior Scientific Officer, which is equivalent to the teaching position of Assistant Professor, is as important to the

University as the teachers for sustaining the research. He personally felt that Scientific Officers should have career advancement scheme parallel to that of the teachers. Those persons are a specialized cadre, if the University wants to retain and use them, they must also do something that these persons also feel that they are an integral part of the University. Before he completes his term, he would like to have a promotion policy for this cadre. There should be a promotion policy for the Scientific Officers and the Scientific Assistants as some people did not join in the officer class but they would gradually move to the officer class by way of assured promotion in their service as is normally available to the people in the government organizations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to make observation in this case only. He had not met that lady. But from the documents which he has pursued, he has come to know that the family has some grievance against the University, may be unfounded.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he and the Dean of University Instruction are seriously looking into the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that, if possible, as the family says that the cause of the death is the stress which had been created in the department, which could be unfounded, unless it is proved. The family says that whatever benefits are due to them after having come from PGI, those should be released and secondly as they are having a compassionate appointments policy, the compassionate appointment be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are considering the matter of compassionate appointment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter could be expedited and in case it is possible, they could do it at the earliest. Secondly as far as the promotion policy is concerned, the concern shown by the Vice Chancellor is highly appreciated that everybody should have at least two promotions in his/her service career. Unfortunately, in the University, first of all he is blaming himself also, they are not bothered about the non-teaching staff especially the class IV staff that how to motivate them by giving assured promotion. With the passage of time, there are so many class IV employees in various departments and in the administrative, who for many years have virtually been working in place of Clerks and have got this expertise that the Departments instead of depending on the Clerks, depend on them. Because of some barriers, Heads of the Departments say that they are not finding out the way how to promote them. If they say that if the Heads of the Departments did not have the avenues to promote such employees, they say that they should take the job of Clerks from the Clerks only, then the Heads say that the department work would suffer. He said that they should think in terms of giving some promotions to such employees which is otherwise available in so many set-ups. They should think for teaching and non-teaching employees especially for those who are the lower level.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky requested to look into the grievance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is looking into it seriously.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that before they proceed with the agenda, he would like to congratulate each one of the members of the present Senate who have been elected for the next 4 years term. He would like to assure, to everyone who have got elected, his cooperation. Whatever that has been during the last 4 years, we should reset the things and make a new beginning on behalf of the University at a very crucial time that the University faced. Right now, he has 1½ years of his term left and he would want to set such an atmosphere during the next 18 months that his successor whenever he/she arrives, that cooperation could be further built up. This is the spirit, he thought, the new Senate must commence its term as soon as the new Senate gets constituted, hopefully by November.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the country for every election, taking the election from Panchayat to the Parliament, they have some Oath taking ceremony process. He requested the House that they have some kind of this oath taking ceremony for the members who have been elected for 4 years to inculcate some sense of responsibility and belongingness. He requested that they should have some kind of such a function. He said that such an oath is sworn to the elected members of Panchayat, Block Samiti, Zila Parishad, Legislative Assembly and Parliament.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now it is not in the constitution of the University. If they want to have it, whenever the new House is convened, the members could introduce themselves and informally they do affirm their commitment to serve the University to the best of their ability. Informally it has been a practice that whenever a new Senate is constituted they spend about an hour or so for the members to introduce themselves. It had been done so last time and this time also in the first meeting of the Senate in December, they could have this exercise of introduction by each one of the member. So, in some sense that opportunity is there whether they read something or say something individually, he thought that is a better thing. He is not opposing it.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if the Vice-Chancellor could invite the Senate for a dinner and the members could have an interaction with the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could have it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as technicality is concerned, there is no mention in the statutes. It was also started by the Syndicate as a new initiative. Then though not mentioned in the statutes, there is nothing mentioned about the introduction by the members also. What Dr. Ajay Ranga is suggesting that basically oath taking ceremony, if is not to be practically implemented, it is nothing. It is only to inculcate a sense of responsibility in the members when he/she says that he/she took oath, as is done in the Parliament. So, the idea is that if they are able to do it for that they have to see how much time is required and, of course, it is a 90-member House and in every meeting at least 70 members participate and those members have to take the oath on a fixed date of the Senate meeting. So they have to keep that time schedule for such an oath. It is very good spirit that the Senate members should have the feeling of having been elected to this August House where they undertake to serve an organization and take the responsibility assigned to them by the Chancellor which they are going to shoulder. This was also suggested

but he did not know to do it that the Senate members not only have to take the oath but they need some kind of orientation also as to how Senate is different from other bodies because by the time one person comes to know about the rules/regulations, the term is over. As far as the orientation is concerned, not only the members of the Senate but the administrative heads/Chairpersons of the Departments also need orientation as far as basic administrative skills are concerned. Unfortunately, in the University there is no such system. There are Universities in Punjab where until and unless a person passed a test conducted by the Punjab Government, he/she could not be appointed as Head of the Department/Chairperson because there they are given the responsibility of drawing and disbursing officer. All of the Heads of the Teaching Departments, for all practical purposes, have to depend on the non-teaching staff as they have the expertise on the rules and it is their discretion as to which rule is to be concealed and which is to be revealed and in good faith every teacher signs whatever is presented to them as the non-teaching staff says that they are working since long and everything is known to them. So orientation at each level in the University is to be done. This is just an idea and he wished that it could be implemented if they want to help the University in the times to come. He wished that this could be accomplished before the tenure of the Vice-Chancellor expires. He is not saying that the Vice-Chancellor would be leaving but before the present term expires.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these things are worth working. Once a person enters the University as a teacher, in addition to the teaching work as the time goes by, he/she could be asked to perform such tasks as Warden, Dean Students Welfare, etc. There is no harm in giving these responsibilities as one gets exposure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying it on the basis of a meeting which he attended a day before in the office of the Dean of University Instruction (DUI) where he came to know that, in spite of the DUI working for 16 hours a day, even after putting such hard labour, if something goes wrong and the Vice-Chancellor or the Dean of University Instruction has to tell that he put the signature in good faith and as a result of that a wrong decision has been taken. Then where would they reach – to square one. So at least orientation about basic skills be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would talk to Shri Ashok Goyal and they would devise such orientation given his experience in helping the governance of this University. So, let them get together and devise a module on behalf of the Human Resource Development Centre (HRDC) in cooperation with Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) and Research Promotion Cell. In addition to the working of the University, they should also make them aware about the governance of the other Universities. The Director, HRDC could also invite some other Director or the Vice-Chancellor or somebody from the UGC to have an interaction. These are qua leadership also for senior administrators. There is a Central Organization in Hyderabad which runs these things. He did not go there but he knows it as his colleagues from TIFR and other DAE institutions, whenever they become Heads of the Departments or assume some senior position, are being deputed to attend such programmes. They could do it in the Panjab University Human Resource Development Centre itself. He would talk to Shri Ashok Goyal and tell him a few things which he had learnt about the governance of this University which he thought that it

should be a common knowledge to everyone, who has even a remote interest in the governance of this University. He is wiser as he has learnt these. He would like to disseminate the same as these are useful for the institution and the people.

Professor Anil Monga said that in one of the meetings in the Staff College, it was suggested that they need to have a programme for lower level of people to impart communication skills and the Registrar has started such type of programmes. The Department of Public Administration also organized such programmes. He is happy to note that such type of programmes are being suggested for Chairpersons also as it has been seen that when a person is appointed as Chairperson, he/she did not have the administrative experience and face problems in performing the administrative job especially the persons from the science departments and did not even know how to issue a show cause notice. It is very important that they organize such programmes. The Department of Public Administration could be asked to formulate the programmes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would work out two modules one of which would be more specific to science departments.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Vice-Chancellor could talk to the present Dean of University Instruction while preparing these things. His impression is that the Vice-Chancellor and the Dean of University Instruction, that is the message, are trying to bring some revolutionary changes. They have to be very particular about the attendance of the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is also a requirement of the UGC. They have to do it because the NAAC would also ask for yearly data. If the data is not prepared, how could they face the NAAC?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be implemented in letter and spirit and they have to train and tell them that this is the need of the hour. The message in which spirit it is being given is not received in that spirit. Probably he expected and probably it is too much that when any such meeting is held, let the suggestions come from the implementing agency. If they did not have the participation of the persons who are to be trained, it could not be implemented. As Professor Anil Monga said that some of the Chairpersons even did not know how to issue a show cause notice, even they did not know about such things. They did not have any specialized cell to enforce such things.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired as to what is the decision on the oath taking ceremony?

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, it is a good thing. Now the issue is that do they have the oath taking ceremony one by one or take it collectively. So, somebody has to make a small oath and that could come to the Syndicate for approval and only then they could proceed further.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that in a meeting of the Senate, oath could be taken by the members individually.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could take a long time for administering the oath individually. However, this could be done collectively.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the idea of oath taking is to have a sense of responsibility that as a member, one is supposed to discharge the assigned responsibility.

Principal B.C. Josan suggested that a special meeting of the Senate could be held for oath taking ceremony.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if something is to be approved in a formal shape in the Syndicate, an item could be placed before the Syndicate in its meeting to be held in November for approval as to how it is to be implemented.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said in the oath taking ceremony of Parliament also, those members who had come present take the oath and the others later on.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that at least 3 members of the present Syndicate who have got elected as Senators prepare a draft of the modalities for the oath taking ceremony.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky suggested the names of Dr. Ajay Ranga, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Dr. Ajay Ranga submit a draft and he would bring the same as an agenda item in the next Syndicate.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Professor S. K. Sharma, Fellow, Panjab University and former Dean University Instruction, PU, on having been nominated as member to the Advisory Committee on Trade & Environment by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India;
 - (ii) Professor Ronki Ram, Fellow, Panjab University, Dean (Faculty of Arts) and Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Science, on having joined as ICCR Chair Professor of Indian Studies at Ryukoku University, Kyoto, Japan, from September 2016 for one Semester;
 - (iii) Professor B.S. Ghuman (re-employed Professor), Department of Public Administration, on having been co-opted as member of the Senate by the Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar

for the term (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018);

- (iv) Prof. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Fellow, Panjab University and Chairman, UIPS, PU, on having been selected for Honorary Membership of the Academic Union, Oxford and the Club of Rectors, CRE, UK, by the Academic Union Council and the Oxford Summit of Leaders Organizing Committee of Europe Business Assembly EBA, Oxford, UK;
- (v) Dr. Devi Sirohi, Professor re-employed, Department of History, at present on leave, and currently Chairperson of Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights, on having been bestowed the prestigious Rashtriya Gaurav Award for meritorious services, outstanding performance and remarkable role by the Indian International Friendship Society;
- (vi) Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Fellow, Panjab University, Deptt. of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, on having been honoured with 'Vidya Shri Award' by the Readers and Writers' Society on 30th September 2016 for her valuable contribution in the field of Education, Administration and Literature;
- (vii) Professor Nandita Singh, Fellow, Panjab University and Department of Education, on having been honoured with 'Vidya Shri Award' by the Readers and Writers' Society on 30th September 2016 for her valuable contribution in the field of Education and Administration;
- (viii) Dr. Shipra Gupta and Dr. Devinder Preet Singh of Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, on having been honoured by the Indian Dentist Research and Review Association (IDDR) with coveted 'Golden Tooth – Outstanding Young Dentist of the Year 2016' Award for their contribution in non-dental fields besides contributing towards the dental fraternity and society in their respective specialties and becoming the first Periodontist and Orthodontist, respectively, from our region to receive the award;

- (ix) Prof. Ramanjit Kaur Johal, Chairperson, Department of Public Administration on having been selected for the 2016 Fulbright-Nehru International Education Administrators Seminar for a period of two weeks in the Washington D.C. Metro area and North Carolina;
- (x) Professor Meenakshi Goyal, Chairperson, Dr S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, on having been selected for Bharat Vikas Award by the Institute of Self-Reliance, Bhubaneswar, for her outstanding contribution to the society;
- (xi) Dr. Sunil Bansal, Department of Applied Sciences at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET) for receiving financial assistance of Rs.58,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty eight lakh) by Government of India, Ministry of Science & Technology, Department of Science & Technology, for the project entitled "Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) Upgrade, Operation and Utilization;
- (xii) Shri Bardev Singh who has got sanctioned an amount of Rs.3,00,000/- (Rupees Three lakh only) through Joint Secretary, Distt. Planning Board, Ferozepur, for commissioning of Water Treatment Plant at Panjab University Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai; and
- (xiii) Ms Vinita Bhardwaj for winning two Gold Medals, namely Air Rifle Women Individual and Air Rifle Women Team.
- (2) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Serial No.(xiii) be noted;
- (3) the action taken report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 31.07.2016, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted; and
- (4) Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Dr. Ajay Ranga be requested to submit a draft of the modalities for oath to be taken by the newly elected Senate (2016 to 2020) to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

At this stage, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that an examination fee of Rs.2,500/- is being charged from the students and the College

students are facing a lot of difficulty. As the hike in the examination fee is very high, the students are agitating and also going on strike in the Colleges. He requested that this decision should be reviewed. They had earlier also opposed the examination fee hike. At least partial roll back should be done as the students are facing difficulties. He also requested all the Syndicate members to rethink on this matter. They should not take strict stand and the children and the parents are really having lot of problems. He requested the Syndicate members to roll back the fee whatever they could. The examination fee had been hiked from Rs.900/- to Rs.2,500/-. He said that his pain over the fee hike be recorded. The students are agitating in the Colleges and they are facing a very peculiar situation without having no role in this fee hike.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about the latest status of the funds as it was said that the Central Government would consider their representation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had given a document to the members which he had handed over to the Hon'ble Minister on 23rd September. A soft copy of the same has been sent to all of the members and the hard copy would be made available. The document is titled "Panjab University: Its Origin, Progression and Financial Requirement for its Sustenance". The document would also be provided to all the members during the Senate meeting along with the annexures. He believed that this document is under consideration. This document is slightly different version from the one given to the Hon'ble Home Minister when he visited on 23rd September and the Home Minister had passed on this letter to the MHRD Secretary. He (Vice-Chancellor) had also written to the MHRD Secretary to allow the University to present its case. There are precedents also which are recorded in the document. Professor R.C. Paul gave a presentation in Delhi in the year 1976, when the University faced the first crisis when Haryana withdrew its Colleges from Panjab University. Panjab University was in a very pathetic shape in 1977 when Haryana withdrew its Colleges. A meeting was held and something came out. The next crisis came in the year 1999. As the peace returned to Punjab when the new government was formed, the Centre which was giving money to Punjab, squeezed its hands. With this, the Punjab Government also started squeezing its hands and the University faced the crisis till the end of 20th century. In the background of that crisis, the self-sustaining courses were started. There were two things which happened in 1998, one that the report of the 5th Pay Commission had come and the arrears had to be paid and the second was that the Punjab Government capped the grant at a figure less than 40% of the total deficit. That is the day when the second crisis came. In the background of this to enhance the income of the University, self-sustaining courses were started and for some years, these courses were generating more money than they were consuming. Everything has been described in this document sequence-wise in the form of a report of task force, the history of which is recorded in the document. This document is a must-read for everyone, must-read that everything is there at one glance at one place. He found it very interesting. Everything is recorded in it. When the crisis came, the new courses were started, it continued to move and moved up to the end of 2005-06, i.e., up to the end of the term of Professor K.N. Pathak. At that time, the Centre had accepted to implement the Pension Scheme of Panjab University which was hanging from early 1990s and whatever was proposed was accepted by the Centre, in principle. To implement

the pension scheme, the University needed huge money as they did not have any corpus of their own. At that time, the Centre had taken a decision that no pension would be applicable to the employees of Central Government after 2004. In spite of this, the Centre allowed the University to implement the pension scheme. Everything is beautifully recorded in this document.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Central Government had approved the pension scheme that it would be applicable to those who were in service prior to 2004.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that, then came the 6th Pay Commission due to which also the liability increased. The University did not have that much money which was required for outflow. They were in a horrible state. When Dr. Manmohan Singh became the Prime Minister and visited the University, he formed a task force. That task force took cognizance of everything about the University. Nothing was hidden from him and nothing was unknown to them. They knew everything inside the University, all its strengths and all its weaknesses. It is beautifully recorded in the summary of this transcript. As far as the task force was concerned, they think they gave a solution to the problems of the University. His (Vice Chancellor) personal feeling is that they had solved the problems once for all. The only thing is its implementation, somewhere the things have gone wrong. They have to recognize where the things have gone wrong. The purpose of preparing this document is to make the present officers not to dilute it in Delhi. The officers are the same and they have been in the related offices. When Professor Sobti made the presentation in Delhi, at that time also all the officers of the concerned Ministries, Punjab Government and U.T. Administration were present. When this conscious decision was taken and it was accepted that Panjab University is the responsibility of the Central Government and the Central Government has to determine as to how much money has to be given by whom. It is written in black and white. That responsibility has not been implemented in letter and spirit. Whenever there is a need, that has to be given a push. It is the purpose of this document that they did not have to push for grants every time. If he is seeking time from the Centre, it is only to request the present officers who may find it difficult to read this document and he could give them a guided reading of this document. If he is given some time, he would do it. If the Minister or the Secretary did not have the time, but some officers should be assigned so that he could explain all these things. This is the purpose. Right now, this is where the matter is that they have made a proposal and it is in that spirit that the University has already generated some income. Part of the needs of the University has been met by them on their own. At the moment, they have put a proposal via enhancement in the examination fee. So, if they go back on that proposal, then this document does not move forward. He did not know what is the response? But the proposal of the University has a meaning only if the Government matches it. Suppose the Government did not match it, then they back to square one which means that the proposal which the University had given, there is no influence of that because the proposal of the University cannot be followed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to do introspection of the decision of the Syndicate taken in July 2016 and what are the compulsions under which they had taken the decision. At that time, it was said that tomorrow a man from the UGC as the representative of

the MHRD would come to attend the meeting of Board of Finance and they would come to know as to what is the response and they have to ask the representative in view of what they had done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is their hearsay. The UGC has said that they have asked for 20% more money in the revised estimates from MHRD. If the Centre would release more money, then only they would be able to give the University more money. How much money the MHRD would be able to release, as far as the UGC is concerned, the UGC could answer only when it gets the answer from MHRD. But the University has been asked to make a direct presentation to the MHRD. He is not seeking presentation to the UGC but seeking presentation before the MHRD. He had sought a presentation from the Home Minister also as the Home Minister also has a responsibility as sometimes the money used to come from there. The requirement of Panjab University is nothing new.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Government wanted to increase the grant, it is to be done through Ministry of Home Affairs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has to be done through Ministry of Home Affairs. At the moment, personally he is not in a position to propose new things on behalf of the University because if he proposes new things, then this document would have no meaning. Whatever requirement the University has submitted to the UGC, on the basis of which the UGC has submitted the requirement to the MHRD, that has not come back. He is just feeling that something would come back.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that the position as on today is as it was on 31st July.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the UGC has put it to the MHRD and they have not given anything in writing. The Finance and Development Officer had talked to the person who had come attend the meeting of the Board of Finance and that individual has said that they have put it to the MHRD. The requirement of the University is a quantum increase. The University is asking for the remaining balance of Rs.45 crores. The University has asked for Rs.101 crores in addition to Rs.176 crores which comes to Rs.277 crores. Rs.176 crores is the amount which the Government has fixed after freezing the grant for the last two years. This situation has not occurred for the first time. Such a situation had occurred in the year 1976, again in the year 2010.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to whether the UGC had incorporated this amount of Rs.176 crore by increasing the demand by 15% while submitting its budget to the Government or the UGC would tell the University how much grant would be given after getting the grants from the Government.

It was informed that the procedure adopted by the UGC is that they make a composite demand by working out the internal mechanism at its own level. That is not the reference point for Ministry of Human Resource Development. There is a oral discussion with the UGC officials that if they get 15% increase in its budget, the requirements of the University would be taken care of.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that they are at the same position at which they were on 31st July. He had earlier also said that they should make a presentation that if they get the grant from the UGC, they could reconsider the decision of hike in the examination fee. That is the spirit of what Shri Raghbir Dyal is saying.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he met HRD Minister on 18th August and on 23rd August, an amount of Rs.50 was released whereas earlier they were expecting about Rs.40 crores. Even if the grant was released on 23rd August but the letter for release of the grant had already been issued on 19th August which meant that when he (Vice-Chancellor) met the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development in the evening (of August 18), the letter delivered to Hon'ble Minister had already reached him and the letter had also reached the Minister of State for Higher Education in MHRD. So, the things moved. He was surprised when the grant of Rs.50 crores was released on 23rd August, whereas they were expecting about Rs.40 crores. It meant that something is happening. When the Minister did not come to the University, he (Vice-Chancellor) got the impression that the Minister would not like to come to the University as the finances were not coming. The Minister had accepted to come on 5th September but he did not come and chose to go to Lucknow and there also the meeting could not be held, whereas the institution of Lucknow had already given wide publicity to the visit of the Minister but the Minister had to go to some other place (for commemoration of Teacher's Day) which also has a University campus. On 16th September, the Minister was expected to be at Bengaluru but could not reach there also. When he came on 23rd September (to IISER, Mohali), he (Vice-Chancellor) gave him the document. He took it, and it is presumed that he had the desire to progress it. By the time MHRD Minister came to Mohali, the Home Minister had already come to Chandigarh (on September 9) and the letter of the University delivered to Home Minister had already reached the MHRD. He (Vice-Chancellor) again sent a letter on 3rd October to MHRD Secretary. He (Vice Chancellor) could make available to the (Syndicate) members the copies of whatever he had been doing.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his apprehension is that whatever reports they have got is that they are getting less number of students in the University School of Open Learning due to the hike in the fees. Actually, the fee hike is excess. There are some Colleges which charge the full fee for the whole of the session at the start of the session. The situation in small towns is very dismal. They have submitted a proposal to the UGC for matching grant by proposing a 12% increase. As the Vice-Chancellor was saying that presently the situation is not clear, he feared that the amount of Rs.35 crores that they were proposing to get by the examination fee hike, they might not be able to get that much amount. It would defeat both the purpose – neither would they get 12% matching grant nor the students which wanted to study in the University would be able to come in the mainstream of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could just say that the coffers of the University are empty and in the absence of the finances, the University could not be run. He could read the history of the finances of the University in whatever time he could find. The University had gone through such situations earlier also and whatever the University did to come out of such situation by taking loan on interest from the banks to pay the salaries that should not have been done. How many

buildings the University could anyone mortgage? The situation is very serious. The only silver lining that he sees is that when 2-3 times such a situation arose, the Centre had been compelled to bail out and give grants to the University. When the 6th Pay Commission was to be implemented, the Centre gave the grants. This document is a very moving document and he would recommend that everybody should read it. He said that without the cooperation of the members, nothing could be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in a very emotional manner, the issue was discussed in the Syndicate on 31st July and in the Senate on 3rd September, where the people even had offered that if the Government did not come forward, they were ready to go with begging bowls in their hands only to convey a message that the University is in very hardship. He understood that some of the students' organizations, subsequent to that, also protested in the Student Centre and at that time it was decided that let them show to the public as a token of message that they are in bad shape. However, a responsible statement is made by the students, what is the reply with them that when they are in complete soup and they are not even in a position to pay the salaries of the teachers and non-teaching staff, how much they are concerned about beautifying the entry portion of the administrative block, from where the funds are coming for this purpose even if it is about Rs.20-25,000/-. That meant that the symbolic message is that as if the University has become empty. Then how could they convince the students that except increasing the examination fee, they had no other option. He meant to say that if some maintenance is to be carried out or some additional rooms have to be constructed, for the time being, that should not be done. He did not know as to what was the need of this beautification of the entrance of the administrative office, where it was approved as the paneling work is going on and from where they did get the money. How could they explain it to the students? On one side, they are ready to go from door to door with begging bowl, on the other side, the University having a heritage building which was constructed very long ago, they are adding some new things. That probably gives an impression that they could roll back the fee hike but they did not have the will to do so. That is why the students protest. He thought that they need to take care of that. After having said that, he expected the Vice-Chancellor to include in the Vice-Chancellor's statement the successful conduct of election to the next Senate, i.e., from 1st November 2016 to 31st October 2020 because they needed to congratulate the whole team of the University which has been able to conduct huge election to the Senate for various constituencies with responsibility and who have worked day and night with the Returning Officer and the Vice-Chancellor. Though in every election, there are some deficiencies, there are some election petitions filed, there are some grievances expressed by one or the other, of course, those notwithstanding, overall it has been a great success on the part of the team which conducted the election successfully, he expected the Vice-Chancellor to include it in his statement. The Syndicate could have appreciated the smooth conduct of the election and hoping that whatever has been done strictly in terms of the statutes of the University notwithstanding whatever has been contained in various petitions which have been filed with the Chancellor or in some courts, hopefully they are able to succeed in that also. But the Syndicate needs to appreciate the whole team and the message be conveyed to the staff that the Syndicate appreciates the day and night working of

the whole team for the smooth conduct and thus enabling the new Senate to be formed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal, from the core of his heart, congratulated the Returning Officer and his team that conducted the election, particularly the Registered Graduate Constituency, in a very fair manner. There was some improvement over the process in which the election was conducted in 2012. The videography of some of the booths was very wonderful as no bogus votes were cast. Overall improvement was there. On behalf of the Registered Graduate Constituency, he congratulated the whole team.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that now the election office of the Registered Graduate Constituency has closed. Instead of thinking later, they should take some steps.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would do it afterwards. A lot of things have to be done. Let the Senate be constituted and they would come back to it with whatever improvements they have to do.

Principal B.C. Josan said that sometimes some of the members leave the meeting and some discussion takes place during zero hour and a decision is taken and circulated whereas in some cases it is said to bring an item for consideration. In one of the earlier meetings, a decision was taken not to hold the interviews at the head offices of the managements of the Colleges or in the University. He did not know about this decision. This matter not being on the agenda, a decision was taken and circulated.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that as said by Principal B.C. Josan that they leave the meeting, who has asked him to leave the meeting.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they have wasted two hours till now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not wastage of time. They are discussing very important issues. He objected to the word 'wastage of time' used by Principal B.C. Josan.

When heated arguments took place between Shri Ashok Goyal and Principal B.C. Josan, the Vice-Chancellor adjourned the meeting for five minutes. During this time also, the arguments amongst the members were going on.

When the meeting resumed, Shri Ashok Goyal said that anybody who ceases to be a member of the Senate, could not continue as a member of the Syndicate. This is an objection raised by Shri Raghbir Dyal that Principal B.C. Josan was elected as a member of the Senate from the Registered Graduate Constituency in the year 2012 and the vote on which he was elected from the Registered Graduate Constituency, it was deleted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not allow more discussion on this matter.

On this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the words used by Principal B.C. Josan that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is wasting the time should be withdrawn by him.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he withdraws the words.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, at UBS, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana

2(i). Considered minutes dated 23.08.2016 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the CAS, at UIAMS, P.U., Chandigarh

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 23.08.2016 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That 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.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), in the Department of Biotechnology, P.U., Chandigarh

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 23.08.2016 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Biotechnology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the CAS, at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh.

2.(iv) Considered minutes dated 23.08.2016 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh..

RESOLVED: That 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the CAS, at U.I.E.T., Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur

2.(v) Considered minutes dated 23.08.2016 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at U.I.E.T., Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

RESOLVED: That 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the CAS, in the Department of Library & Information Science, P.U., Chandigarh

2.(vi) Considered minutes dated 23.08.2016 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Library & Information Science, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That 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.

Promotion as Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under CAS, at Centre for Social Work, P.U., Chandigarh

2.(vii) Considered minutes dated 23.08.2016 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre For Social Work, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That 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.

Promotion as Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under CAS, at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar UICET P.U., Chandigarh

2.(viii) Considered minutes dated 23.08.2016 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That 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.

Issue regarding appointment of Chief of University Security

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 31.08.2016 & 01.09.2016 (**Appendix-X**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Chief of University Security-1 (Advt. No. 2/2016), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he is sure that the Vice-Chancellor took a very wise decision and the Committee was very full of expertise and capable. He is talking in terms of the Chief Security Officer. If they look at the history of the Security Officer over the last 10-15 years, he just wanted to draw their attention that when they bring a Security Officer from outside, usually the person stays for a year or two, the reason being that the student community is very volatile and they need a person who can have a rapport with the students not only in terms of need of Security Officer but as an elder person who can talk to the students. He is not casting any aspersion on the quality of the person selected. He is sure that the person must be excellent considering the fact that the Committee which they had. But what he is saying is that when they have an Academic-cum-Security Officer, he tends to be a person whom they could relate to the community. When a person from outside comes, he finds certain difficulties with the students as previously the SPs and DSPs had left within a year or two thinking that this is not their job. He thought that first of all, this particular person who is being appointed for 25-30 years, it meant that for the next 30 years, he would be here. He is not doubting his credentials and feel that he is the best person and he is sure that the Vice-Chancellor has selected the right person. If they bring in a person and replace the existing man who is an academician and doing a very good job and then on top of it, they are cash strapped and do not have the money to recruit people at this stage. He was just thinking as to how to get out of it and thought that now when they have made the selection, if they were going to make it a tenure post as

they were taking Professors and Assistant Professors in the Departments who stay on in spite of the fact that there are people who did not take the classes, who are not interested in teaching but still they become a liability for the department. He has been here for many years and knows about what he is saying that there are so many liabilities. So he was thinking that if they did not select a person for 25 years, they could actually have for 5 years tenure and within that they could as to how that person looks after the law and order situation. That is the way that they could do it. His suggestion is and the fellow Syndics would agree that the students' community is not an easy community to deal with and they need a person with age and experience to look after. His suggestion is that the appointment should be on tenure basis. He is sure that the Vice-Chancellor has taken pains in the selection process.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about students' community, it is right.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now it is not zero hour and it is the selection under consideration.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it pertains to that as they are going to appoint a Chief Security Officer who is going to deal with the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not give this justification at the moment.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they could change the terms and conditions and then could make a selection. It is a very serious issue as some police cases are pending against the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the proposal before the members is a selection that has been made. They need not approve it. But he is not in a position to recommend that they change the service conditions at this moment. Right now, they have to approve or reject it on the basis of what they have at the moment. They have a right to reject it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to add something not speaking on the merits of the case. Do not mind if he says that it is not within the purview of the Syndicate to even consider the recommendation of the Selection Committee when the Senate had already passed the recommendations of the Board of Finance that no appointment is to be made unless and until the permission is taken from the Board of Finance. He wanted to ask under what circumstances this interview had been conducted and the minutes of the Board of Finance have been approved by the Syndicate/ recommended to the Senate and finally approved by the Senate. Even after the same had been approved by the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had gone with conducting the interview for the Chief Security Officer. On one side, they are pleading with the Centre for more grants, their nominee had come to the Board of Finance and suggested that no appointment is to be made and the Vice-Chancellor in response to that had said that they have only two advertisements pending, i.e., one about the Deputy Registrar and one about the Chief Security Officer. Even that was not accepted. It is at the suggestion of the Dean of University Instruction that do not make a blanket ban. At least this can be said that if any appointment is to be made, it would not be

made without the permission of the Board of Finance. He did not know why the office did not bring it to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor that in view of the decision of the Senate which has been conveyed not only to the UGC but MHRD also, they probably are not in a position to hold this interview. He, as a member of the Syndicate, after having taken that decision, is he hoping to consider the recommendations of the Selection Committee. Probably keeping that thing in mind, the next item is appointment of Assistant Professor purely on temporary basis and that too through walk-in-interview and why not regular appointments because the same bar is there. He could only understand that these appointments have been made under some compelling circumstances and a walk-in-interview has been organized where for two posts only two candidates have appeared and this has also been brought to the Syndicate. Now, this could have been done if the necessity was there, this appointment could have been made by the Vice-Chancellor himself under Regulation 5. That is the emergency appointment. There was no need for the same to have been brought to the Syndicate. Otherwise, it is temporary appointment and through walk-in-interview. Even if there was no interview, the Vice-Chancellor could have appointed. But to consider this probably would be going out of their jurisdiction. So his proposal is that this item should straightaway be sent to files and nothing else.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he understood that on the post of Chief Security Officer, if they did not appoint any teacher or a similar personality, he would not be able to deal with the students. He cited an example from his experience. He belonged to District Gurdaspur and during the peak of the terrorism in Punjab, there was a SSP in Batala who was appointed the Chief Security Officer here for some time. He tried to deal in the same manner and he (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) had told the then Vice-Chancellor that the students are not terrorists in the University. Here they have students who are to be reformed and shaped at every step. There are different types of students like meritorious, poor, aggressive, etc. and the Vice-Chancellor must have seen during his tenure that how many agitations were and how the students were treated. At a number of times, he had already pointed out in the Senate that what steps they have taken to withdraw the cases filed by the police against the students. If the term of the Vice-Chancellor as also the members is over and the students are not raising their voice, the career of the students would be at stake. If they want to give the command to a teacher to stop the aggression, such persons are definitely required. If the concept of teacher is missing, they have to appoint some mature person, it is for the benefit of the students. The person must have a commendable job where he has served. That is a different nature of job. But here the nature of job is different. He understood that, as said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, somebody from the teacher community be appointed who could handle the students in a better way.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as far as teacher is concerned, it is very difficult for the teacher to perform this responsibility. The present incumbent has also talked to him and asked that someone be appointed on this post on regular basis. Whereas the thing of intervention is concerned, he has seen that the present Security Officers do nothing except making a call to him to come or send some of the Wardens and do some cordoning off but ultimately a teacher has to talk to the students for communication. As said by Shri Ashok Goyal, he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) was in the

Board of Finance, the talking about blanket ban was not there. He thought that the Vice-Chancellor also pointed out at that time that only these two are pending and there was no talk for those two pending. It was talked that for future advertisement, that would be first taken to the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he might be wrong. They could see the minutes of the Board of Finance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is a written fact.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if what Professor Navdeep Goyal is saying is right. The Vice-Chancellor could give a ruling that whether in view of the minutes of the Board of Finance which has now become the decision of the Senate, could they consider it now. If they could consider, then let them discuss it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that his understanding in the Board of Finance meeting was very clear that these two positions would not be touched and would be allowed to be completed and for other positions of teachers to be advertised, the MHRD would be asked. The MHRD has only frozen the teaching positions first.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was said but it was not accepted in the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor read the minutes of the Board of Finance where it was mentioned that for fresh appointments in future shall be made only on need based justification after getting the same approved from the Board of Finance. They could go to the Board of Finance again. He was very clear in his mind when he pointed out the position of Chief Security Officer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this conducting of interview, in fact, is a violation of the decision of the Senate whatever might be the intention. He read out from para 4 on page 58 of the minutes of the Board of Finance where it is mentioned that "On this, the Vice-Chancellor stated no advertisement with regard to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor was pending except that of constituent colleges where the teachers appointed vide walk in interviews have already been working against the vacant posts. A blanket ban on all inductions could adversely affect the functioning of the University. There could arise a need for critical inductions, like, Chief of University Security, Medical Officer(s), Deputy Registrar who have been selected but there was a court case and judgement in that case stands reserved. No Deputy Registrar has joined against advertisement for long and at the moment only one directly inducted Deputy Registrar is working in the University". These are the views given by the Vice-Chancellor. Then, "Dr. J.K. Tripathi stated that in the last meeting of the Board of Finance, it was decided that the manpower audit (both teaching and non-teaching) be made but, there is no information in the agenda papers relating to it. On this the Dean of University Instruction after having responded to the Vice-Chancellor said that the manpower audit of (teaching) has already been completed. He further stated that there should not be a blanket ban on the appointments. He suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to fill up the posts on very essential need basis" which the Vice-Chancellor was talking of while speaking in the preceding para. "The Registrar stated that the manpower audit (non-teaching) is

at a final stage and it would be completed shortly. He further stated that if the Non-teaching posts are not advertised/filled, it would adversely impact the working of the University administration as every month, on an average 15-20 persons had been retiring. For the last three years, the University had not recruited/filled any clerical post due to which the base of ministerial cadre was vanishing". The Registrar had also expressed his concern since the ministerial cadre was vanishing, how the University could be run. That is also the concern which the Vice-Chancellor had expressed. "Dr. J.K. Tripathi suggested that the University should fill up the post of supporting staff on contractual basis and there would be lesser financial liability on the University and as per his experience the contractual supporting staff would perform in a better way. The Registrar stated that the University had already taken steps in that direction and the University has stopped inducting 'D' class posts on a regular basis. However, the posts of supervisory staff have to be provided, opined Registrar. Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to fill up the position on need basis. The Vice-Chancellor stated that keeping in mind that the major cost component of the Non-Plan budget was the salary/retirement benefits, the expenditure of the University was bound to grow up minimum by 12%, even if the University remains stagnant. The University had been taking steps to increase its internal revenue generation but, the whole burden of enhancement in the Non-Plan budget could not be passed on to the students, being a government funded University. Therefore, the Government should also enhance the amount of maintenance grant in proportion to the increase in the internal income of the University. Dr. J.K. Tripathy stated that the Board of Finance is only the recommending body and on the basis of the recommendations they could plead with the Ministry. He further stated that the University should request the Punjab Government also for enhancing the maintenance grant to the University. Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that they had talked about enhancing the examination and tuition fee. He suggested that the University should explore the possibility of increasing the income from estates. This was agreed to. In view of above discussion, the members unanimously resolved to recommend to the Syndicate that (i) the revised estimates be approved; (ii) fresh appointments in future shall be made only on need basis with due justification after getting the same approved from the Board of Finance; (iii) the University should take steps to enhance its revenue from all possible means, specially the income from estates". Now with this decision, if there could be any interpretation, any far-felt interpretation that this does not include the appointment of Chief of University Security and the Deputy Registrar, CMOs and whatever it is, he thought that they could discuss. Whatever the intention of the Vice-Chancellor, Dean of University Instruction, Registrar or DSW could be, he only remembered what was placed before the Syndicate and Syndicate resolved no fresh appointment. He did not know even far-fetched imagination, could he say that these are not fresh appointments being considered. In his view, it is only having confrontation with the government and let them not go ahead with that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could ask the Government whether the Chief Security Officer is an essential and whether his absence would adversely affect the functioning of the University. This is the only thing. They have the next meeting of the Board of Finance. It is his understanding when he said that the Chief Security Officer,

which was advertised and everything done, it would go through. They could go back to the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here they were talking contradictory. Only 50 minutes back, it was the Vice-Chancellor who had said that they must ensure at least two promotions under career progression scheme available to everybody who has joined this University and on the other hand, they were trying to bring somebody who, all the members of the Syndicate or if not all, at least majority of the members feel, that the purpose for which the Chief Security Officer is to be recruited, that would not be served by way of bringing a young man and by discouraging a man who is already working successfully not to grant him promotion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let them not mix up the two things. One thing is that the need for a Chief Security Officer for the University has been there as long as he could look at the records. They always had a Chief Security Officer. For a while, a Professor was doing this job. When the Professors are doing this, there were inherent problems. The Professors did not have a quality time and not that kind of emergency, he could look after. They need a leadership role in a person who could do this. They need a person. It just happens that they did not have any age restriction and whatever restriction is there, so many persons come in that band. The high powered body has selected and looked into all the candidates that were available and amongst them all options have been seen and a person was selected. There is a small moot point where they could say whether because of the financial constraints, they take the matter back to the MHRD and then see if the MHRD says that they could not recruit, it is fine. It is his understanding that, when he said and when the UGC representative came in the Board of Finance meeting that this was not an issue and the Chief Security Officer is a dire need of the University. It is indeed a dire need of the University and it is in that background that this person has been recruited and inducted. It just so happened, that he is young and it does not bar him and he had the best comprehension of the needs of the University and he articulated it by way of a presentation. Now it is a matter of technicality that after getting the same approved from the Board of Finance, they could go back to the Board of Finance and give the justification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in view of rightly or wrongly whatever has been decided by the Senate on the recommendation of the Board of Finance and the Syndicate, it is not within their purview even to consider the recommendation of the Selection Committee. In fact, there should not have been any interview before taking the approval of the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there is no need but if the members feel that they have to go back to the Board of Finance then they could go back to the Board of Finance. He did not feel that there is a need to go to the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that this decision has no meaning because the Vice-Chancellor feels that this is the spirit. When they go to the Board of Finance, it is the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor that the Chief Security Officer, the way it is proposed to be appointed, is very much required. Now, Professor Navdeep Goyal has said that otherwise also the Security Officer do the job of only calling

the DSW to send the Wardens and all the work has to be done by the teachers. Do they think that they need a person only to give a call to the DSW and in the last as they have seen and as Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said, they forget about prior to 2000 because he was there only up to 2000 as a student, even if they talk after 2000 or may be 90s, even when the terrorism was at peak, they look as to who was the Chief Security Officer and how many serious lapses have been there up to 2016 and for how long the Chief Security Officer has not been there and for how long the teachers who had been assigned the duty of Chief Security Officer at various times, how successfully they have managed the duty. He could understand that the person who has been given the additional responsibility, he might have some difficulty, then they could say that he might go back and they would appoint somebody else. If something could be done by the fund-starved University for Rs.5,000/- p.m. and that too successfully, how do they justify that they need to spend Rs.50,000/- p.m. If they have to go the Board of Finance, they must go to the Board of Finance with what the governing body of the University thinks and not what an individual thinks and then they have to think what kind of a person, if at all he is to be recruited, is required to handle the students. The Chief Security Officer is not only required for the students but for the overall security of the University. His simple suggestion is that in this way, they are not only conveying a message as if the University has gone into a problem in the absence of the regular Chief Security Officer. If that is so, at least no such incident has been brought to the notice of the Syndicate and the Senate that because of the absence of the Chief Security Officer, the University has been put into a very serious trouble, that is not the case. If that is not the case, present arrangement is doing very well. As the Vice-Chancellor said that and they also confess that when they were framing the qualifications, they have framed the qualification with this intention only that somebody at least above the age of 50 years would be recruited, who at least is mature enough to handle the students as his children and not a person who comes as rival competitive to the students only as he also has the same ego as the young boys have. They did not think that. What he could say is that they did not take the decision what was taken there. His intention could be any. Similarly, he had said that the Board of Finance had decided something in particular despite the Vice-Chancellor having something else in his mind but they have to go by what is recorded. Now, if the Vice-Chancellor thinks that they have to go the Board of Finance back particularly for appointment of Chief of University Security, he felt that it is should be discussed in the Syndicate on merit whether they need as present the kind of financial position they are going through and in view of that position in which the Board of Finance has taken the decision, they must make out a case, a healthy case to be put before the Board of Finance that without Chief of University Security, the University is going to face problems.

Professor Anil Monga said that the Chief Security Officer performs multi-tasks some of which are long-term while others are short-term. It has been going and this is not the only task to be performed by the Chief Security Officer. Some Professors had been appointed and it seemed that everything is going right. The University needs a security arrangement where large number of long term plans, which had been pending for long time, needed to be undertaken. The plans related to recruitment, training of the staff, requirement of infrastructure like as to where the CCTV cameras have to be installed and how the cameras are to be monitored. He had seen all these

things when he worked as Chief Security Officer for 11 months and kept on thinking as to how these tasks could be completed. First of all, they could see as to what is the situation of the security of the hostels. When he was the Chief Security Officer, he could not see for so many days as to what kind of this security is particularly for girls' hostels. It has been pending for so many years. When the advertisement is given, some problems related with qualifications emerge. When the finalization is nearing, again some issues emerge and the appointment is kept pending. He requested that the appointment be made. The High Powered Committee has selected the best person, whose presentation after interviewing was found to be the best, and the candidates who were interviewed included young as well as old. All the points were taken care of as an Army General was also in the Selection Committee. They should have confidence in the Selection Committees. But if they talk about such things here and want to keep it pending, it would not be a good thing. A candidate has been selected and 3-4 persons have been put on the waiting list. The best candidate has been selected and if there is any technical issue, as the Vice-Chancellor has already said about the need of two selections, these should be approved while the other cases could be taken to the Board of Finance. If they want to take these appointments also, they could take but they should not keep it pending or should not defer it because they have already selected a candidate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that filling up of this post is pending for the last 3 years and they have waited for a long time. They have to fill up the post as this is an essential requirement for this University. There is a large establishment and they need a person who could think of long term plan of security, security of hostels, estate, introducing technology, giving right kind of training of these people. Chief of the University Security is absolutely essential for a large estate of 550 acres which has hostels, student centre, administrative buildings, teaching departments, residential colonies, shopping centre. So many things are needed as far as the security of this estate is concerned. Nobody, who is assigned this job on a part-time basis, would be able to do justice to such things. There would be long term consequences of it, if today they did not appoint a whole time Chief Security Officer. To get the need of it articulated, if they want, he could go back to the MHRD and get their concurrence. They have to hold a meeting of the Board of Finance next month. They could not escape the meeting of the Board of Finance before the next meeting of the Syndicate. They have to present the recommendations of the Board of Finance to the first meeting of the next Senate. So, his plea to all of them is that right now just consider this recommendation, they need not issue an appointment letter until the matter goes back to the Board of Finance and the matter again goes to the new Senate. His plea to the members is that Chief of University Security is a dire need of the University. They are lucky that till now no such incident has occurred for which they have to repent. But nothing could be predicted. If they did not appoint a Chief Security Officer and if unfortunately something untoward happens due to this, they would be in problem. Secondly, for long-term planning, they need somebody to start thinking on long-term basis as to how to look after the security of the University, provide leadership, right kind of training. They need somebody who is technology savvy, who already has a comprehension. The kind of comprehension this particular candidate presented about the security needs, it was quite clear that he was far superior to all others.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they have no doubt on the merit of the person selected by the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal simply made a request to the Vice-Chancellor that as Chairman of the meeting not to allow anybody make any comments on anything which has not been said at all. He requested to take care of it. Now it has been alleged as if anybody in the Syndicate has raised suspicion on the judgment of the members of the Selection Committee. Has anybody done it, as Professor Anil Monga had said not to do such and such? They have not discussed the case on merits.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are a large body. They have to take complete concurrence of every statement that a person makes. There should be complete concurrence. Let them not do bit splitting. No decisions are taken in such a body like this, based on consensus, as 100% concurrence could not be there otherwise the freedom of speech would be diminished. Everyone could have different opinion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Shelley Walia started the discussion that the Vice-Chancellor had selected the best person. Everybody has appreciated it and they have not discussed the case on merits.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there is no doubt on the selection procedure and on the merit of the person selected. But two main aspects of the nature of job of the Chief Security Officer are security and handling the students. As the Vice-Chancellor was talking about the technology-savvy, they are having departments like UIET, CIL, Physics, etc., from which the technology is emerging and he wondered who could be more tech-savvy than the teachers of these departments. If they have such criteria and they take persons from UIET and such other departments, with this, the tech-savvy criteria would be met. Till the time the teacher-student relationship is not maintained, even if they have persons like SSP or from Army, the confrontation would increase instead of decreasing. Every teacher would have a thinking in his/her mind to at least give something to the students even if a student might not be good in the hope that one day the student would improve the behavior. The persons who have worked in commands could not understand the working of dealing with the students. He suggested that the post should be made a tenure-based as it is going to put a heavy financial burden on the University. Any untoward incident could occur at any place, even at a holy place also. The students, residents, teachers all have to put efforts collectively for the betterment. One of the measures could be to install more CCTV cameras on entry points which could help in sorting out the matters. Keeping in view the financial aspect, which is the most important aspect, it should be a tenure post for 3 or 5 years and teachers be appointed on this post on the same pattern of DUI, DSW and other Deans. Secondly, the teacher-student relationship should be given more importance and with strict orders, they could not extinguish the fire with fire. The youth is full of energy and there is a need to handle properly and not confront. He suggested that they have to take collective efforts and only the Chief Security Officer could not solve the matters. It is not such that after 5.00 p.m. the campus is empty and the families are also living in the campus. He suggested that it would be in the best interest of the students and for all to appoint a teacher on this post on a tenure basis as also there would not be financial burden.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa cited the example of SSP Shri Sita Ram, who was known in Punjab as a terror by the terrorists who was able to deal with the terrorism in an excellent manner but unfortunately completely failed here as Chief Security Officer of Panjab University as maximum confrontation was there. Then they tried the idea of bringing somebody from CRPF and appointed a retired DIG from CRPF and there was completely failure. Then they thought that since they have to have communication with the local police, they recruited 3 local retired DSPs at various times and all the three were complete failure. If they go by his experience, it is only when the additional charge of Chief Security Officer had been given to a teacher they had much lesser confrontation and much lesser problems. That is why he was saying that if they have to discuss that, let them discuss that. He is not straightaway saying that they do not need, but he is not ready to accept straightaway that they need a Chief Security Officer unless and until they reach some consensus. As far as saying for long-term and short-term arrangement, for long-term arrangements no organization could depend on its Chief Security Officer. There are various agencies available which could suggest such arrangements. The Chief Security Officer is only for the recruiting and monitoring the security staff and not that he would put the cameras in place or would tell where the cameras have to be installed. Even if the Chief Security Officer is appointed from Army/Air Force, they would have to depend on specialized agencies. The present Chief Security Officer, according to him, is working well. As pointed out by someone that the present Chief Security Officer has asked to relieve him, he could say so, but he could not say that in his place a regular Chief Security Officer be appointed and it is far-fetched. Let them prepare a comparative data of what was the position when they had a regular Chief Security Officer and when they had a stop-gap arrangement by appointing teachers on this post so that they are able to reach as to what exactly the situation is. Let them not hurry. They could say that it is technical ground but he would say that it is morally also binding on them that if they had taken a decision not to do anything without the approval of the Board of Finance, then they should not even consider it and if it is to be taken to the Board of Finance for its approval as it had been decided there, then before that it should be discussed in the Syndicate and let them make out a case that they really need to recruit the Chief Security Officer keeping in the financial situation. For that, an item could be brought for consideration or if the Vice-Chancellor wanted to make a Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to him, the present Chief Security Officer is working well and the traffic is being regulated properly. If he wants to be relieved of this responsibility but the responsibility was assigned to him in the interest of the University. As suggested by the members, a team from various science departments could be prepared which could be given the specialized training. They are facing the financial crunch and the Chief Security Officer might also ask for some staff for him, with which the financial burden would increase further. The present person is performing as a good Chief Security Officer, is having good coordination with the students, visits the sites and solves the problems of the students. They could further strengthen the present set-up.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the present security system is doing well. As he has seen during the last few months, the security arrangement is very good and for that kudos to the University

administration. The barricades have been installed at the gates and other areas. As Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that if there is any technical issue involved in it, the Vice-Chancellor could take it to the Board of Finance. It should be deferred so that there is no technical problem in that.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that without any bias, during the last two months, the things have improved a lot.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that his viewpoint is that as everyone is feeling, earlier he was thinking that only he is feeling, the security set-up has improved tremendously at all levels including the parking, presence of the security at the gates. If the present Chief Security Officer is allowed to continue or some other person is appointed, the guidance of the present person should be taken which would help in improving the security set-up. Secondly, if they take it to the Board of Finance, it would send a wrong signal that on the one hand they are facing financial crunch and on the other, they are spending Rs.50,000/- p.m. and other expenses could also be there, whereas the same duty is being performed by a teacher for Rs.5,000/- p.m. The need of the hour is that as approved by the Board of Finance, they should not fill up the posts as otherwise there would be pressure from many sides. As a member of the Board of Finance, he suggested that till the financial position is stabilized, they should not go with regular appointments. If the present Chief Security Officer would not have been performing well, then it would have been a separate issue. At the moment, they are having the best Chief Security Officer. He appreciated his work and suggested that they should continue with the present arrangement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him recall the circumstances in which the Chief of University Security is a necessity of the University. If it was not the necessity of this University, they would not have advertised the post several times. They have advertised the position and the qualifications for this position have been approved by the governing body of the University. They advertised the position, the selected person and those persons could not come several times. It is the same process. As far as the need of the Chief of University Security is concerned, an apex crucial position is concerned, it did not require any further articulation. Already it has been articulated and approved by the governing bodies of this University. A process once commenced, it must be taken to the completion that is the necessity. So, when the Board of Finance met, the posts had already been advertised, the screening etc. had been done and the only thing that remained was conducting of interview. So it was in that background the remarks were made whatever these were. He was very clear that this process be completed. The same applies to the post of Deputy Registrar, if the Court permits the process is to be completed. So he has answered that why it is. Now, what a Chief of the University Security is expected to do and whatever is not at the moment. Right now, there is a status quo situation. The periphery of the University needs a huge improvement. No one is attending to that. They need to introduce technology, need to introduce training to the people. They also need to evolve a process where parts of their needs are being met by a small functionary by their own people and rest of it is being outsourced. So they need someone who has comprehension of all these things and whose worry for these things is far more than what they are worrying at the moment. They have seen that traffic position has improved and it is only a marginal improvement as far as the

University is concerned. There is no process in place as far as the traffic management is concerned. They have been talking for the last 3 years but they have not introduced any permanent system whether in terms of parking or in terms of one-way or in terms of imparting any training to their own people. So the job of the Chief of University Security is a 24-hours job. It could not be done by a part-time person. Somehow, they have a part-time person and they need to combine all these qualities at an apex place to have interface. They need a team of persons to perform the job like from CRPF or Army and that person might have a mindset to comprehend all these things. It is in that background that they need a Chief of University Security. So, even when there are financial constraints, certain minimum things have to happen. In the financial constraints, it is not that somebody could say that let them not appoint the Vice-Chancellor of the University because the University could run for its existence for the initial 58-years without a Vice-Chancellor. After all, Dean of University Instruction could perform the duty of the Vice-Chancellor. The meetings of the Syndicate and Senate could be held by any member of the Syndicate/Senate. It is not necessary that if the Vice-Chancellor is not there, the meetings of the Syndicate/Senate could not be held. One could not argue that the Senate meeting could also be held without the Vice-Chancellor. Anybody could perform the task of the Vice-Chancellor. So certain things are needed even when they are in financial crisis for overall functioning. They could, of course, continue. It is possible that they appoint a Chief of University Security today and the first person did not come or the second person did not join or the first person joins after six months and it is not a guarantee. One is alive today and who knows what the destiny has written. The life is so fragile that anything could happen to anybody. But the processes have to be carried to their completion in the overall interest of the University. Today they are in a financial crisis. They do not appoint a Vice-Chancellor or some other officer. The system could also do without them as even the Dean of University Instruction or some other person could perform very well the job of the Vice-Chancellor. One could say that they do not appoint the Vice-Chancellor till they come out of the financial crisis. One could say so many things. He is personally convinced that this University which he had seen over the last 4 years and whatever expectation of the U.T. Administration from the University that they must have a Chief of University Security. He is personally convinced that a teacher given the additional charge as Chief of University Security is not a good arrangement. This is all what he had to say. He has put it before them. He is nobody to take a decision on it. They have three options – the first option is that in principle they approve it and let it go to the Senate and if the Senate does not approve in principle, let it go to the Board of Finance and it comes back in November meeting of Syndicate and then it goes to the new Senate in December. The second option is that they take a call that in principle they abolish the position of Chief of University Security. The third option is that they do not discuss it today, they defer it and take it to the Board of Finance, then come back to the November meeting of Syndicate and then to December meeting of Senate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Vice-Chancellor did not give the fourth option that the existing arrangement should continue or it be added in the second option that a teacher should be appointed who is student sensitive and that aspect is missing in the three options given by the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when they were discussing the advertisement of the Chief Security Officer at that time this thing was not kept in mind as the Vice-Chancellor had given a statement in the last meeting of the Syndicate that if the grants are not received, the situation would worsen.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him just point out that in the meeting of July where for hours and hours they discussed the recommendations of the Think-Tank and the minutes of that meeting run into 120 pages. Again and again after every 10/20 pages, there is this thing, there is awareness and consciousness amongst all of them as the meeting proceeded in July itself that if the Centre does not give the money, the University would not be able to run. The statement given in the meeting of Senate on 3rd September attributed to him has been made as headline in the newspapers that the Vice-Chancellor had said that the University would close down. September 3rd is not the day one when this thing had been stated. It had been come repeatedly in the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate that if the recommendations of the Think-Tank are not approved and implemented, the University would not be able to function. The Think-Tank had recommended to enhance the income and the only way of enhancing the income is examination fee and not any other means. The decision to enhance the examination fee was taken in the July meeting of Syndicate and if the fee is not increased, the University would not be able to function. It is recorded there in the more than 120-pages minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate. It was not the first time on 3rd September when it was stated that if the grant is not received, the University would not be able to function. The point is that how they have come to this stage by pleading for grants. However, they have been paying the salary. They must have seen the strike by the teachers for the implementation of the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission and if these recommendations are implemented, they would have no money to pay the salaries. The Centre has given the grant of only Rs.40 crores which would be sufficient to pay the salary for the month of October only. They have been pleading with the Centre to release the grant of Rs.176 crores to pay the salary to the employees up to December so that the results of the first semester could be declared. The Centre should also inform the University whether the grants asked for in the revised estimates would be released or not. It is the responsibility of the Central Government and the University had been directly under the control of the Central Government for about 108 years out of the 134-years of its history. After the year 1976, it had been repeatedly said that the Centre has to determine as to how much increase in the grants is to be effected by different contributors to the University. It is also mentioned that to constitute and implement the recommendations of the Pay Commission is the responsibility of the Central Government. Earlier also it was mentioned that when the recommendations of the new Pay Commission are implemented and the money which is required to be paid as arrears, it would be the responsibility of the Central Government. If the Punjab Government could not take this responsibility since 1999, how it could do so now. The ratio of 60:40 is an old thing and it ended in 1998-99 when the Punjab Government could not give grant more than Rs.16 crores. How this grant of Rs.16 crores was increased to Rs.20 crores is also a mystery. It is a benevolence of the Punjab Government that it was increased to Rs.20 crores which was otherwise fixed at Rs.16 crores. In the year 2005-06, the U.T. also did not take the responsibility. In the year 2006-07, the U.T. fixed the grant at the level which was given in the year 2005-

06. That was why there was a crisis in the year 2006-07. At the same time, the recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission had to be implemented and they had made a commitment to implement it. The Centre had also made a commitment that the pension scheme would be implemented in Panjab University. It is written that the proposal of pension corpus would not run and the corpus would finish if the original proposals were to be implemented. If they have to pay all the benefits as per Central Government structure, as the salary is inflation protected and if the pension is also inflation protected, the pension corpus would finish even at some earlier stage. That is why, the Centre at that time consciously took this responsibility to provide all the money. The situation that they are facing today is unfortunate. The Centre ought not to have dragged its feet when it comes to needs of the Panjab University. All that the Centre demands from the University is that whatever fraction the Centre meets that is increasing at a rate. That rate could not be so much that if the 7th Pay Commission recommendations are to be implemented, the quantum could not remain frozen at a ratio of 50:50. This 50:50 ratio could remain frozen only if the recommendations of the Pay Commission are not implemented and other beneficial schemes of the Centre are not a compulsion on the University. This 50 would be 50 + X for the Centre and 50 - X for the University. So they have to determine 'X' and not '+' or '-' and it would have to be determined by whichever Government is there at the Centre.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor could also make a point that he is not filling up the post of Chief Security Officer and saving the money.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the MHRD Secretary or the MHRD Minister tell him (Vice-Chancellor) that the University did not need a Chief of University Security or say that it is needed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the MHRD says whether there is a need or not and if the Syndicate and Senate says so, that has no value.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had said that the Chief of University Security is needed. That is why the advertisement had been given. If they are saying that today it is not needed and the earlier decision of the Syndicate be annulled. It is their right to annul the same. But today that is not an agenda item to annul the same. If the members wanted to have this, a new agenda for the same would be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate to be held in November.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor had himself said that a decision could not be taken that the University could function without the Vice-Chancellor. But the decision not to make fresh appointment has been taken by the Board of Finance and whatever could be the intention of the Vice-Chancellor and he should have said at that time that he did not agree with it and would appoint the Chief Security Officer but it was not said so there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is his (Shri Ashok Goyal) interpretation of those lines. His (Vice-Chancellor) own interpretation is something else. They have a disagreement, fine.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that some members could say that the details which the Vice-Chancellor had given, he expected, as reported in the media that the Vice-Chancellor said that the University would close from 1st January. There are some serious developments which have taken place besides in the media that the Hon'ble High Court has issued a *suo moto* notice to the Panjab University, he thought that the Vice-Chancellor would like to share with the Syndicate about what that notice is, how they have responded or how they are going to respond and how should they respond to that. Is this *suo moto* notice going to help the University vis-à-vis the Central Government or it has put them in disadvantageous position because they did not know except what they read in the newspapers. As a member of the Syndicate, he thought that the Vice-Chancellor would share that as a follow-up of the notice as reported in the media that this notice also and it is not only the media, this *suo moto* notice has probably been issued to the Panjab University for the first time in its history since inception. He is sure that the Vice-Chancellor must be knowing what is written in that and how they have to respond to that if they had not responded already.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had not been posed any question and all that there is something versus Panjab University and he has to appear in the Court on 20th October. That is why he has got prepared the document on sustenance which he has submitted to the Centre and have asked the Centre that the presentation of this document has to be given in the Court and he wanted to go the Centre and tell them as to what he is going to tell in the Court and requested for permission to present the same. He has also provided a copy of this document to the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who has been asked to be present in the Court?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Vice-Chancellor had been asked to be present in the Court. The first party is the Vice-Chancellor and the representatives of the U.T., MHRD and Punjab Government have also been made parties in this matter. He would submit the document which he has given to the members, three days before 20th October and he would go himself in the Court. He did not think that it would adversely affect the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a debatable issue whether this notice is against or in favour of the University.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that it must be such that the Ministry could be asked as to why the grants are not being given. But he felt that ultimately it would settle in favour of the University. The Court had taken note of the statement of the Vice-Chancellor and issued a *suo moto* notice.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as he understood it meant that the Vice-Chancellor needs to explain in the court that what he said that the University would close down in the absence of the grants from the Central Government. If yes, that is the data which the Vice-Chancellor has to place before the Court and has to justify it before the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Task Force had said so many things including that this uniqueness of the University should be

guarded, respected and appreciated. It should be accepted and recognized as an institution and if necessary through amendment in the Panjab University Act. This should be done to remove misperception and misapprehension. A distinguishing feature of this 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 was the only University which has first been built by the people and then recognized by the State.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this Task Force says and the Vice-Chancellor also says, the Syndicate and Senate also say that they have to establish in the High Court that this is the responsibility of the Central Government and they expect from the High Court to pass some directions to the Central Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he wrote this abstract after that only. The Panjab University was established as the 4th University of Indian continent in 1882 by the then Central Government in response to a campaign by the nobles and members of the public. All its stakeholders had participated in its progression and sustenance since then. During 134 years of its existence, its governance has been the responsibility of Central Government of India for 108 years and the reorganization of the State of Punjab by an Act of Parliament in 1966 enjoined the Central Government to explicitly assume the responsibility towards its maintenance by virtue of its campus of Panjab University being an integral part of Union Territory, Chandigarh. The maintenance expenditure of the University which mainly comprises salaries and other concurrent 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 tuition fee and examination fee, the successor State Government as well as the Central Government in the shape of annual grants. The funding pattern of the University as well as proportion of the shares towards its maintenance grant between the stakeholders has undergone changes a number of times in the past decade. 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 fulfillment of national agenda of higher education and research. A very difficult situation has emerged once again due to limitation in release of funds by the UGC. The University today faces challenge even to release the due salary with periodic enhancement of DA 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 teachers and non-teaching employees would get notified by the UGC and U.T. Administration, Chandigarh. Through this document, an appeal is being made to MHRD to address the 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. He has not added anything new to this document. After giving a reading to this document, he has paraphrased two paragraphs in such a way that everyone could understand that he is not saying anything wrong. He has already submitted this document and would like to personally hand over the same to MHRD. On behalf of them, he would submit a copy of the same in the Court. He would not submit anything in the Court which had not been earlier considered by the governing body. He has got all this information from the website of the University of Panjab at Lahore. It is all about how the University started from Lahore from 1869 as a College. There is common history up to 1947. It started in

1869 when the Senate was formed. In the first meeting of the Senate of University College, the word Syndicate, the executive governing body of the University, came up. Then the Act of 1882 came which was enacted by the Central Government. In 1904, Lord Curzon got enacted what is known as Indian Universities Act which applied to all the five Universities of India, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Allahabad and Panjab. They were governed by the Universities Act of Government of India until the year 1947. Then they come from Lahore to Shimla. What changes were brought in the University? In 1938, the first full time Vice-Chancellor of the University was appointed. The Central Government then said that the responsibility of the Central Government is now entrusted to the State Government. In the year 1947, the Punjab Government becomes West Punjab Government and East Punjab Government. West Punjab Government remains in Lahore and East Punjab Government comes to Shimla. They had to adopt their ordinance. Under the 1904 Act, no University paid the salaries to the teachers. Teachers were being recruited on behalf of the University, research was being done on behalf of the University. Up to 1904, the (Panjab) University paid salary only to the teachers of Oriental College. Later on salaries of some of the teachers was being paid by the University. There were no teaching departments of the University. The Government College had teaching departments and the salary of those teachers was being paid by the Government. The University conducted the examinations and from the examination fee the University was to be started. The Syndicate used to decide as to which department was to be opened and how many teachers were to be appointed. Only those laboratories were to be opened for which the money could be given by the University. Why the University needed teachers? The ranking/global status started after 2012. But that consciousness that the University of Panjab at Lahore had to compete with the University, this is the purpose for which the University was created and it could be fruitful only when the teachers of the University would do research work only when they would be provided facilities of laboratories, observatories, etc. Under the Act of 1904, the Government said that to run the academic administration, someone would have to take this responsibility. Under the Act, it is specified that there would be 11 Faculties in the Panjab University. 10 Senators would be elected, 58 would be nominated and they could choose up to 3 Faculties which were defined. To help the Fellows, the notion of added faculty was also a part of the Universities Act. As on today, 6 Fellows are elected from the Faculties but as per the Act of 1904, it is 5 from the Faculties of Oriental, Art, Medical, Science and Law and none from the other 6 Faculties. Ten members would be from the Registered Graduates. Ten members would be ex-officio like Chief Justice, Bishop of Lahore, DPI Lahore, DPI Peshawar, representatives of the Maharajas who had contributed to start the University in 1882. From Lahore the University came to Shimla and then came the issue as to how the Syndicate would be formed. It was also defined that 4 members would be from Oriental, 4 from Arts, 3 from Science and 2 each from others which comes to a total of 15. What happened from Lahore to Shimla is that the Faculty of Oriental was changed to Languages. The combined Faculty was formed from which there was no representation. The assignment of 3 Faculties which existed at Lahore were increased to 4. The Head of the Department used to be the University Professor or any eminent teacher of the Government College. The composition of the departments of the University was made up of handful teachers on behalf of the University, the remaining drawn out of the Colleges of Lahore. That was considered as a Department. All the teachers from

Lahore and Government College were sent to Hoshiarpur and the same was declared as a University College, the same concept from where the University had started in 1869. They were made as members of the University Departments. The University shifted from Hoshiarpur to Chandigarh and those who were not interested were left there. The Colleges had already been established in Chandigarh, and had nothing to do with the University. Now there were Professors and Heads of the Departments in the University and they were made as ex-officio members of the Faculties and they were not ex-officio members at Lahore. As Professor R.P. Bambah had said that there were only 1-2 Professors in some of the Departments while there was no Professor in others. That composition stabilized by the year 2000 and that situation has not changed as on today. When the Task Force visited the University, there were 671 teachers in the University. Now he has got all the documents and it has become easy for him to prove all these things. The Universities of Calcutta, Allahabad, Bombay, Madras have changed their Acts. It is only the Panjab University which has the original Act which was prepared by Lord Curzon.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Vice-Chancellor should devote at least half an hour for making the members of the new Senate aware about the history of Panjab University and requested to make a copy of the document available to the members.

Principal I.S. Sandhu also requested that a copy of the document be made available to the members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all these things have been written by the hardened bureaucrats. It is written that Panjab University is a unique institution. Alumni of the University get emotional when they visit the institution. It was informed by the Deans and Directors of the University that old students on their visit to the campus touch 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". It is not known as to how many Universities command this kind of respect from its past students. He had to read these repeatedly to understand the meaning.

Professor Anil Monga requested that a copy of the book written by R.R. Sethi and also 'Flight of Phoenix' be given to all the members of the new Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the Panjab University Act of 1882 it is written that it shall be the duty of the Central Government to require that the proceedings of the University shall be in conformity with this Act and with the Statutes, Rules and Regulations for the time being in force under the same and the Central Government may exercise all powers necessary for giving effect to its requisition in its behalf and may among other things, annual by way of notification in the official gazette any such proceeding which is not in conformity with this Act and the said Statutes, Rules and Regulations. It is the responsibility of the Central Government. He said that he would take Shri Ashok Goyal along when he would appear before the Court as they have to save this institution.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the whole Syndicate is ready to go with the Vice-Chancellor provided he is ready to say that the whole Syndicate has come with him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are the Government of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that otherwise it would give an impression as if they have confrontation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the outset he had stated that he wanted to hand over to his successors a very healthy organization. The Act says that the income and expenditure of the University shall be submitted once in a year to the Central Government for such examination and audit as the Central Government may direct. It is the responsibility of the Central Government. If the University did not have funds to run the University, it is for the Central Government to see as to how the University could be run. If the Central Government did not want to take the responsibility, then why the University is asked to submit the accounts? They are left with only 18% of the budget for development and they could not have the best campus award which is good for branding of the University. The news about the award of best campus by ASSOCHAM is published in Delhi newspapers and not at local level and the Central Government takes note of it and thinks that if the grant is not released what would happen. The University is having 4 buildings – Gandhi Bhavan, Dewan Anand Kumar Hall, Student Centre and A.C. Joshi Library - which are recognized as heritage buildings. They have forgotten as to who was Dewan Anand Kumar. He was not an administrator but an eminent scientist. He (Vice-Chancellor) came to know about him through a write-up sent by someone. They wanted to get it inscribed on the front of the Dewan Kumar Anand Hall building as has been inscribed in the International Hostel. It would be inaugurated by Mrs. Sushma Swaraj.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor had been doing well but he (Shri Ashok Goyal) never got any invitation for any function of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would address this concern of Shri Ashok Goyal and would send the invitation to him personally.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the International Hostel has come into existence on the advice of Professor Shelley Walia when he was the Dean, International Students and he also did not get the invitation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the past could not be repaired and future would be looked after. He has come to know that father of Mr. Swaraj Kaushal, the husband of Mrs. Sushma Swaraj was a part of the University. So, he intended to invite both of them on the day when the inscription of the write-up on Dewan Anand Kumar is to be unveiled. So by honouring Dewan Anand Kumar by having this inscription and having such a heritage status for this building, they would be able to get some money for this building for resurrection as has been done by the Chandigarh Administration for its Capitol Complex which is now in the list of UNESCO heritage sites. The U.T. Administration after allotting the land forgot the University and did not do anything for the University in this regard. Dewan Anand Kumar Hall, A.C. Joshi Library and Student Centre are part of the Capitol Complex of Panjab University. He is in touch the Secretary to Mrs. Sushma Swaraj and whenever the programme is finalized they would pay tribute to Dewan Anand Kumar.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the history of the building and the personality after whom it has been named, could be inscribed. He said that he had come to know from his friend, who is a Deputy Mayor in Shimla Municipal Corporation, that the brief history of the buildings of British era or earlier to that has been inscribed on the buildings.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why such initiatives are being taken up. He thought of it as the new generation might not know such things. He said that now let them go back to the position of Chief of University Security and recalled the 3 propositions. The first proposition was that in principle, they approve it and that does not mean that it goes to the Senate for approval. They take it back to the Board of Finance, explain the circumstances and if the Board of Finance in the meeting to be held in November approves it and then they bring it back to the Syndicate and then only they take it to the Senate. The second proposition could be that they pass it, pass it from the Senate and then send it to MHRD and seek their concurrence. The third proposition could be that which was articulated that they say, they revise the decision of the Syndicate and say that they did not need a Chief of University Security. But then again it has to be brought as an agenda item in the next Syndicate. The fourth proposition could be that they do nothing, they defer it and take it to the Board of Finance. They do not accord any in principle approval, they take it to the Board of Finance, then take it to the Syndicate and then to the meeting of the new Senate which could be held after 31st October.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in the third option, his suggestion should be incorporated that the teacher should be involved in it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was just articulating it and he is not a decision maker.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that they would have to take a decision that they did not require the Chief of University Security in its present form. That is what the option is. Now they say that they need and need with some amendment incorporating the qualifications, age, tenure post or regular post on probation. Then for that they have to first take a decision that they did not need a Chief of University Security in its present form and they want to become wiser and want to revise their own decision and thereafter, the Syndicate by itself or by constituting a Committee that in what form they need, if they need or if they do not need at all, the present arrangement is to go on. Or if they need, then what are the changes which are required to be made and with those changes they go to the Board of Finance to seek the approval. When the Board of Finance approves, then the advertisement could be given. This decision has to be taken that the present is not to be approved. As said by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa that the teacher should also be considered for this post, then they would have to amend the qualifications.

Some of the members suggested that the appointment could be made on tenure basis as is the case with DSW.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as said by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, the experiment of appointing Chief Security Officers had completely failed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that the Chief of University Security has to be a thinking person who is all the time worrying about all sorts of possible threats that the University could face and that job could not be performed by a teacher. They should try to understand it that it could not be done so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that keeping in view this spirit only supposing if they appoint somebody who is to remain here for 25 years and after confirmation after one year, he did not come up to their expectations and he is not a thinking person, where would they go.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is what the Selection Committee has made it sure by interviewing that person. The Selection Committee had a very long interview which continued for 2 days and thoroughly discussed all such questions with the candidates.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor must remember that earlier there was no age bar and later on it was imposed. At that time also thought of whether they are not going in the direction of appointing persons from a particular background, i.e. Army or other paramilitary forces or debarring persons from police. At that time, their intention was only that a person should be here for a limited period only so that if the experiment fails, they did not have to suffer for long. In the present form, it seems that it is not so, but to his mind, that person is asking for pay of Rs.80,000/- p.m. It is not salary but pay and what they were going to offer him, it is not mentioned. Are they going to pay him Rs.50,000/- or are going to pay after protecting the salary. So, they have to keep in mind the recommendation of the Selection Committee, the quantum of finance they have to incur vis-à-vis the financial position of the University. In his view, today they should not accept the recommendations of the Selection Committee and thereafter adopt whatever formally has to be brought to the Syndicate for consideration otherwise they would have to face the financial problem and if they again take it to the Board of Finance, they would have to give the justification and he hoped that the Board of Finance may agree or may not agree because the Syndicate also feels that they did not require the Chief of University Security at this cost and as per these qualifications.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not issue of cost for any officer that they appoint with this kind of a responsibility. They are not giving an extraordinary salary to this person. They have to pay Rs.70,000/-. Even a research scholar gets Rs.26,000/-. But it is an unfortunate thing that when he/she completes Ph.D., they appoint a person at a salary of Rs.21,600/- as Assistant Professor. The Government of India desires to pay Rs.26,000/- p.m. to any competent research scholar.

Professor Anil Monga said that as the points related to the qualifications are coming forward, they had already devoted so much time on it earlier. They had deliberated upon everything and then had decided the qualifications, background appropriate for the post. A great thought was given to this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this person that they are appointing or if at all he gets appointed in 2016 or 17, the appointment is in the scheme of 7th Pay Commission. The minimum pay of 7th Pay Commission where there is a defined pay band or

someone who has a grade pay of Rs.6,600/-, he/she is to be given a minimum salary and that is decided by the Central Government and that would not be less than Rs.60,000/- or Rs.70,000/-. It would not be less than that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is complicated matter. They have earlier also made such appointments in the old scales and in the meantime the new pay scales became due and it was said that those persons should be fitted according to new pay scales but they could not do so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at present the pay scale is Rs.15600-39100+GP 6600 and the person would get whatever the minimum of this scale would be decided by the Central Government in the 7th Pay Commission. They could not pay below that level. They could pay below that level only if the Central Government did not allow the University to implement the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission and did not release the grants.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the salary of the Chief of University Security would go beyond Rs.1 lac.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such apex positions are not decided by such narrow considerations. This is his understanding of running of the affairs of the Government of India.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Central Government had asked the University to generate the income of Rs.35 crores and they have passed on all this burden on the students, the percentage of that burden on the students of the University and the Colleges. Since all the Colleges are having hostels with student strength ranging from 500 to 600, would all those Colleges have to appoint the Chief Security Officers? If they are going to appoint the Chief of University Security from the police or army background, they would have to implement the University rules and would not implement some other outside mechanism or would not be able to prepare a new force of the University. As has already been said by some members that earlier they had persons from the police background but that could not be successful. He said that since he is working in a boys College, whenever there is some untoward incident and the police enter the campus, but are unable to control the situation. Only a teacher of that institution could handle the situation. The conditions are the same in the University. As is being repeatedly said whether they need a Chief of University Security, it is not that the Chief of University Security could handle the situation on his own and could diffuse the situation only with the help of Chandigarh Administration. He thought that a teacher could do it in a better way and they had experienced it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that that item is not under consideration. At the moment, the item under consideration is the recommendation of the Selection Committee. They could talk all these things provided they reject it. Let them not digress and take decisions.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that then it should be rejected.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that everyone has given his/her pleadings. No one of them, should take the issue as a personal matter. They all are interested to take care of the University security and if any

decision of theirs could hang the University system for 20-30 years or put into trouble. He could not say but there must have been such decisions earlier also. But from the views of majority of the members it is emerging that the views are not in favour.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they could reject it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga endorsed the viewpoints of Shri Raghbir Dyal.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if anyone has dissent, the same be recorded otherwise it is unanimously rejected.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not recommending the rejection because it would have serious consequences.

Professor Anil Monga said that there should be no rejection.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that spending Rs.70,000/- p.m. for the entire security of the University is a small amount.

The Vice-Chancellor said that giving the responsibility of the post, it is a very small amount of pay. As on today, even if they appoint an Assistant Professor, they have to pay the grade pay of Rs.6600/-. Even for the Constituent Colleges where they are making temporary appointment of teachers under Rule 5, they are to be paid the salary which is equal to grade pay of Rs.6600/-. So, the Chief of University Security is not being paid any great sum of money. Chief of University Security is just being paid salary which is equivalent to a teacher appointed in the University at the lower level who is not even a Ph.D. who otherwise would get 5 increments. It is a minimum salary that they are giving to a teacher. It is not a great deal of money considering the responsibility and the task that they are assigning and they are expecting from someone of the importance of Chief of University Security. So this is not a great deal of salary and is not even equal to a Deputy Registrar. So it is a position just equivalent to Assistant Registrar who, in the administrative hierarchy, is just one step above the Superintendent. Salary is not the issue. So let them not worry about the salary. They had already advertised the position and it was a decision of the Syndicate to advertise this position with specified qualifications, salary, etc. Nothing that has been done until today is illegitimate. The only technical point is whether the Government of India would accept it or not. That is the only small thing that is there. To him, there is nothing that they have done is wrong and they would be setting a wrong precedence that one Syndicate comes after the whole process has been gone to its completion and the Syndicate says 'no'. This is not a good thing. They could do whatever they wanted. But personally, he is not recommending. They would send a wrong signal to the society and to the Government of India also.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that at least once they could take it to the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all as Dr. Ajay Ranga had said, let them not take it at an emotional level and not take it as a personal case. They are bound to differ on so many issues. The Syndicate took a decision and they are saying that it is not correct on their part to revise the decision which was taken by the earlier Syndicate. But is he supposed not to follow the decision taken by this

Syndicate only. The Vice-Chancellor is saying about a small technical point. He is saying that not only this Syndicate, the Senate has taken the decision not to make any fresh appointment. He simply said in the beginning that it is not within the purview of the Syndicate to even consider the recommendations of the Selection Committee and purely on that technical ground and the decision of the Syndicate and Senate, without going into the merits of the case, without going into the financial quantum, they straightaway reject it and they would come to it later on. Why should they go to the Board of Finance?

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is his (Shri Ashok Goyal) opinion.

Professor Anil Monga said that in the minutes which have been recorded, perhaps the true spirit of the Vice-Chancellor has not been reflected in the sense in which the decision was taken and that should be considered.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the minutes of the Board of Finance are not recorded word-by-word.

Professor Anil Monga said that while recording perhaps those two points, the Board of Finance could have considered at that time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying that the minutes of the Board of Finance are not recorded word-by-word and they have to go by what is resolved.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that it be taken to the Board of Finance for clarification and till that time a consensus might also be formed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he gave that option also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that even after the decision of the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate, they have gone ahead with the interview.

Professor Anil Monga said that perhaps the spirit was not reflected in the minutes which have been recorded.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he knew only one thing that when he was considering it in the Syndicate and Senate, he knew what spirit they had and he only knew that spirit.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the teachers should be involved in it which would create a good atmosphere. He had been repeatedly requesting this.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if a wrong decision is taken, would they stick to that? It is not a personal issue. It is for the welfare of the University which he also favoured but if a wrong decision is taken, who would be responsible for that? Could they revert it? He did not know the candidate, he is not saying that the person selection is not having calibre, he suggested that such sensitive posts should be tenure based and not for 30-35 years because the Chief Security Officer has to reach to each and every person, has to deal with students of all kinds like notorious, meritorious, hostellers, etc. Did they keep all these things in mind while making the appointment?

The Vice-Chancellor said that all these things have been well thought of. The Committee consisted of very mature and senior people. Each and everything that they are saying had been thought of and discussed in the context of this person's case.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Vice-Chancellor should try to understand that they are not against this person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that what is before them is a valid selection. He read the minutes of the Board of Finance where it is mentioned that Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that instead of freezing, the University should not fill up new posts, teaching and non-teaching, till the financial position is stabilized. On this, the Vice-Chancellor said that no advertisement was pending except that of Constituent Colleges where the teachers appointed by walk-in-interview have already been working against vacant post. A blanket ban on all inductions would adversely affect the functioning of the University. There could arise a need of critical inductions like Chief of University Security, Medical Officers, Deputy Registrars, who have been selected and there was a court case and judgment in that case stands reserved. No Deputy Registrar has joined against the advertisement for long and at the moment only one directly recruited Deputy Registrar is working. So this is all that is here. When this was there, it was in his mind that the Chief of University Security is a critical induction. Now, technically at the way that shall be made on due justification after having the same approved by the Board of Finance. Alright, they go back to the Board of Finance, explain these things. If the Board of Finance permits, they bring it back to the Syndicate. If the Board of Finance does not permit, then the matter does not come to the Syndicate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that out of the four options suggested by the Vice-Chancellor, he agreed with the third option.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him just paraphrase it again. One option is that they go back to the Board of Finance. If the Board of Finance accepts that it is a critical induction and allows it, then only the matter comes to the Syndicate otherwise the matter ends.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why only one option.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he agrees with Dr. Ajay Ranga that any appointment being made for a period of 25-30 years is not a good decision. Secondly, they are facing financial crunch and it is being discussed in every meeting. It seems that they are not respecting the decision of the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate. The Syndicate took a decision and it is recorded that with the appointment of the Principals in the Constituent Colleges, the services of the Coordinator are no more required, but the Coordinator is continuing. It meant that the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate are not being respected. It is related with the sanctity of the decisions of the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate. He is against this appointment and it should be rejected and a Committee could be formed to decide as to why this appointment is necessary. As Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the teachers could be assigned this responsibility, he thought that they are not bearing any extra financial burden on this except paying Rs.5-7000 to the teacher performing this duty and it is not a huge amount. They are facing

financial crunch and the minimum salary of the Chief of University Security would be around Rs.60,000/- in the minimum of the pay scale even if they pay is not protected. This appointment needs to be rejected and a Committee could be formed and it should be given a rethought.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, okay, it is rejected.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that there is no question on the merits of the procedure. But one thing is to be kept in mind that earlier when they were considering to approve the qualifications, then they never thought about all this. When they approved the qualifications of the Chief of University Security, then nobody raised the question and now members are raising questions. If they feel that there is any problem, or if there is any apprehension, then they could go to the Board of Finance otherwise it should be approved.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that Dr. Jatinder Grover is doing a good job and his team should be more strengthened, should be made more tech-savvy. He out-rightly rejected the item.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that his opinion about this item is that it should be rejected and his argument is that the University teacher should be given the chance.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is rejected and he is satisfied with the present arrangement.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought that such an item should not have been brought here to maintain the sanctity of the decision of the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate. It is not within their purview even to consider this item. So this outrightly needs to be rejected.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he is absolutely against this voting business which is going on. But he is of the opinion that they need to evolve new eligibility conditions keeping in mind the internal academic criteria which a Security Officer must have which means his experience as a Professor or as a teacher is important and relevant to his functioning as a Security Officer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is not the matter under consideration. They have already approved the qualifications.

Professor Shelley Walia said that under these conditions, obviously, he says 'no'.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that his decision is that whatever the Senate had taken the decision, they should respect that and this appointment should not have been made. If it has been made, it should be rejected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if there is any technical hitch, it should go back to the Board of Finance otherwise this particular selection/item which they are talking about has been discussed for the last 2 years. It came to the Syndicate, then it was sent back for modification, it was modified. Then selection was made, people had not joined and they had re-advertised. Now it has come again. He thought that the decision has been taken many times as far as

eligibility is concerned. The only thing is whether they should have gone ahead with the interview or not. In the Board of Finance, he thought that it was clear that those positions which had been advertised, they could continue with those and but any way because the way the minutes have been written, there seems to be a little doubt and that could be cleared in the Board of Finance.

Professor Anil Monga said that the recommendations of the Selection Committee be approved and if there is some technicality, it should be considered by the Board of Finance and they should approve it. The objections raised and pointed out by the members regarding eligibility conditions were taken care of and approved by the Syndicate and after that they advertised the post and made the selection. He thought that they should approve it and if there is any technicality, they could go back to the Board of Finance.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that there are three parts, first is the need and she definitely agreed that there is a need of Chief Security Officer. The second part is of qualification and of course, basically the Board of Finance has to say 'yes' and only then they could go ahead.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he is repeatedly focusing on it that they have to see two aspects of the security. First is the security and the second is handling of students. The most important is the handling of students. If the teacher aspect is missing in it, then that person could not perform this duty. However, if they needed to hire a Security Officer for some other organization or a building, that person would have been the best person. But in the University, that person has to handle the students, shape them and if the teacher aspect is missing, it would be misleading. He thought that some teacher should be taken on tenure basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is not the matter under consideration. The matter under consideration is whether they accept the recommendation or not.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he did not accept it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is his (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) right and he could exercise it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is not accepted.

Principal B.C. Josan said that it should be referred back to the Board of Finance.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that he has already expressed his opinion that it should be referred to the Board of Finance and there it should be discussed again.

At this, the Vice-Chancellor said that all the 14 members have given their viewpoints. Shri Raghbir Dyal, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Shelley Walia, Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, Dr. Ajay Ranga (8 members) said that they reject it. Professor Emanuel Nahar (1 member) favoured. Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Anil Monga, Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi, Principal B.C. Josan and Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky (5 members) say that it be referred back to

the Board of Finance. Thus there being 8 members in favour of rejection, 1 in favour of acceptance and 5 in favour of referring back to Board of Finance, the item is rejected.

RESOLVED: That in view of the recommendation of the Board of Finance that fresh appointments in future shall be made only on need basis with due justification and after getting the same approved from the Board of Finance, which have duly been approved by the Syndicate and Senate, the recommendation of Selection Committee dated 31.08.2016 & 01.09.2016 (**Appendix-X**) for appointment of Chief of University Security-1 (Advt. No. 2/2016), Panjab University, Chandigarh be rejected by majority opinion (eight for rejection, one for approval and five for referring back to the Board of Finance).

Appointment of Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, P.U., Chandigarh

2(x). Considered minutes dated 09.09.2016 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Selection Committee (Walk-in-Interview) for appointment of Assistant Professors-2 (purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2016-2017), in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, at Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, P.U., Chandigarh

3. Considered recommendation of the Screening Committee dated 05.08.2016 (**Appendix-XII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that Dr. Shweta, Assistant Professor at Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) w.e.f. 03.12.2013 as the API score obtained by her meets the UGC requirement with capping as per 2nd amendment.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Shweta, Assistant Professor at Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) w.e.f. 03.12.2013 as the API score obtained by her meets the UGC requirement with capping as per 2nd amendment.

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

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

Extra Ordinary Leave Without Pay to Dr. Sawarn Singh, Assistant Director, Population Research Centre, P.U.

4. Considered, if, Dr. Sawarn Singh, Assistant Director, Population Research Centre, P.U., be granted, Extra Ordinary Leave Without Pay, for another six months w.e.f. 18.06.2016 to 17.12.2016, as per his request dated 11.07.2016 (**Appendix-XIII**). Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIII**) was also taken for consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 11.1 (i) appearing at page 119 of Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reproduced as below.

11.1. Unless otherwise laid down in these Regulations, the authorities competent to grant leave (other than casual) shall be-

(i) Syndicate - for employee of Class-A for leave of more than six months

2. Dr. Sawarn Singh, Assistant Director was sanctioned Extra Ordinary Leave Without Pay for six months w.e.f. 18.06.2015. He was again sanctioned EOL Without Pay for six months w.e.f. 18.12.2015, which was ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 (Para 40-R(v)) (**Appendix-XIII**).

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sawarn Singh, Assistant Director, Population Research Centre, P.U., be granted, Extra Ordinary Leave Without Pay, for another six months w.e.f. 18.06.2016 to 17.12.2016, as per his request dated 11.07.2016 (**Appendix-XIII**).

Recommendation/s of the Regulations Committee dated 19.05.2016 regarding amendment in Pension Regulations

5. Considered the recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 19.05.2016 (**Appendix-XIV**) as well as the information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIV**), and

RESOLVED: That -

- (1) amendment in Regulations 1.2, 1.6 and 4.3 appearing at pages 180-191 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007 **be made as under and be given effect to** in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<u>PRESENT REGULATIONS</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</u>
<p>1.2 The provisions of these Regulations shall apply to-</p> <p>** (a) all employees who joined service under the University before 1.1.2004;</p> <p>(b) the employees who retired prior to the date of notification of these Regulations if they specifically elect to be governed by these Regulations by exercising an option as provided in Regulation 1.8 infra.</p>	<p>1.2 No Change</p> <p>(a) all employees who joined service under the University before 01.01.2004 <u>and those employees who have joined the University on or after 1.1.2004 and borne on Pensionable post in the previous organization and have applied through proper channel without any break shall also be covered under old pension scheme under the provisions of these Regulations subject to the condition that the previous employer have transferred the pro-rata pensionary benefit to University as defined in Regulation 3.14 (i).</u></p> <p>(b) <u>No Change</u></p>
<p>NOTE: The proposed amendment is an enabling provision to give effect to the notification No. 28/30/2004-P&PW (B) dated 26.7.2005 issued by Government of India, Ministry of Personal & Public Grievance and Pension, Department of Pension and Pension Welfare. This notification has been adopted by the Government of Punjab vide Notification No.6/10/08-6/Finance Pension rules & Coordination/723 dated 24.10.2008. The same has been adopted by the Senate at its meeting dated 10.10.2010 vide Paragraph LVI. Through this notification the Govt. of India has clarified that all employees who entered in the Government service before 31.12.2013 and were governed by old Pension Scheme will continue to be governed by the same Pension Scheme as amended from time to time, if such employees submit technical resignation on or after 01.01. 2004 to take a new appointment in another government department or an autonomous body set up by the government.</p>	
<p>1.6 In the matter of application of these Regulations, regard may be given to the corresponding provisions of Pension Rules contained in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume II, as amended from time to time, insofar as, these can be adopted to the service in the University, but subject</p>	<p>1.6 In the matter of application of these Regulations, regard may be given to the corresponding provisions of Pension Rules contained in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume II, as amended from time to time, as the University may,</p>

to such exceptions and modifications, as the University may from time to time, determine through Regulations.	<u>from time to time, determine through its governing bodies i.e. Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate.</u>
4.3 In the case of an employee who has rendered 10 years (20 half years), or more of the qualifying service, the pension payable shall be calculated at the rate of 50% of average emoluments, if the qualifying service rendered is not less than 33 years (sixty six half years). In cases where the qualifying service is less than sixty six half years, the pension admissible shall first be calculated at 50% of average emoluments and then reduced proportionately, to completed half years service actually rendered, provided that pension shall, in no case, be less than Rs. 375 per month.	4.3 In case an employee who has rendered 10 years (20 half years) or more of the qualifying service, the pension payable shall be calculated <u>as per the pension Rules of Punjab Govt. as contained in Punjab Civil Service Rules Volume II as amended from time to time.</u>

Explanation to the proposed amendment as above

The present Pension Regulations of the University as approved by the MHRD, are based on the Pension Rules as contained in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-II. In the recent past, there had been some amendments in the Pension Rules of Government of Punjab consequent to the implementation of pay commission report w.e.f. 1.1.2006. E.g.

- (i) The benefit of full pension had been allowed on the basis of qualifying service of 25 years instead of 33 years;
- (ii) the minimum amount of pension now has been enhanced to Rs. 3500 p.m. from the earlier limit of Rs. 375 p.m. from 1.1.1986 and Rs. 1310 p.m. from 1.1.1996.

The amendment of regulation as above has been proposed so that University may adopt and implement the changes in the Pension Rules as approved by the Government from time to time.

- (2) additions/amendments in Regulations 1.2(c), 1.8 (a) and 5.2 appearing at pages 180-187 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, (Para 21), be made as under and be given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATIONS	PROPOSED REGULATIONS
<p>1.2 The provisions of these Regulations shall apply to –</p> <p>**(a) all employees who joined service under the University before 1.1.2004;</p>	<p>1.2 The provisions of these Regulations shall apply to –</p> <p>(a) all employees who joined service under the University before 01.01.2004 <u>and those employees who have joined the University on or after 1.1.2004 and borne on</u></p>

<p>(b) the employee who retired prior to the date of notification of these Regulations if they specially elect to be governed by these Regulations by exercising an option as provided in Regulation 1.8 infra.</p>	<p><u>Pensionable post in the previous organization and have applied through proper channel without any break shall also be covered under old pension scheme under the provisions of these Regulations subject to the condition that the previous employer have transferred the pro-rata pensionary benefit to University as defined in Regulation 3.14 (i).</u></p> <p>(b) No Change</p> <p>(c) <u>the widow/widowers/legal heirs of the employees who expired prior to the date of notification of these Regulations if they specifically opt to be governed by these Regulations from the date of amendment by exercising an option as provided in Regulation 1.8 infra.</u></p>
<p>1.8. (a) The employees who joined the service of the University before the date of notification of these Regulations shall have the option -</p> <p>i) to continue to be governed by the Contributory Provident Fund-cum- Gratuity Scheme contained in Chapter VI “Conditions of Service of University Employees” of the Panjab University Calendar, Vol. I, 1994.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(ii) to elect to be governed by the Pensionary Scheme contained in these Regulations.</p> <p>(b) **(i) In the case of an employee who elects the alternative under sub clause (a)(ii) above, the total contribution of the University to his C.P. Fund Account as on 24-10-2005 or the date of retirement whichever is earlier, alongwith</p>	<p>1.8 (a) <u>The employees or the widow/widowers/Legal Heirs of the employees on whom these regulations are applicable under Regulation 1.2 shall have the option -</u></p> <p>(i) to continue to be governed by the Contributory Provident Fund-cum- Gratuity Scheme contained in Chapter VI “Conditions of Service of University Employees” of the Panjab University Calendar, Vol. I, 2007, as amended from time to time.</p> <p>(ii) No change</p> <p>(b) (i) to (ii) No Change</p>

<p>interest thereon, shall be transferred from his C.P. Fund Account for being credited to the University Pension Fund (Corpus).</p> <p>**<u>(ii)</u> The employee's share of C.P. Fund, as on 24-10-2005, alongwith interest thereon, shall be transferred to his General Provident Fund Account to which he shall subscribe compulsorily under the rules of that fund as prescribed by the University from time to time.</p> <p>(c) The option shall have to be exercised within such period as may be decided by the Syndicate and once exercised shall be final and irrevocable.</p> <p>(d) Those who fail to exercise the option within the period prescribed under Clause (c) above shall be deemed to have elected for continuing under the C.P. Fund and Gratuity schemes mentioned in sub-clause a (i) above.</p> <p>**<u>(e)</u> <u>The employees who retired prior to 24-10-2005 may</u>, if they so desire, elect to be governed by these Pension Regulations, subject to the condition that they refund the University's C.P. Fund contribution, including interest thereon, as received by them from the University for being credited to the University Pension Fund (Corpus). The University would neither charge any interest on this amount of the University share of C.P. Fund received by the retiree for the period from the date of his/her retirement upto the date of his/her joining the Pension Scheme nor would pay any arrear of pension. The pension may be made available to the employees from the date they deposit their University share of C.P. Fund, including interest thereon.</p>	<p>(c) to (d) No Change</p> <p>**<u>(e)</u> <u>The employees who retired or the legal heir of an employee who deceased prior to 24-10-2005 may</u>, if they so desire, elect to be governed by these Pension Regulations, subject to the condition that they refund the University's C.P. Fund contribution, including interest thereon, as received by them from the University for being credited to the University Pension Fund (Corpus). The University would neither charge any interest on this amount of the University share of C.P. Fund received by the retiree/ legal heir for the period from the date of his/her retirement/death upto the date of his/her joining the Pension Scheme nor would pay any arrear of pension. The pension may be made available to the employees/legal heir from the date they deposit their University share of C.P. Fund, including interest thereon.</p>
<p>5.2 In the event of death after retirement, family pension is admissible only if the retiree was in receipt of pension at the time of death.</p>	<p>5.2 Family pension is admissible only if,</p> <p>(i) <u>the retiree was in receipt of pension at the time of death.</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) <u>the legal heirs of the deceased employee had opted for the pension under Regulation 1.8 (a)</u></p>

**Recommendation of the
Committee dated
23.06.2016 regarding
amendment in
nomenclature of degrees.**

6. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 23.06.2016 (**Appendix-XV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to letter F. No. 5-1/2016 Pt.A (CPP-II) dated May 13, 2016 (**Appendix-XV**) received from University Grants Commission, regarding specification of degrees.

RESOLVED: That, recommendations of the Committee dated 23.06.2016, **as per Appendix**, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to letter F. No. 5-1/2016 Pt.A (CPP-II) dated May 13, 2016 (**Appendix-XV**) received from University Grants Commission, regarding amendment in nomenclature of degrees, be approved.

**Adoption of Gazette
Notification dated
5.7.2016 pertaining to
Minimum Standards and
Procedure for Award of
M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees**

7. Considered, if the Gazette notification dated 05.07.2016 with regard to U.G.C. regulations Minimum Standards and Procedure for Award of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees Regulations 2016, be adopted. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired whether they have to adopt the UGC notification or they could change it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could change it in principle but there have to be strong reasons and would have to be communicated.

Professor Shelley Walia said that people wanted lot of information of which one is that the JRFs who join the Departments, would they automatically get into Ph.D. because many JRFs clear the examination. But their potential is seen for Ph.D., they fail that and so nowhere it is written that JRFs would automatically get into Ph.D. He wanted some sort of clarification on this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all that he could tell is that in the national institutions including the Deemed Universities, the JRFs have to qualify the criteria which those institutes had which is very stringent. The national institutes like TIFR have their own criteria.

Professor Shelley Walia said that some academic and administrative committees of the departments feel that a particular JRF is not fit enough to take up the Ph.D. programme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a candidate could say that he/she wanted to undergo Ph.D. under a particular supervisor.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it meant that if a person had qualified JRF, he/she is eligible and could do Ph.D.

Professor Anil Monga said that when a JRF candidate makes a presentation before the academic and administrative committee, that is being evaluated and only then it is decided and it is not automatic admission to Ph.D.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the other thing, it is quite clear that the M.Phil and Ph.D. examination would be separate. The whole idea of M.Phil. and Ph.D. in the University as one single examination, there was a meeting a day before yesterday in the office of the Dean of University Instruction with all the Chairpersons and all of them were of the view that the examination for M.Phil. and Ph.D. should be separate. The argument is that if they have B.A. and M.A. and having the same examination, obviously the people would choose

the higher degree. He had been stressing on the need of having a separate examination for M.Phil. and Ph.D. because most of the students go to Ph.D. and very few come to M.Phil. course. He suggested that they should send a circular to all the departments which should emphasise on the separate examination. He thought that the University kept its convenience in view while conducting a common examination instead of holding two separate examinations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as per Regulation 10 of UGC where it is mentioned that the Colleges may be considered eligible to offer M.Phil/Ph.D. programmes which meant a common examination for which the qualification prescribed is a Master's degree. So, this is where the problem lies.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa felt that the M.Phil. course is becoming a dying course.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it is true and that is very important because in many departments, M.Phil. is a very vibrant course. The reason why it is dying is because of this common examination. The M.Phil. course which now the UGC has said that it should be of 3-4 semesters or from one year to 2 years, the UGC is also very impressed that the M.Phil. should be a very important course. If they look around Jawaharlal Nehru University and other Universities, as is mentioned in the UGC Regulations as an integrated programme, the M.Phil. programme is so vigorous and it is such a wonderful programme because it has courses on research methodology, dissertation, seminar and conferences as compulsory and one is marked for it. So, he thought that the M.Phil. course should be strengthened in the University as it is a degree, a distinguishing feature of the University and the departments. If they abolish M.Phil., they would become like the Colleges which have only P.G. studies and now the Colleges also have Ph.D. The only distinguishing feature that the departments have is M.Phil. course and it should be strengthened. He wanted to draw the attention to the last sentence of procedure for admission (Regulation 5.1) "similar approach may be adopted in respect of Entrance Test for M.Phil. programme" which meant that there should be a separate entrance test. It also meant that the UGC is also implying on separate examination.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it would be better if the Departments should start the integrated programmes.

Professor Shelley Walia emphasised that they need to ensure that M.Phil. becomes a very rigorous pre-doctoral degree and it becomes compulsory and they could take a policy decision on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the UGC might not permit it. However, some incentive has also to be given.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the students would not be interested in M.Phil. if they hold a separate entrance test. M.Phil. course is going on because of a combined entrance test otherwise this course would close. The students who were able to get the supervisor do the Ph.D. and the others go for M.Phil. and after that upon the availability of supervisor, that student starts the Ph.D. In this way, the students save about a time of 1-1½ years and they complete the course work in M.Phil. The burden on the University has also

decreased by way of holding a combined entrance test. If they hold separate entrance test for admission to M.Phil. and Ph.D. it would be a burden. Moreover, since the eligibility for teaching job is not M.Phil. but a Ph.D., not much students would take admission in M.Phil., the seats of which at present are being filled up. Therefore, the earlier practice of holding a common entrance test for admission to M.Phil. and Ph.D. should continue which would benefit the students as well as the University so that the M.Phil. course could run otherwise, this course would close.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he disagreed with it as he had joined the first batch of M.Phil.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that earlier M.Phil. was one of the eligibility conditions for teaching job and he had also done M.Phil.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he had taught M.Phil. course for about 25 years there used to be separate examination for M.Phil. and Ph.D.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the subject of Punjabi, there are many students who are not getting the Ph.D. supervisors, they take admission in M.Phil. and upon the availability of the supervisor, they start the Ph.D. programme. If they hold a separate entrance test, the M.Phil. course would close down. He had done M.Phil. after about 10-15 years ago when Professor Shelley Walia would have done it. When Professor Shelley Walia had done M.Phil., the eligibility for teaching was Master degree with 55%. However, the candidates holding M.Phil. degree were given the advantage and were getting the jobs. But, now the M.Phil. degree holders are not getting the jobs. The only advantage is that they are getting exemption from Ph.D. course work. They also did not want that the Ph.D. should also be given to the Colleges. This is what the University teachers want. Therefore, the entrance test should be common. If the students could not get the supervisors from the University, they would be able to get the supervisor from the Colleges. He suggested that the present practice should continue.

Professor Shelley Walia said that there are 20 seats in the M.Phil. course in the Department of English and Cultural Studies and for about 20 years, all the seats used to be filled up. Many candidates had to be rejected as there was a very rigorous interview and the M.Phil. programme was excellent for the people who went through it. Now, if they go and find out that many departments are getting 2-3 students in the M.Phil. programme and even at present the Department of English and Cultural Studies is having 15 students and are very good as 7 of them are from Delhi University. Those students have taken admission in the M.Phil. programme thinking that if they go through the M.Phil. course, they would be prove to be better scholars for research at the Ph.D. level because they would have to go for research writing, papers, etc. Therefore, the students have chosen the M.Phil. Let them say that they agree with Principal I.S. Sandhu that they have a common entrance test, have a common entrance test, but make M.Phil. compulsory so that every student who takes up research does M.Phil. and Ph.D. and this is being followed in many of the good Universities.

The Vice Chancellor said that this should not be made compulsory and it should be left to a given department whether they wanted it to be a common or as a separate entrance test.

Professor Anil Monga said that the candidates having M.Phil. are given exemption from course work in Ph.D. If they hold a common entrance test it would ensure the credibility for admission as the candidate had qualified the same entrance test and a student who wanted to have both M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees had first chosen to do M.Phil. and exemption is given in Ph.D. If there is a separate entrance test for M.Phil. at the departmental level, its credibility would be lower.

The Vice Chancellor said that the idea of M.Phil. option is that a candidate could study for some time, go away for some other course and again could do the Ph.D.

Professor Shelley Walia said that supposing if a M.A. pass student wanted to do Ph.D. directly, he/she would complete the Ph.D. degree, but did not know as to how to write a footnote, did not know the documentation.

Professor Anil Monga said that in Regulation 8, Research Advisory Committee and its functions are mentioned. The Research Advisory Committee would perform the function of the RDC which they are presently having in the University and they have a separate Research Monitoring Committee also. The present system has to be replaced by Research Advisory Committee and the Research Supervisor of the scholar shall be the Convener of this Committee. Presently, they have two Committees and he suggested that it should remain as it is.

The Vice Chancellor said that most national institutions have a 3-member Committee for every student. The purpose of it is that if only Research Supervisor is monitoring and something goes wrong, the corrective measures could be taken. The Chairman of the Department and whosoever is monitoring could continuously get the feedback on whether the research work is going on or not and if anything wrong happens, corrective steps could be taken.

Professor Anil Monga said that presently in the University there are two Committees working whereas as per the UGC Regulations, only one Research Advisory Committee is to be formed and they need to look into it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could refer it to a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Dean of University Instruction which could also have a Syndicate member and come back with the suggestions.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if they go by the spirit of the UGC Regulations, then there is a separate entrance for M.Phil.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not ask the Chairpersons. However, if the Chairpersons wanted, they could have a separate entrance test. The UGC is permitting it but they could not force it.

Professor Shelley Walia said that there should be a separate entrance test as per the UGC Regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the UGC says that the entrance test for admission to Ph.D. is to be conducted and said that the similar approach may be adopted for M.Phil. also. It is not that they have to do it. The UGC says conduct the entrance for M.Phil. on the same lines. For example, there is degree course of B.A. and if they say that similar approach may be adopted for B.Com. It did not mean that there would be common test for B.A. and B.Com. It only meant that the same criterion of percentage is to be adopted.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a student qualifies the NET for JRF at national level and as Professor Shelley Walia said that they want to take the interview of those students also and wanted to reject. He cited the example of a student of the Department of English and Cultural Studies that a student who had got 3rd rank in the test but the Department did not provide the Supervisor to that student for Ph.D. and he had to go to Punjabi University, Patiala. The Department's intention is that the student may not come for Ph.D.

Professor Shelley Walia said that every teacher in the Department is having 8 Ph.D. students.

The Vice Chancellor said that research student is a guy who has to have a potential for research which could not be forced upon him/her.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if there are 10 seats in Ph.D. programme and 50 students have qualified the entrance test or UGC NET or JRF, how those students are further assessed. The students should be given specified marks for graduation, post-graduation and M.Phil. because the students complain that even after qualifying in the JRF, they did not get admission in Ph.D. There should be transparency in it and academic merit should be considered.

The Vice Chancellor said that this question would be posed to the Dean of University Instruction.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he had seen that in many of the Departments the teachers did not want to run the M.Phil. programme. However, he did not want to name the Department. The students want to come to the University for M.Phil., it being a prestigious course. He wanted to give some suggestions that they could have some integrated course like M.A. M.Phil. and M.Phil. Ph.D. and such courses could run successfully. It is for the authority as to how to take the work from the teachers. They could revive the M.Phil. course through integrated courses. The admission process would become more transparent. There should be an account of the achievement of the students of the last 5-10 years and it should not be that in interview, some selected students are chosen and given the admission. Thirdly, if they have the shortage of teachers in the University for Ph.D., there are able teachers in the Colleges who could also provide able guidance to the students, the gates should be opened to the Colleges' teachers also. They could also have the NAAC grading of the Colleges and the good teachers could be engaged for guidance. As pointed out by Principal I.S. Sandhu that a candidate of Panjab University has gone to Punjabi University for Ph.D., he also knows a candidate from UIET who has qualified the JRF and is gold medallist and she had also to go Punjabi University.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Regulation 6.5 (page 9) regarding allocation of Research Supervisor specifies as to how many students a teacher could take, it states that a Professor can have 3 M.Phil. and 8 Ph.D. students, an Associate Professor can have 2 M.Phil. and 6 Ph.D. students and an Assistant Professor can have 1 M.Phil. and 4 Ph.D. students. His question is, for example, the Departments which are having very high intake of M.Phil. or LLM students and the faculty strength is very low, then what would happen. For example, in UIIS they are having 120 seats in LLM course. Every student has to do dissertation work which is equivalent to M.Phil. dissertation and the number of regular teachers in the Department is about 25 and out of them 8-10 being the teachers of other subjects, only 15 teachers of Law are regular. As per the conditions, only a regular teacher could guide the students for dissertation. Therefore, to guide 120 students, 120 Supervisors would be required and he did not know as to how the Supervisors would be available. If they adopt these Regulations in toto, the intake of the students would decrease and how they would be able to guide the already enrolled students.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the Department of Punjabi, there are 3 teachers. If there are 20 seats in M.Phil. course and as per the criteria only 9 students could be guided, then where the other 11 students would go for guidance. There are so many problems due to the number of teachers being very less in the Departments.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are all Department specific problems. The Departments would bring these problems to the Dean of University Instruction and they would try to find out a solution. This is not a thing that they could decide at the Syndicate level. It is a policy making body. Such problems could be submitted in advance and only then they could discuss such issues. If they discuss such free issues, the meeting could prolong. At the moment, the item before them is whether they adopt the UGC Regulations or not and did not have much choice. Whatever changes are required in this have to be considered separately. When he asked whether they are, in principle, against this document of UGC, the members said 'no'. So, let them adopt it and whatever issues the members had, they could give the same to him and he would take it to the Dean of University Instruction and they have a machinery now to take care of these things and whatever decision would be taken, that would be brought back to the Syndicate and that could be ratified.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they adopt it, could they make the changes in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that why not. They could make anything stringent. They could propose anything which is not violative of this document. What is the spirit of this document? If a member is posing some problems, then they have to find a solution to the problems. If in that spirit it is violative of the UGC Regulations, then they would have to pose it to the UGC and could say that they have done such and such on account of this. They could club the students of M.Phil. and Ph.D. with a teacher so that they could satisfy their local needs. Some concrete solution has to be found out. He has already suggested a Committee including Director, Research Promotion Cell (RPC), Director, Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) and Professor A.K. Bhandari for this purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor had approved something and some other thing has come as an item for consideration. The Committee has still to work on it. The Vice Chancellor had approved two things and the Dean of University Instruction had written that 'x' may be allowed and 'x' is only the gazette notification which has been brought here for adopting. If they adopt it here, where and when it would be applicable because in the next line, it is written that however the admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. programmes 2016 will be as per the guidelines printed in Handbook of Information. The Handbook of Information, 2016 has already been published in May 2016 and they have made the admissions accordingly. If they adopt it today, for whom they would be adopting it. It is also written that if some changes are required keeping in view of this thing, a Committee be formed for the same and the Vice Chancellor had formed a Committee. As per the instructions of the Vice Chancellor, the Dean of University Instruction has suggested a Committee and the Vice Chancellor approved 'x'. Instead of the matter going to that Committee to work out the changes which they have sought, which should have come to the Syndicate to adopt and make the changes. It is not known as to why it has gone to the Deputy Registrar (General) and the Vice Chancellor had not marked it to Syndicate. He could not understand as to what they are doing. Where is it written that the first para is to be taken to the Syndicate? In fact, the first para is to be adopted in principle and keeping in view that whatever changes are required to be made in 2014 Regulations, for that the Vice Chancellor has already constituted a Committee and the Committee is to work on that both the things are supposed together to be brought to the Syndicate which would be approved and that would be applicable for future admissions to be made to M.Phil. and Ph.D.

Professor Anil Monga said that in view of the suggestions, they could refer it to the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the intention of the Vice Chancellor is that both these things be put up together. It is not known who has marked to the Syndicate and who has marked it to the Deputy Registrar (General). All the points which are being raised here, may be those points would be taken care of by the Committee which has been constituted by the Vice Chancellor. When this comes with the gazette notification and the report of the Committee, may be half of the points which are being raised, would be taken care of by the Committee when Syndicate approves it. Saying that they approved (1), when are they approving it, when are they going to implement as they have already made admissions up to 2016. The next admissions have to be made after considering these. Then why are they doing it. These two things should have been integrated.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the Committee could be asked to submit the report in a time bound manner.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that may be the Dean of University Instruction must be working on it. Since there is no emergency for adopting it, why are they doing it in parts? Instead of deferring it, they could bring it along with the comments of the Committee. He wanted to suggest that the points which are being raised, those things should also be brought the notice of the Dean of University Instruction so that while discussing the same could be taken into account by the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that this discussion would go to the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there is anything urgent in it, then probably nobody has objection. But this adoption in its present form has no meaning. He is saying so because it might not be that in future somebody could say that it is approved as it is without any changes.

RESOLVED: That the item be referred to the Committee already constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to consider the gazette notification of the M.Phil./Ph.D. Regulations 2016 in its entirety and make recommendations so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate.

Amendment/addition in 8. M.Phil./Ph.D. Regulations Considered, if –

- (i) following extract of clause 1 (i) of Press Information Bureau, Government of India dated 12.04.2016 (**Appendix-XVI**) regarding UGC (Minimum Standard and Procedure for Award of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degree) Regulations, be adopted:

“Women candidates and persons with Disability (more than 40% disability) may be allowed a relaxation of one year for M.Phil. and two years for Ph.D. In addition, women candidates may be provided Maternity Leave/ Child Care Leave once in the entire duration of M.Phil./Ph.D. for up to 240 days”.

- (ii) the following Amendment/addition, be made in Regulation 13.1 appearing at page 193 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007:

Existing (approved by the Syndicate/Senate and yet to be incorporated in P.U. Cal.Vol.II, 2007)	Proposed
“13.1. A candidate who is unable to complete research work and thesis within the time allowed by these Regulations may apply through his Supervisor and Chairperson/Director/ Co-ordinator of the Department concerned for grant of extension	“13.1. A candidate who is unable to complete research work and thesis within the time allowed by these Regulations may apply through his Supervisor and Chairperson/Director/ Co-ordinator of the Department concerned for grant of extension
Extension may be granted by the Joint/Science Research Board upto a maximum of three years, i.e. every candidate must submit his thesis on the expiry of a total period of six years from the date of registration of application.	Extension may be granted by the Joint/Science Research Board upto a maximum of three years, i.e. every candidate must submit his thesis on the expiry of a total period of six years from the date of registration of application. (The Dean of University Instruction be authorized, to grant extension in the submission of Ph.D thesis up to a period of three years.) (Syndicate/Senate approved meeting dt. 30.08.2015/27.09.2015)

<p>Provided that -</p> <p>(i) extension shall not be granted for more than a year at a time;</p> <p>(ii) every application for grant of extension shall be accompanied by a fee prescribed by the Syndicate/ Senate from time to time.</p> <p>If the thesis is received after the prescribed period of six years, the delay may be condoned by the authorities names below:-</p> <p>(i) Up to 3 months - Dean of University Instruction.</p> <p>(ii) Up to one year - Joint/Science Research Board.</p> <p>(iii) Beyond one year up to two years - Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Joint Research Board, under special and exceptional circumstances to be recorded.</p> <p>*However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor/s and Chairperson, with reason to be recorded.</p> <p>*A fee of Rs. 5,000/- or as prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time, be charged for condonation of delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis after expiry of the period of six years and Rs.10,000/- per year from the expiry of seven years from the date of Registration.</p> <p>*Provided that the maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis would be eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period : three years, extension period : three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years **{, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled}.</p>	<p>Provided that -</p> <p>(i) extension shall not be granted for more than a year at a time;</p> <p>(ii) every application for grant of extension shall be accompanied by a fee prescribed by the Syndicate/ Senate from time to time.</p> <p>If the thesis is received after the prescribed period of six years, the delay may be condoned by the authorities names below:-</p> <p>(i) Up to 3 months - Dean of University Instruction.</p> <p>(ii) Up to one year - Joint/Science Research Board.</p> <p>(iii) Beyond one year up to two years - Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Joint Research Board, under special and exceptional circumstances to be recorded.</p> <p>(iv) ***Beyond two years up to six months The Dean of University Instruction</p> <hr/> <p>However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years & six months may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor/s and Chairperson, with reason to be recorded.</p> <p>A fee of Rs. 5,000/- or as prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time, be charged for condonation of delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis after expiry of the period of six years and Rs.10,000/- per year from the expiry of seven years from the date of Registration.</p> <p>Provided that the maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis would be eight years & six months from the date of registration, i.e. normal period : three years, extension period : three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years & six months. However, the Women Candidates and Persons with Disability (more than 40% disability) shall be allowed a relaxation of two years for Ph.D.</p>
--	---

	<p>once in the entire duration of Ph.D. In addition, women candidates shall be provided Maternity Leave/Child Care Leave once in the entire duration of Ph.D. for upto 240 days.</p>
--	---

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 18.10.2015 vide Para No. 6 & 7 (**Appendix-XVI**) has resolved further that the power to condone the delay up to six months beyond the period of eight years, under exceptional circumstances, on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reason to be recorded, be delegated to the Dean of University Instruction.
2. The relaxation to Women Candidate and persons with Disability (more than 40% disability) may be allowed a relaxation of one year for M.Phil. and two years for Ph.D. may also be given once in the entire duration of M.Phil./Ph.D.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the condonation could be given by the Syndicate beyond the proposed period of eight years & six months.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that new UGC Regulations have been coming from time to time. Earlier some Regulations were not there and whenever new Regulations came the same were adopted by the University. The present Regulations provide further condonation to some special category and condonation has to be given on the basis of how a candidate had taken the admission.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the present Regulations provide for condonation beyond eight years whereas the proposed amendment provides for condonation beyond eight years & six months. What is the relevance of this six months period? There may be some relevance of it but he could not understand it. If they have prepared the new Regulations, would it be applicable to those also who had now taken admission in the year 2016. Let them presume that if these proposed Regulations are accepted, anybody who is governed by these Regulations, could he/she be given the condonation beyond eight years & six months. It meant that the candidates could not complete the degree beyond eight years. There are contradictions.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if a case for condonation beyond 8½ years comes to the Syndicate, the Syndicate is authorised to consider the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the women candidates and persons with disability were to be incorporated. That, in fact, seems to be the purpose. The item should have been to incorporate the provision as mentioned in the UGC notification.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they adopt the UGC gazette notification which was for consideration under item 7, these would have been covered under that itself.

It was clarified that it has been clubbed with the case of Ms. Manpreet Kaur.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that only the disability portion needed to be incorporated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they wanted to help somebody, let them say that as per the existing Regulations, the case of Ms. Manpreet Kaur is not covered. However, as per the latest UGC Regulations where such and such provision is there, the benefit could be granted as a special case by taking that provision and it could have been a simple item. Otherwise the Regulations come into force from the date the same are approved by Government of India. He said that it had already been approved in the year 2015. Now, when this item is coming, the portion which is in bold is the new amendment which is being proposed which, in fact, is not the case. The case here is only to incorporate the persons with disability and nothing else. If the same is in the existing Regulations, it should not be in bold. They could not change the Regulations to cover that candidate. Whenever the Regulations are changed, the same would be applicable for all. Till that time, that case could be considered. It is only to avoid confusion. He is not sure what he is saying is correct or not, the office must be knowing it, but from the bold lines it looks as if these are also to be incorporated now which has nothing to do with the case of Ms. Manpreet Kaur. They could see the contradictory things. Whatever the Vice Chancellor had approved under item 7 which they had earlier discussed where it is written that 'x' may please be allowed. However the admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. 2016 will be as per the guidelines printed in the Handbook of Information. It meant that the case of this candidate is not covered under the Handbook of Information because this provision is not there in the Handbook of Information.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this case was not being covered under the Handbook of Information. That is why it has come for consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it was not covered under that, then her case would have been prepared as a special case that as per the existing Regulations and as per what is printed in the Handbook of Information, her case is not included. Since the adoption of the notification along with the changes which are supposed to be suggested by the Committee are still under process. However, keeping in view her difficulty her case be considered. He said that this is clear to everybody that whatever comes to the Syndicate, it comes as recommendation of the Vice Chancellor. Whatever has to come to the Syndicate, at least it should have the signatures of the Vice Chancellor so that he could know about the matter. There are no signatures anywhere except the office note which is a different case. It should not be done that to accommodate a particular candidate, they are changing the Regulations.

It was informed that they were in the process of changing the Regulations. Simultaneously, this case came.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that both these should not be clubbed together otherwise it would appear that the rules are made keeping in view the person who is in front of them. Only the case of that candidate could be brought. There seems to be something very serious. The office note (p.58), without changing the Regulations, without adopting the notification which they are discussing, says that the candidate has also appended a UGC notification dated 12.04.2016 with her application, clause 1(i) of the same is read as under. This notification is dated 12th April 2016 and not July which they were discussing in the last item and it has been put up to the Dean of University Instruction. The office writes that in view of the UGC notification, the candidate may be allowed relaxation for six months for the submission of synopsis. Dean of University Instruction has written that confirm the approval of 'A' by Syndicate/Senate. The Dean of University Instruction is right because this does not have the approval of the Syndicate and the Senate while proposing the amendment in the Regulations by incorporating this along with her case, it is brought to the Syndicate. The answer to the query raised by the Dean of University Instruction is that it has not been approved. The objection is dated 21st June 2016 and after a lapse of about 3½ months, it is coming to the Syndicate. After that they would write to the candidate that her case has been approved. On page 60, it is written that the Dean of University Instruction after looking into the case has passed ordered as under: "confirm the approval of 'A' pre-page by the Syndicate/Senate". The office note says that it is pertinent to mention here that till date this office has not received any UGC notification officially. Further, in the first part of the above regulation it is not clear that in which stage the relaxation to women candidates and person with disability (more than 40% disability) may be allowed a relaxation of one year for M.Phil. and two years for Ph.D. However in the 2nd part of the Regulation it has clearly been mentioned that the women candidate may be provided maternity leave/child care leave once in the entire duration of M.Phil/Ph.D. for up to 240 days. He could not understand as to what they are going to approve. He enquired whether there was any urgency in this case.

It was informed that there is no such urgency.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the submission of the synopsis of the candidate is pending.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that either the Vice Chancellor be authorised to take decision in consultation with the Dean of University Instruction. But it should not be resolved as it is.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would talk to the Dean of University Instruction.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be kept in mind that such a message is not given that to accommodate a particular case, they had changed the Regulations. One more thing that they could do is that the case of that candidate should not be brought to the Syndicate because it is not mentioned that they are considering her case otherwise it would look as if they had approved her case. This case should be separated and as far as this is concerned, the Vice Chancellor be authorised, first it should be adopted and after that her case be considered. Simultaneously they could not consider both the cases.

RESOLVED: That the Vice Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to take decision in the case of Ms. Manpreet Kaur, after adoption of UGC (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Award of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees) Regulations, 2016 by the University.

Special Leave for female daily wage employees to give birth to their child

9. Considered if, female daily wage employees of Panjab University, who have been engaged for 89 days and submitted requests to proceed on leave on grounds to give birth to their child, be granted leave as under:-

- (i) special leave (with pay) up to the term of their appointment for the purpose to give birth to their child.

Provided that no Special leave (with pay) shall be granted to such female employee who has two or more living children.

- (ii) their job will be protected for the period they remained absent beyond their term of appointment up to 180 days from the date they proceeded on leave.

- (iii) they will be re-engaged and allowed to join duty on production of medical fitness certificate duly countersigned by the Chief Medical Officer of Panjab University, Chandigarh.

In case if the circumstances do not permit to join after 180 days the case will be decided by the authority on merit.

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a provision of special leave in the Panjab University Calendar but it could not be more than 10 days. There could arise some difficulties in future. It could be mentioned as maternity leave (for temporary employees).

It was informed that it is not for temporary employees. They specifically wanted to cover the people who had been engaged for 89 days on daily wages. There is a separate provision for temporary employees. They are inclusive and trying to help the daily wages employees. They could not grant maternity leave for 6 months to a person engaged on daily wages basis for less than 3 months. That is a legal issue. They have a provision in the Calendar that if the Syndicate allows, special leave could be given to these employees.

Professor Anil Monga said that they could mention it as special leave (maternity) for daily wages employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the procedure for grant of maternity leave to the daily wages employees.

It was informed that there is no procedure. Earlier they were allowing the maternity leave to daily wages employees. An employee proceeds on maternity leave but the salary is not paid during the period the employee does not attend duty and join back as their services are on daily wages basis for 89 days. After getting the

medical fitness certificate, the employees resume the services. That period becomes an indefinite period ranging from 3 to 6 months. It was intended to regularise the procedure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that the leave that they are proposing now is without pay.

It was informed that it is without pay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item is "to consider if female daily wage employees of Panjab University, who have been engaged for 89 days and submitted requests to proceed on leave on grounds to give birth to their child, be granted leave as under: special leave (with pay) up to the term of their appointment for the purpose to give birth to their child".

It was informed that the term of the employees for 89 days.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they appoint a person for 89 days and pregnancy is not a bar on appointment. If an employee with pregnancy of 8 months joins and proceeds on leave after one month, would she be paid the salary for 89 days. This way they are paying the salary for 60 days to an employee after having worked for 30 days.

It was informed that hitherto the practice was that the employees were given maternity leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there is any provision, maternity leave should be granted.

It was informed that at present there is no such provision. As per the legal opinion obtained, the maternity leave could not be granted. This caused resentment amongst the employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if an employee had joined for 89 days and beyond that period maternity leave could not be given. He is not suggesting that the maternity leave should not be given, he is not suggesting that after the employee is declared medically fit, she may not be allowed to join. But is there any provision to pay the salary for that period as the employees are asking for the salary up to the period of 89 days.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the employees are asking for the salary up to the period of 89 days for which they were employed. As is being said that if there is pregnancy of 8 months, he did not think that anybody would allow joining at this stage. If an employee proceeds on leave after serving for about 50-60 days, the salary for the rest period up to 89 days is to be paid and would have to join after availing the maternity leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that an employee is continuing in service after being given the break of one day after every 89 days. But in actual the employee is not working for 89 days but is continuing for 4 years or so.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the employees think that they might not be allowed to re-join after availing the maternity leave. He understood that they could not grant special leave for a very long time and only maternity leave could be granted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one of the basic purposes of undergoing the medical examination for permanent employees is that the medical board has to certify that she has this much pregnancy. Since pregnancy is not a bar to the appointment but at the same time the organisations did not want to appoint someone that after joining, she may proceed on maternity leave for six months. So the organisations say that the employee could join afterwards after getting medical examined because they are not sure that after joining for a month or so and after availing this much leave, whether they are going to come back or not. That is for regular employees. As far as this employment is concerned, on the one hand they are talking about 89 days employment and on the other hand they are saying the employees as daily wagers. How could somebody be engaged for 89 days?

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the College where he joined, he was surprised to know that a lady was appointed as Guest Faculty in Computer Science which is also known to Shri Raghbir Dyal and she availed the maternity leave for 6 months with pay during the period of appointment as Guest Faculty.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the teacher about whom Principal I.S. Sandhu is talking about, no doubt, she is known to him being from Muktsar. There are three Colleges where non-NET qualified teachers in Computer Science have been appointed. There is a judgement of the Hon'ble High Court that they could replace the Guest Faculty/contract basis only with the eligible candidates.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is a wrong statement as it is not written in the appointment letter and their appointment is only for a session and there is nothing that they could be replaced only by regular appointee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that Principal I.S. Sandhu is talking in some other context. There is a landmark judgement of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court which had already been discussed several times in the Syndicate that the Guest Faculty/contract employees could not be replaced with the persons on the same terms and conditions till they are replaced by permanent appointee.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that these orders are applicable for temporary employees and not for Guest Faculty.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that even if it is not mentioned in the appointment letters but there is a landmark judgment of the Hon'ble High Court and they are following the same in the Colleges that the Guest Faculty/Contract teachers even if they are ineligible, they could not be replaced with the same terms and conditions. An ineligible teacher could not be replaced with another ineligible teacher and could be replaced only with the regular appointee.

On a point of order, Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the orders were not issued for Shri Jaswinder Singh, a Punjabi teacher. A Committee was also formed and the Committee also took decision for issuance of the orders for the same College. That teacher is working on contract and is not being transferred whereas the transfers are being effected in the University. As they are talking that only a regular appointee could replace the guest faculty/contract teacher. He

wanted to know why the orders in respect of that person were not issued.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as Principal I.S. Sandhu has started the discussion, it is good and there should be a healthy discussion on it and they should take it to a logical conclusion. He referred to the judgement of the Hon'ble High Court. If the work and conduct of a person was not found to be good, then he/she could not be allowed to continue. If there is no workload how one could be appointed? There has to be justification for the workload. One could not be replaced with another ineligible teacher. The maternity leave was given as the teacher was working as a temporary teacher and not as a guest faculty.

It was informed that there was a problem related with the daily wager non-teaching employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to could they call these employees as daily wagers.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the appointment for 89 days could not be on daily wages basis.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the appointment for a period of 89 days could not be on daily wages but it is a temporary employment. The nomenclature that they are using is as daily wager for 89 days. Whether that employee is a daily wager or 89 days wager?

It was informed that daily wager is employed on D.C. rate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not so. If an employee is employed on D.C. rates, it did not mean that he/she a daily wager.

It was informed that such employees are appointed on daily wages basis for a period of 89 days and if their work and conduct is satisfactory, they are given another extension. It is only for seasonal work.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that seasonal work is a temporary one. Daily wages means that a person is engaged for a day for some particular work to be finished within a specified period of time. When a person finishes the work and takes the wages, it is called daily wages which they engage from anywhere. But the practice that they are following needed to be taken care of. There is a provision for temporary employees.

It was informed that legal opinion was taken. There is a provision for those employees who had been engaged for one year on contract/temporary basis. But the provision for those on 89 days is not there practically for the reason that a person who is appointed only for 89 days, he/she could not be given the leave beyond that. In their case the provision of maternity leave could not be applied. So it was to cover such cases. There are some employees working on temporary basis for one year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are four categories of employees – contractual, ad hoc, temporary and daily wages. These are all different categories. He did not think that anybody could be engaged on temporary basis for one year. They could appoint

someone for a year on contract basis because there is a provision of maternity leave for temporary employees. If they apply this for employees engaged for 89 days, they take it granted that they are temporary employees as one day break is given and again engaged for 89 days.

It was informed that they wanted to regularise the procedure for grant of maternity leave. Regulation 13 appearing at page 128 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I says that "any case not coming within the purview of the Regulations and/or Rules approved by the Syndicate, for non-teaching employees, may be decided in such manner as the Senate in the case of employees of Class A and the Syndicate in the case of employees of Class B and C may deem fit". They wanted to regularise these and the question is whether maternity leave could be granted or not, whether the rules apply to them or not, they have a provision for special leave and the Syndicate has to take a decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to which of the cases are not covered under the rules.

It was informed that the left out cases which are not covered under the rules, the Syndicate could grant the leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whether these Regulations apply to daily wagers.

It was informed that the Regulation is vague and specifies applicability neither to regular nor to daily wagers. However, for temporary employees, there are separate rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for all practical purposes, these employees are temporary employees but in their wisdom they call daily wagers because they are paying them on D.C. rates as prescribed by the D.C.

It was informed that even the holidays are also not given to these employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not a case that these employees are not being given holidays but the employees did not take holidays otherwise the salary would be deducted for the holidays. Such employees are even ready to work for 7 days a week and could not afford that they get salary only for 5 days.

It was informed that there are no supervisors to supervise the daily wages employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not say that the employees are not being given the holidays but it is, otherwise, that the employees did not prefer to take leave. If they are making these employees to work on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, then these employees are daily wagers and how they are employing them for 89 days. If their appointment is for 89 days, then they could be treated as temporary employees.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it meant that all the daily wagers are temporary employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the pension scam occurred, he had said that throughout his life, he had not seen where a daily wager had been placed under suspension. For all practical purposes, the daily wagers are temporary employees. Since the employee involved in the pension scam was appointed for 89 days, further extension was not given.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the case of Avtar Singh versus State of Punjab, the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court said that this one day break is to be considered as a notional break and if it is notional break then because of that reason, the Court is considering the employees' services in continuity. If the employees are in continuity then they could not say that they are daily wagers. He cited a number of other cases decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India such as Sunil Sukhija vs. State of Punjab and others, 2016; Archana Singh vs. State of Rajasthan, 2012; Municipal Corporation of Delhi vs. Muster Roll Workers, 2002; Smt. Reena Patil vs. State Education Department, 2012; Anu vs. Union Territory, Chandigarh, 2012. In all these cases, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has specifically decided that maternity leave with related benefits are to be granted to all the temporary employees and temporary employees include daily wagers in itself. If they are recruiting daily wagers on 89 days giving just one day notional break and after that they are keeping them on continuous basis. They are making the seniority of the employees on the basis of their initial joining. The employees are facing the problem. When an employee proceeds on maternity leave for 2-3 months and joins back, the seniority is changed and the person is placed at the bottom of the seniority list. It is the fear of losing the seniority that such employees did not avail the leave. This is the biggest problem that these employees are facing. If 100 persons had joined on the same day and some of the employees had availed the leave for 2-3 months, they could lose the seniority of the period for which they had availed the leave.

It was informed that there is another administrative problem in this case. There are cases not only of maternity leave but there are cases that somebody did not want to come for any practical purpose, the employee brings a medical certificate for period ranging from 6 months to 1 year and after that would come and say that he/she wants to join back saying that he/she had submitted the medical certificate. To correct all this, to regularise all this, it was proposed to have a system which is approved by the competent authority. There is a provision and let that be availed by the employees so that the job is protected and the leave could also be granted for a limited period.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the legal opinion in the last line says, "therefore, she is not entitled to maternity leave (with pay)". He failed to understand on what grounds this line has been written. No doubt, legal opinion has been given by a senior person. He did not know what are the reasons and what are the grounds on which maternity leave has been rejected and there are no decisions quoted whether of the Hon'ble Supreme Court or Hon'ble High Court or any other law. No such decisions have been quoted. Section 5 of Maternity Benefit Act, 1961 says that this benefit will be given to all temporary employees. Sub-Clause 2 of Section 20 of UGC also clearly specifies that if there is a confrontation between the Central Policy and the State Policy, then the Central Policy would prevail. If there are guidelines of the Government, judgments of the Hon'ble High Court and Supreme Court, then they could not deny the benefit of maternity

to the employees. They all know that one day break is a notional break.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that they are advocating that the employees should be given the leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the salary should be given and it could be paid only when they could treat these employees as temporary employees. Dr. Ajay Ranga must be knowing it but did not tell. This practice of employing on 89 days is an old practice since the days of British regime so that nobody could claim that he has completed so many days and he/she be regularised. If the employer says that a person has served for a specific period but the employee says that he had completed so many days, the employer says that the earlier rendered service is finished after the break. It was for the first time that the Hon'ble Supreme Court gave a ruling that anybody who has worked for 240 days in a calendar year irrespective of the breaks, he/she has to be regularised. Thereafter what the people started doing that they used to appoint in such a manner that an employee could not complete 240 days in a calendar year. Then Supreme Court gave another judgment for 240 days in a span of any 12 months only to take care of it that the notional break of one day is given even when the employee attends the office but the salary for that day is not given. He has seen for the first time that in the University an employee employed for 89 days is called a daily wager. These employees are temporary and it is only in case of temporary that they have to specify the period for which the employment is given that is why it is 89 days. The moment they say that the maternity leave to daily wagers that does not sound well. So, they would have to change the nomenclature. He is telling this out of his knowledge, he could be wrong also but this needs to be clarified. But if they say that the maternity leave is already being given to the employees with or without pay.

It was informed that whatever is the proposal is actually being followed but the nomenclature was given as maternity leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever practice they had been following for years and wanted to regularise the same, could they wait for another month so that they could not go wrong anywhere and which could be quoted as precedence that in the University it is applicable to the daily wagers. The nomenclature should be looked into as to what is it for employees engaged for 89 days.

It was informed that the maternity leave was being given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the maternity leave was being given then why it was refused.

It was clarified that the maternity leave was refused because legally it was not tenable. When it was the case, the audit raised an objection that it is not possible for employees for 89 days.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as whether the Registrar or the Audit had raised an objection to the maternity leave earlier being granted.

It was informed that it was observed that special leave could be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the audit would surely raise objection over it.

It was informed that let it be regularised by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the maternity leave that they are presently granting, let that continue till the position is regularised as is being suggested.

It was informed that, that is not legally tenable as the legal opinion says that it is not permissible.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why legal opinion was taken. Instead of taking legal opinion if something wrong is being done, it is a decision to be taken by the Syndicate and Senate, the matter should have been brought to the Syndicate. If legally it was not admissible, the audit must have raised the objection at that time itself.

It was informed that the DoPT guidelines have also been gone through and the same also do not permit the maternity leave to the persons employed for a period of 89 days. It is obvious that if they appoint someone for a period of 89 days, they could not grant leave beyond the period of 89 days.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi intervened to say that the persons appointed for a period of 89 days could not be granted maternity leave as they do not earn.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if anything wrong was going on for so many years and the Registrar tried to stop that. Obviously, there had to be unrest. The Registrar, in his own wisdom, did not prefer to take Syndicate/Senate in confidence.

It was informed that the legal opinion was taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first it was stopped by the Registrar and then said that the special leave be granted which was objected by the Audit and then legal opinion was sought.

It was informed that first the legal opinion was sought which says that it is not permissible and they had a provision of special leave and thought of giving special leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how could they grant special leave to the persons appointed for 89 days.

It was informed that special leave is given under section 13 that any leave which is not covered under any Regulation of any kind, leave could be taken after approval of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the special leave was granted after taking approval from the Syndicate.

It was informed that the special leave could be granted and that is why this item has been placed for consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since firstly the special leave was not granted then on what did the Audit raise the objection. The earlier practice was discontinued and special leave was granted which was

objected by the Audit. Then the Registrar went for legal opinion which says that it is not admissible and the matter is brought to the Syndicate. The problem arose when a thing which the Registrar thought as an irregular thing, it was revised by him on his own and because of the audit objection and legal opinion, the matter is before them. He wanted to say that if something wrong was going on, instead of stopping that, till they regularise that, at least let that continue. They instead of stopping could say that they are not harming the employees, but instead of that way, they would do in this way. Then there was no need of audit objection. Whatever they are doing today, they could have done the same earlier. He did not think that the audit has raised any objection. It could be said that everything was going on smoothly but the Registrar has stopped that. The Registrar thought of giving special leave under Regulations which has been objected by the Audit as there is a provision. Then the Registrar sent the matter to the Legal Retainer who should have been asked whether special leave could be granted as the dispute is on the grant of special leave. The Legal Retainer has not given opinion on special leave.

It was informed that legal opinion was taken on an earlier stage whether they could grant the maternity leave or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that matter ended. Had they taken legal opinion on grant of special leave?

It was informed that there is a provision for special leave to the employees which is very clear in the Regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then they would have to see the definition of the employee also as to who could be granted the special leave.

It was informed that employee means any person in the service of the University and includes any such person whose services are temporarily placed in the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that till the time they did not consider these employees as temporary, they could not grant the special leave. The daily wages employees are altogether different from temporary and it has been established by law number of times. A daily wager could not be equated with temporary. Supposing if the Syndicate approves the grant of special leave and even then the Audit raises the objection that there is not provision then what would they do because the Syndicate is not the Supreme Court.

It was informed that the provision is there in the Panjab University Calendar that the Syndicate has the power.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they would have to declare all the daily wagers as temporary.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for a moment if they approve it, do they think that the Audit would not raise any objection.

It was suggested that they could take it on record that all the daily wages employees are temporary employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is why he saying that it should be examined and till that the benefits which were being given

earlier should be continued as their purpose is not to harass anybody but to regularise the process. If they consider these employees as temporary employees, then automatically the benefit would be extended.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not stop the salary of anybody if there is a provision in the Calendar and if a person attends office for 2 days and that period is covered within the period of 89 days. What Dr. Ajay Ranga is saying is that somebody is entitled for maternity leave for 6 months, if there is 89 days period within that 6 months period, they are bound to pay full salary.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the salary is given only for the period within 89 days. The daily wage employees think that if they avail the leave, they might not be appointed again and this is the only purpose why the employees are requesting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are paying the salary for the remaining period within 89 days, let them continue that. The only thing is to cover them under the Maternity Act, let them change the nomenclature and if as per law they have to give the leave for 3 months or 6 months, then they have no choice. But if they have choice by changing the nomenclature and restricting their salary within the period of 89 days and beyond that no pay and then after getting medically fitness certificate the employees would be taken back. To take care of the apprehension which has been expressed by Dr. Ajay Ranga, another rule could be made that in case the leave has been taken because of the maternity, then her seniority would not be affected. But that needs to be examined if there is no emergency.

It was informed that some cases are pending.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all such cases should be given.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a representation had come to the Vice Chancellor and the Dean College Development Council also that this decision of paying salary for maternity is not being properly implemented in the Colleges as some Colleges are giving the salary for 1 month, some for 3 months days while others not even for a day. Since the Colleges are having 4 teachers and if 3 teachers apply for leave, the leave is granted but only without pay. He requested that whatever benefit is given to the employees of the University, the same should be extended to the employees of the Colleges also. The situation in the Affiliated Colleges is even worse. If a management is having 3-4 Colleges and makes the appointment for a particular College, the management is transferring the teachers to other Colleges so that the teachers could leave on their own due to inconvenience. He cited the example of a College of SGPC management who had transferred one teacher to Mansowal. Earlier these teachers had been working for many years as temporary teachers. The probation period is also two years. He requested that a Committee should be formed to check this. He suggested that a letter from the Dean College Development Council should be sent to the Colleges that all kinds of leave as per University Calendar should be given to the employees of the Colleges also.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out in the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of February, 2016, a decision was taken to form a Committee to look into the issue of Provident Fund in the

Colleges, but till date there is no information about the formation of the Committee. He had pointed out the same in the meeting of the Senate also that the status of the PF and the efforts made to get the stay vacated in respect of B.Ed. Colleges be made available. It has been noticed that some of the Colleges appoint the teachers only at the basic salary and so many such teachers are working for the last 6-7 years. In spite of this they had taken a decision to allow such Colleges to start the 5-year B.A. B.Ed. courses. He has been pointing out this issue since February but the Committee had not been notified in spite of the Syndicate having formed the Committee. Whenever any condition of fulfilment of teachers is imposed by the University, the Colleges show the appointment of the same teacher to several Colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the Dean College Development Council should visit or a Committee could be formed to visit the Colleges to see as to what the managements are doing. The appointments in the Colleges are approved only for specific Colleges.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Dean College Development Council should visit the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is already decided that wherever any such complaint is there, the Committee which had already been constituted by the Syndicate, out of that Committee 2-3 members in consultation with Dean College Development Council could make a surprise visit. The members of this Committee could visit the Colleges as the Dean College Development Council might not be able to visit everywhere.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that in one of the earlier meetings a decision not to hold the interviews at the DAV Headquarters was taken whereas other managements are holding the interviews at their headquarters.

Principal B.C. Josan said that all the interviews of the DAV management are held at Delhi since the inception of the DAV institution.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that once Haryana Government had also taken such a decision not to allow the interviews at Delhi, the dispute over this prolonged for 2 years. Ultimately, the Haryana Government had to agree on the holding of interviews at the headquarters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the circular in this regard had been issued that should be withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that the DAV management has its office in Delhi since 1955. When Justice Mehar Chand Mahajan retired, he took the office from Jalandhar to Delhi. All the interviews since 1955 are being held at Delhi. He said that whatever practice had been going since then, it should be allowed to be continued.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the circular should be withdrawn.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the DAV management has its headquarters at Delhi. Similarly, there are some other

managements also which have their headquarters at a particular place and sub-offices at other places. In particular, nobody had pointed out about holding the interviews by the DAV management at Delhi but it was some other context. There are managements which are having their Colleges in far off places in Punjab and holding the interviews at Chandigarh but the selected candidates are not allowed to join the Colleges. The managements say that they had selected the candidates but the candidates are not joining.

Principal B.C. Josan said that there were no such complaints against the DAV management.

The Vice Chancellor said that the societies like DAV, S.D. and Dev Samaj have so many institutions. Dev Samaj is having its headquarters in Sector-36, Chandigarh. If Dev Samaj has to hold the interviews in which the President of the management has to preside over, the President would see his convenience and would not go to other places for this purpose.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there are so many other managements also like the SGPC. Supposing a candidate from a remote area Tarn Taran has to attend the interview and in the case of DAV, he/she would have to go to Delhi to attend the interview which is not a central place as is the case with Chandigarh. It is very difficult for a candidate to go to Delhi to attend the interview and return the same day as the candidates did not have much money to stay overnight at Delhi as they have to spend the money on travel also.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the institutions of DAV are located not only in Punjab but all over India. Recently, the interviews for schools located in various parts of the country like Chhattisgarh, Tamil Nadu were held in which even the overseas candidates also participated and it is not possible for the President to visit every station.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as said by Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky if a candidate from Chhattisgarh has to come to Delhi to attend the interview, the DAV management might be having institutions in Chhattisgarh also and the interviews could be held there at a central place for the convenience of the candidates.

The Vice Chancellor said that the thing which is going on for long should not be disturbed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he never expected that that the Vice Chancellor would take a U-turn like this. In the last meeting, when it was being discussed that the Colleges have started a practice, earlier the Colleges had started the practice of holding the meetings in the hotels. To discourage them from doing that, a circular was issued that the interview be conducted only in the Colleges or the head offices of the Society/Management. Subsequently, the Colleges which did not want to hold the interview in the Colleges only, they started taking permission to hold the interview in the University and the candidates were asked to attend the interview at the Golden Jubilee Guest House, Panjab University, Chandigarh. The candidates came from far off places thinking that they were being appointed at Chandigarh but here the candidates were told to join at a place where if one took the bus in the night, he/she would reach the next day. So, last time it was discussed that this practice should be stopped. It was the

Vice Chancellor who said, 'no', the interview would take place at the place of posting. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) had said that they need to take a conscious decision keeping in mind one thing that this decision of allowing the holding of the meeting at head offices was taken keeping in view the requirement of the DAV Colleges and let them not take any decision if it is to be reversed tomorrow under any pressure and they could see the video how the Vice Chancellor had reacted that 'no, nothing doing, they would have to hold the interviews in their Colleges only, there is no question of holding it in the head office'. He had said that he is telling the Vice Chancellor that the pressure would come. So let them not take the decision in a haste. Now without discussion, the Vice Chancellor is saying that whatever is going for the last 60 years, let it go. Secondly, the argument which is given is that the President does not have the time to attend the interviews. He could understand as to how one person could go to Chandigarh and Abohar or various places to attend the interview. He could understand where the President has to sit in the interview, but in the name of the President, how could they allow them to make all the people, who have applied, to travel to Delhi which is not even in the territorial jurisdiction of Panjab University. As the Vice Chancellor said that Mehar Chand Mahajan had shifted the head office from Jalandhar to Delhi and tomorrow if somebody shifts the head office to Bhopal, then the management would ask the candidates to attend the interviews at Bhopal. He could give the concession that if any interview where the President of DAV management is to sit, as a special case let the Vice Chancellor say that this interview be fixed in Delhi. But if out of 90 interviews the President sits only in two interviews, why the interviews are held at Delhi. He told his own experience that there were 16 interviews conducted during a span of 5 days. In none of the interviews, the President was there, he was present in the office but did not sit in the interview. When he (Shri Ashok Goyal) asked, it was told that the President does not sit in these meetings but the Vice-President or the General Secretary sits. They could pass that if the President has to sit in the interview meeting and it is not possible for him to go out of Delhi, only those interviews could be held at Delhi.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that with this, only the candidates would be at the loss as the President might not be free for going to other places to hold the interview for several months and the appointment would not be made.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no such provision in the Calendar to recognise any apex body. They as Panjab University recognise only the Local Management Committee. He thought that the President, DAV Management is the ex-officio Chairman of all the Local Management Committees.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky clarified that the President is the Chairman in many cases but not in all the cases.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the President, DAV Management is the Chairman of each College and not the school.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was also talking about the Colleges and not the schools.

The Vice Chancellor said that a practical solution could be that they allow the interviews to be held in the College Bhawan. There are

so many Chairpersons, experts that they have on the Selection Committees and a vast majority of them is from the University who are not interested to go outside and ask the managements to come to Chandigarh. The appointments have to be made within a specified period. In order to enable these people to make the appointments, let the interviews be held in College Bhawan. If they are allowing the interviews in the College Bhawan, then they have to permit the interviews somewhere else depending on the convenience of the candidates. The colleagues from the University do not go to far off places due to which the interviews are delayed and then the College managements start contacting that they be allowed to hold the interviews in the College Bhawan as they needed the teachers. It was under these circumstances that he had allowed the interviews to be held in College Bhawan.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that last time the Vice Chancellor had said that they would not change the decision at any cost. But now they are changing that decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is nobody to do it and they need not ask him what he did. They being the members of the Syndicate could take any decision whatever they wanted to and leave him alone.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked why he (Vice Chancellor) was reacting like this. He had at that time requested the Vice Chancellor that they should not take such a decision by which the Syndicate might face embarrassment if the decision is to be reversed and at that time the Vice Chancellor had said nothing doing.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was telling just that he had done so and so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at that time he (Vice Chancellor) was not in the meeting but was outside the meeting and what was being said as if Shri Ashok Goyal was ready to get this decision done from the Syndicate during zero hour. The Vice Chancellor knows that it was not zero hour and on whose instructions it was done.

At this time, heated arguments took place amongst some of the members and the Vice Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting for 10 minutes.

When the meeting resumed, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky requested that the meeting be adjourned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was he who, at that time, had said that they should not take the decision because there would be pressure from the DAV management and the same thing has happened. He had said that the other managements have also started holding the interviews at their headquarters on the plea that the DAV management is also holding the interview at its headquarters. He pointed out that they did not have the territorial jurisdiction at Delhi and maximum number of candidates apply for the posts in DAV institutions. Approximately 150 candidates go from Chandigarh to attend the interviews at Delhi. The DAV management should pay to and fro fare by second class train or ordinary bus so that it is justified that the interviews are held at Delhi.

The Vice Chancellor said that this University also did not pay anything even when a person is invited for attending the interview for the post of Vice Chancellor and it is not permissible under the rules.

RESOLVED: That, the matter be examined in totality. In the meantime, the maternity leave benefits which were earlier being given be continued.

**Chair in the domain of
Sports and Physical
Education**

10. Considered the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, that a chair be created in the domain of Sports & Physical Education, in honour of Olympian Balbir Singh Sr. on the lines of Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair.

NOTE: Minutes of combined Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department of Physical Education, P.U., Chandigarh, dated 11.08.2016 enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

Professor Shelley Walia said that the papers attached with the item are talking about Shri Abhinav Bindra and there is no mention of Shri Balbir Singh.

The Vice Chancellor said that Principal Surinder Singh Sangha had proposed that a Chair be established in the name of Shri Balbir Singh Sr. and the name of Shri Abhinav Bindra is coincidentally connected with the shooting range as it was inaugurated by Shri Balbir Singh Sr.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired as to if they approving Shri Balbir Singh Sr. and Shri Abhinav Bindra. The request is to allow to invite Shri Abhinav Bindra.

The Vice Chancellor said he is happy with Shri Abhinav Bindra. He had proposed the name of Shri Balbir Singh Sr. Now the Department of Physical Education has proposed that Shri Abhinav Bindra be invited on this Chair.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are two parts. The item under consideration is creation of the Chair and they are approving it. The proceedings of the Academic and Administrative Committee mention to appoint Shri Abhinav Bindra as Visiting Faculty in the Department of Physical Education which would be a great honour to the University and recognition of his achievements. Nowhere it is described that Shri Abhinav Bindra be appointed on this Chair.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Syndicate had desired that a Chair be created in the domain of Sports and Physical Education. Let such a Chair be created in honour of Olympian Balbir Singh Sr. on the lines of Maharaja Ranjit Singh.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are creating the Chair. That is all.

The Vice Chancellor said, "alright". They could give him a proposal for inviting some eminent sportsperson for this Chair.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the SGPC is also having its office at Chandigarh and all the interviews are also held at Chandigarh as

Syndicate Proceedings dated 8th October 2016

the Director is sitting here and the candidates come to attend the interviews and no one has any problem.

RESOLVED: That, a chair be created in the domain of Sports & Physical Education, in honour of Olympian Balbir Singh Senior on the lines of Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair.

Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR