

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Sunday, 10th September 2017 at 10.00 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the Chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Dr. Amit Joshi
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Ms. Anu Chatrath
6. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
7. Shri Amanpreet Singh
8. Dr. Amar Singh
9. Professor Anita Kaushal
10. Dr. Ameer Sultana
11. Dr. Baljinder Singh
12. Professor B.S. Ghuman
13. Dr. B.C. Josan
14. Professor Chaman Lal
15. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
16. Dr. Dalip Kumar
17. Shri Deepak Kaushik
18. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
19. Dr. Gurmit Singh
20. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
21. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
22. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
23. Dr. Harjodh Singh
24. Dr. Harsh Batra
25. Shri H.S. Dua
26. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
27. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
28. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
29. Dr. Jagdish Chander
30. Shri Jarnail Singh
31. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
32. Dr. K.K. Sharma
33. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
34. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
35. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
36. Dr. N.R. Sharma
37. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
38. Dr. Neeru Malik
39. Professor Navdeep Goyal
40. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra
41. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
42. Shri Naresh Gaur
43. Professor Pam Rajput
44. Dr. Parveen Goyal
45. Shri Prabhjit Singh
46. Professor Rajat Sandhir

47. Professor Ronki Ram
48. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
49. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
50. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
51. Professor R.P. Bambah
52. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
53. Shri Raghbir Dyal
54. Dr. S. S. Sangha
55. Dr. S.K. Sharma
56. Ms. Surinder Kaur
57. Shri Satya Pal Jain
58. Professor Shelly Walia
59. Shri Sandeep Singh
60. Shri Sandeep Kumar
61. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
62. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
63. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
64. Shri V.K. Sibal
65. Shri Varinder Singh
66. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Dr. Amod Gupta
2. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
3. Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary ,Education Minister, Punjab
4. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
5. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
6. Professor Deepak Pental
7. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
8. Justice Harbans Lal
9. Shri Harjit Singh, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
10. Smt. Kirron Kher
11. Shri Parimal Rai
12. Shri Parmod Kumar
13. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
14. Shri Punam Suri
15. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
16. Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director, Higher Education, Punjab
17. Dr. Subhash Sharma
18. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
19. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
20. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
21. Shri Sanjay Tandon
22. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
23. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma

Before taking up the agenda items, Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that a Committee should be formed to reduce the rise of agenda papers which have become voluminous.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that the volume of the agenda could be reduced. However the Vice Chancellor asked him to allow him to proceed with the agenda and it will be dealt with.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that i-pads of Micromax Company are available which costs between Rs. 3-4 thousands. The current agenda contains two volumes. He suggested that the cost of all the papers for preparing this agenda could be worked out. He also pointed out that some applications are still not attached to the agenda papers. It would have been better if those could also be attached till the meeting of December. In the meeting of March, 2017, it was decided and the Vice Chancellor has also said that these will be included next time. The soft copy of the agenda has been sent by email, but the application and API score papers are still not attached to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will put it to the forthcoming meeting of the Syndicate on 23rd and hopefully, something would happen by that time.

On a question by Professor Keshav Malhotra regarding the size of the agenda, the Vice Chancellor said that he can raise these things in the zero hour. As a mark of respect to Professor Bambah, he did not resist his intervention. Professor Bambah also asked Professor Keshav Malhotra to sit down and expressed regret for his intervention.

The Vice Chancellor said that with a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the members about the sad demise of:

- (i) Rajamata Mrs. Mohinder Kaur, revered mother of Captain Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister, Punjab and Ex-officio Member of PU Senate, on July 24, 2017;
- (ii) Professor Yash Pal, former Chairman, University Grants Commission, New Delhi and an iconic PU Alumnus, on July 24, 2017. Prof. Yash Pal had graduated in Physics from Panjab University in 1949;
- (iii) Ms. Archana, Associate Professor of English in the Department of Evening Studies-Multi Disciplinary Research Centre, PU, on August 26, 2017;
- (iv) Prof. V.B. Bhanot, former D.U.I. and Professor Emeritus, Deptt. of Physics, on August 28, 2017.

The Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Rajamata Smt. Mohinder Kaur ji, Professor Yash Pal, Ms. Archana and Professor V.B. Bhanot 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.

I. I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that:

- i) Hon'ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu ji took over as Vice-President of India on August 11, 2017. As Vice-President of India, Shri Venkaiah Naidu is also the Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh. I made a courtesy call on him on August 24, 2017. He has in principle accepted to be the Chief Guest at PU Convocation in February, 2018.
- ii) Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public Administration and Fellow, PU, has been appointed as Vice-Chancellor of Punjabi University, Patiala, for a period of three years by the Governor of Punjab and Chancellor, Punjabi University, Patiala. He assumed office on 15th of August.

- iii) The Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund Account has been opened and the first two contributions were deposited in it, i.e., one from Professor R.P. Bambah, Fellow and former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University and other from Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji, Fellow and former Member of Parliament. Professor Bambah has given one time contribution of Rs. 7 lakhs. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji had offered to contribute Rs. 2 lakhs every year and his first instalment of Rs. 2 lakhs stands deposited.
- iv) Panjab University had submitted a claim of 66495 points for MAKATrophy for the year 2016-17. This is nearly 40% more than the claim of 43380 points during 2015-16. This year PU stands second. PU was earlier placed at the second position in 2015-16 as well.
- v) 6th Panjab University Foundation Day Lecture will be delivered by Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professor Shri Kailash Satyarthi on October 12, 2017 in the University Auditorium. He was awarded with PU's honorary degree of Doctor of Law (*honoris causa*) during the 64th PU Annual Convocation held on March 14, 2015.
- vi) Dr. Kiran Bedi, Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor of Puducherry and alumnus PU, will be visiting on the University Campus on September 22, 2017 to deliver Prof. J.C. Anand Memorial Oration hosted by Department of Political Science and to bless the students who have joined the new courses on 'Leadership and Governance'. This course was initiated on her suggestion.
- vii) Prof. Arun K. Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU and President, Chandigarh Region Innovation Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), has been appointed as member of Group of Eight Australian Universities-India PhD Advisory Taskforce, announced by the Australian Minister for Education & Training. The objective of the Taskforce is to provide advice for Universities and Governments on strategies to increase two-way mobility of Ph.D. students between India and Australia. An important bilateral meeting ensued in New Delhi on August 29 and 30, 2017 during the recent visit of the Australian Minister to India.
- viii) CSIR has appointed Professor Arun K. Grover as Chairman of the Research Council of National Physical Laboratory, New Delhi, for a period of three years.
- ix) AICTE has invited Prof. Arun K. Grover to serve on a 7-member Committee of Experts to be Chaired by Prof. G.D. Yadav, Vice-Chancellor, ICT, Mumbai, to provide feedback on 'Research Excellence Framework Policy Document' as per provisions in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed between AICTE and Clarivate Analytics, a rating agency like Times Higher Education based in America.
- x) I have also received a resolution from a large number of Senate members that we should consider expressing our appreciation for the predecessor Chancellor.

The following Resolution proposed by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Professor Pam Rajput, Professor D.V.S. Jain, S. Tarlochan Singh, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Dr. Ameer Sultana, Shri Rashpal Malhotra, Dr. Pramod Kumar and Professor Chaman Lal was read out by the Vice-Chancellor:

“The Senate meeting on 10th of September 2017 deeply appreciate the role of Janab Hamid Ansari Ji as Chancellor of Panjab University providing enlightened leadership to the University for 10 years. The Senate expressed its gratitude to the outgoing Hon’ble Vice President of India and Chancellor of PU Janab. Hamid Ansari Ji for advancing and promoting the interest of the University during his term as a Chancellor”.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma pointed out that it would have been better if the felicitations being sent to the Chancellor should go from the Chair. He has raised this issue in the Syndicate that they should at least send their good wishes to Shri Mohd. Hamid Ansari Ji, who has been the Chancellor of this University for 10 years. Even at that time all the members have given their consent to it. It would have been better if this was included in the Vice Chancellor’s statement. Now, since some people have given in writing, it gives the impression that there is nothing from your side, but from the members.

RESOLVED: That –

1. Felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to –
 - i) Hon’ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu ji on having taken over as Vice-President of India on August 11, 2017 and Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh;
 - ii) Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public Administration and Fellow, PU, on having been appointed as Vice-Chancellor of Punjabi University, Patiala;
 - iii) Professor R.P. Bambah for contributing a one-time sum of Rs. 7 lakhs to the Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund Account;
 - iv) Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal for having offered to contribute Rs. 2 lakhs every year and having contributed Rs.2 lakhs for the first year to the Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund Account;
 - v) Prof. Arun K. Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU and President, Chandigarh Region Innovation Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), on having been appointed as member of Group of Eight Australian Universities-India Ph.D. Advisory Taskforce, announced by the Australian Minister for Education & Training;
 - vi) Professor Arun K. Grover on having been appointed as Chairman of the Research Council of National Physical Laboratory, New Delhi, for a period of three years;
 - vii) Shri M. Hamid Ansari for providing enlightened leadership, advancing and promoting the interests of the University during his term as Chancellor for 10 years.

2. The information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (iv), (v), (vi) and (ix) be noted.

II.

Considered the recommendations of the Board of Finance (**Items C-2 on the agenda**) contained in minutes of its meeting dated 01.08.2017 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 20 as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 (Para 2):

Item 1

That:

- (i) the Revised Estimates of 2017-2018 as per (**Appendix-I to III**, the summarized position of which is as below) as well as Non recurring provisions as per **Appendix IV** be approved:

	NON-PLAN	(FIGURES IN LAC OF RUPEES)	
		Estimates for the Current year 2017-2018	
		Original	Revised
A	Internal Revenue	27133.00	29303.50
	Grant-in-Aid from MHRD/UGC	19773.00	20780.00
	Grant-in-Aid from Punjab Govt.	2000.00	*2700.00
	Total (Revenue)	48906.00	52783.50
B	Expenditure		
	Employee Cost	42464.96	**43718.80
	Other Expenditure	9096.75	9064.70
	Total (Expenditure)	51561.71	52783.50

* The Govt. of Punjab has announced an increase of Rs.7.00 crores in its budget allocation in 2017-18 to Panjab University during the budget speech before its Legislative Assembly on 20.06.2017.

** The employee cost includes a provision of Rs.11.40 crore for payment of Gratuity & Leave encashment to those teachers who have been continuing in service beyond the age of 60 years under the interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana.

- (ii) Vice-Chancellor is authorized for allowing re-appropriation from one budget head to another with condition that the total expenditure would remain within overall sanctioned revised estimates.
- (iii) University shall send two separate proposals to UGC:
- i) for seeking permission for filling up of posts of Dean College Development Council and Chief of University Security;
 - ii) for the posts of Assistant Professors which got vacated after completion of 65 years.

- NOTE:**
1. Head wise detail of Expenditure and Income is enclosed as (**Appendix - I & II**), respectively.
 2. The detail of budget heads where revision is proposed (upward/downward) is enclosed herewith as **Appendix - III**.
 3. The detail of Demands for Non-Recurring Capital provisions for Specific works/projects is enclosed herewith as **Appendix - IV**.
 4. Status of Income & Expenditure as on 31.03.2017.

Sr. No	Particulars	Amount
1.	Deficit carried over from previous years as on 31.03.2016 (Audited)	4631.79
2.	Actual expenditure for 2016-17 excluding Depreciation (Unaudited)	46249.62
3.	Actual Income including grant-in-aid for 2016-17 (Unaudited)	49082.53
4.	Uncovered deficit as on 31.03.2017 (1+2-3)	1798.88

5. The audit of balance sheet for the 2016-2017 is in progress.
6. In order to cover up the uncovered deficit, the Panjab University has already represented to Govt. of Punjab to consider providing arrears of grant considering a uniform growth rate @12.5%, taking the grant of 2013-14 as base (**Appendix- VII**) (**Page 14-15**).

Item 2

Noted and ratified the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for allowing the utilization of already sanctioned amount of Rs. 50,000/- out of "Development Fund" for purchase and installation of RO+UV water purifiers and a water cooler instead of CCTV cameras in the Amrita Shergill Girls Hostel, P.U.R.C., Ludhiana which was sanctioned in the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 13-02-2017.

- NOTE:** The Director P.U Regional Centre Ludhiana stated that they had already purchased and installed 8 cameras during the financial year 2016-17. Now it is dire necessity of

RO+UV water purifiers and one water cooler for the resident of Hostels.

Item 3

To enhance the salary provision of Technician (Community Radio Station) from Rs.16,000/- p.m.(fixed) to Rs.20,000 p.m.(fixed) with condition that if the applicable DC rate turn out to be higher than Rs. 20,000 then the applicable DC rate be allowed.

- NOTE:** 1. The remuneration for the Technician (Community Radio Station) was last revised in May, 2014 from Rs.11,000/- p.m. to Rs.16,000/- p.m.
2. The recommendation of the Chairperson is placed at **Appendix – VIII (Page-16-17)**.
3. The honorarium shall continue to be paid long the concerned official continues discharging additional duties/ responsibilities.

Item 4

That:

- (i) the following persons appointed as Guest Faculty (Non NET qualified) in P.U. Constituent Colleges at Dharamkot and Ferozpur for teaching the subjects mentioned against each on lecture basis be sanctioned an honorarium of Rs.800/- per lecture subject to the ceiling of Rs.20000/- p.m., w.e.f. the date they started work upto 31.08.2017.

Sr. No	Name of the Candidate	Subject	College
1.	Mr. Sandeep Kamar Sharma	English	P.U. Constituent College at Dharamkot, Distt. Moga
2.	Ms. Navpreet Kaur	Computer Science	P.U. Constituent College at Dharamkot, Distt. Moga
3.	Mr. Raja Singh	Physical Education	P.U. Constituent College at Dharamkot, Distt. Moga
4.	Ms. Kirandeep Kaur	Computer science	P.U. P.U. Constituent College at Ferozpur

- (ii) for future, the notification issued by the U.T. Administration would be applicable.

NOTE: 1. Due to the non-availability of NET qualified candidates for these subjects, the above said Guest Faculty members were appointed by the duly constituted Selection Committee to meet the

immediate requirement of New P.U. Constituent Colleges as a very special case.

2. In the first instance, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the appointment of non NET qualified faculty for the first semester upto 31.12.2016 as a very special case, on the assurance that efforts will be initiated to find NET qualified applicants.
3. In view of the ongoing classes at the Constituent colleges the Vice-Chancellor has further allowed the continuance of Non-NET qualified faculty upto 31.08.2017 only and has ordered that a fresh advertisement be given immediately in an English & Punjabi Newspaper of national standing, preferably, Tribune. Also the advertisement be circulated to local/nearby colleges, where PG Classes are conducted.
4. The audit has not admitted the payment of above mentioned Guest Faculty with the following observations:

“Appointment whether contractual or regular should have to be made in accordance with the procedure & candidates are Qualification as prescribed by the UGC. In the instant case both NET qualified & Non NET qualified candidates are appointed as Guest Faculty at honorarium of Rs1000/- per lecture to both type of candidates. It is therefore, advised to strictly appoint the candidate who fulfills the qualification as prescribed by the UGC. If qualified candidates are not available, then to appoint non qualified candidates matter be taken up with UGC & also got decided the rate per lecture to Non Net Qualified to be paid to them”.

5. In view of the audit observation the matter of payments to the said Guest Faculty was considered as a very Special case.

Item 5

That:

- (i) the following provisions of Panjab University Centre for Media Studies for which a grant of Rs.39,97,000/- has already been sanctioned to Panjab University by the Hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha, Shri H.K. Dua under the MPLAD scheme be approved.

1. Non-Recurring Provisions:

- i) Rs.2,85,000/- for procurement of furniture and air-conditioners for smart class rooms out of Development Fund.
- ii) The other requirement for capital expenditure such as computers, softwares equipments for laboratory etc. would be met out of the grant sanctioned under MPLAD scheme.

2. Recurring Provisions (Revenue Account):

Sr. No	Item	Approx. cost (yearly)
1.	Establishment expenditure	
a)	One Audio Video Lab. Technician on contract basis (Rs.25,000.00 p.m)	Rs.3,00,000.00
b)	One Technician for Computer Lab on contract basis (Rs.20,000.00 p.m.)	Rs.2,40,000.00
c)	One Clerk on contract basis (Rs.18,000/- p.m.) D.C. rate	Rs.2,40,000.00
d)	One Helper on contract basis (Rs.11803/- p.m.) D.C. rate	Rs.1,50,000.00
2.	Library Books, Journals, Magazine, Newspaper, Subscriptions, Software/Spectrum Licenses/Wi Fi seamless connectivity	Rs.2,50,000.00
3.	Running, Repair and Maintenance of equipment, AMC. Etc.	Rs.1,00,000.00
4.	Honorarium to External Expert/Teachers @ Rs.1000/- per session & Coordinator @ Rs.5000/- per course	Rs.1,50,000.00
	Total	Rs.14,30,000.00

- (ii) the total recurring expenditure on the centre shall in no case exceed the revenue generated by it and a report in this regard shall be submitted by the in charge of the centre after the end of each session for consideration of BOF.

- NOTE:** 1. The above recurring provisions shall be met out of the income to be generated by the Centre by conducting various educational workshops for teachers, short term media literacy courses for common man, professional training programme for media persons etc.;
2. Detailed proposal submitted by the School of Communication Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh as per **(Appendix- IX) (Page-18 to 29)**.

Item 7

To note that the request of Shri J.S. Rathore, Department of Correspondence Studies, for allowing the benefits of pension is not accepted.

Item 8

To note that the issue with regard to three non-compoundable increments to Dr. Sukhwinder Singh Bamber, Assistant Professor, S.S. Giri, P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur on account of acquiring Ph.D. from Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology, Jalandhar, while in service as a regular faculty member in the University, be sent to the UGC for examination/clarification.

Item 9

That the pending payment of various allowances i.e, tiffin, uniform, washing and bonus to M/s Punjab Ex-servicemen Corporation (PESCO) as per agreement dated 05.08.2016 **(Appendix-XIV) (Page-40 to 46)** for providing security services for the University be released.

- NOTE:** 1. The Board of Fiannce in its meeting held on 13.02.2017, vide agenda Item No.6 approved the award of contract of security services to PESCO in pursuance of the notification of Government of Punjab, Department of Defence Services Welfare dated 12.06.2014 **(Appendix-XV)(Page-47)** regarding nomination of Punjab Ex-Serviceman Corporation (PESCO) as sole agency for availing security by all the Punjab Government Departments/ Corporations/ Boards/Semi Government Undertakings with following condition:

that a clarification be sought from Punjab Government regarding the admissibility of allowances i.e., Tiffin, Uniform, Washing and Bonus to the outsourced security personnel and till then the amount of such allowances/bonus be withheld.

2. The present contract with PESCO is expiring on 05.08.2017.
3. The Panjab Government, Department of Finance was requested vide letter No.s 3219/Estt dated 07.03.2017, 5060/Estt. dated 20.04.2017, 7257 dated 26.05.2017 for necessary clarification on said allowances. Besides this officials from Establishment Branch have visited the Finance Department Office on many occasions and have been requesting them for an early clarification. Till date, no inputs has been received.
4. The M/s Punjab Ex-servicemen Corporation (PESCO) had given an undertaking /certificate on 31.05.2017 that they are charging Tiffin, Uniform, Washing and Bonus from all Panjab Government Undertakings and Departments. **(Appendix-XVI) (Page-48).**

Item 10

That formula of *Revenue Sharing* as per *Clause 4.9 of the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University Chandigarh (Appendix- XVII) (Page-49-50)* be approved.

- NOTE:**1) The Syndicate at its meeting held on 19.07.2015, Paragraph 18 approved the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University Chandigarh including financial Clause "**4.9-Revenue Sharing**".
- 2) The formula of **Revenue Sharing** as per *Clause 4.9 of the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University Chandigarh* was placed in the meeting of Board of Finance dated 13-02-2017 vide Agenda Item No 3 wherein it was suggested that this matter be taken up in the next meeting of the Board of Finance **(Appendix-XVIII) (Page-51-52).**

- 3) In the meeting of Syndicate held on 19.07.2015 (Paragraph No.18) it was discussed that if the University may like to enhance the ratio of sharing from 70:30 to 80:20 or more it may consult IIT Ropar and Bombay.
- 4) The Director CIIPP had requested through e-mail dated 05.07.2017 **(Appendix-XIX)(Page- 53-54)** to IIT Mumbai, IIT Madras, IIT Kharagpur, IIT Ropar, Banaras Hindu University, Hyderabad, Delhi University, BBAU, Lucknow to provide the policy being followed by the respective Institutes/Universities for revenue sharing between institute and the inventor. Only IIT Ropar has informed that their IPR Policy is still under the process of drafting.

In meantime the CIIPP has collected the desired information w.r.t. revenue sharing pattern /policies available on website of IIT Mumbai, IIT Kharagpur, BHU and IIT Roorkee and that formula of **Revenue Sharing** is as under:

S.No	Name of University/ Institute	Revenue Sharing pattern/ policies
1	IIT Mumbai	70:30
2	IIT Kharagpur	70:30
3	Banaras Hindu University	60:40
4	IIT Madras	50:50

- 5) The Formula of **Revenue Sharing** in the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy is in uniformity with the CIIPP Consultancy Rules of Panjab University. As per CIIPP Consultancy Rules, consultant's intellectual fee is shared in the ratio of 70:30. The CIIPP Consultancy Rules are duly approved by the Syndicate dated 15-03-2014, vide Paragraph 14 available as per **(Appendix-XX) (Page-55 to 57)**.

Item 11

That the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 30.03.2017 for sanctioning additional amount of Rs.26,68,173/- out of below mentioned budget head on account of incentives to the outstanding

sports person during the annual sports prize distribution function held on 30.03.2017 as under:

Name of Budget Head	Original amount	Revised amount	Balance & Shortfall
Medals, Trophies & Incentive to the players, Expenditure on prize distribution function, (ii) Sports Uniforms & Sports Material	Rs 2,00,00,000	Rs.2,26,68,173	Rs 26,68,173

- NOTE:** 1. The University has improved its performance in the sports field from 13,800 point in the year 2014-15 to 43,880 during 2015-16 with scoring of 2nd position for award of MAKA Trophy during the year 2016-17. University sports persons further excelled their performance by securing more positions and it is expected that the increase in points is likely to be more than 30%.
2. As per PUSC rules, outstanding players who get positions International, National and Inter-University level tournaments/games are allowed incentives in the form of cash award.
3. As the Panjab University sports persons got more positions as compared in the year 2015-16 the amount of cash awards has also increased.
4. The audit has observed that the above excess expenditure incurred out of Sports fund account may be got noted from the Board of Finance.

Item 12

That:

- (i) the following budget estimates for reintroduction of Post Graduate Diploma in Women Studies in the Department-cum Centre for Women's Studies & Development, Panjab University, Chandigarh from the academic session 2017-18.

1	Honorarium to Teachers 180 days X 4 periods= 720 @ Rs.1000/-	=	Rs. 7,20,000/-
2	Office & General expenses	=	Rs.50,000/-
3	Running, repair & Maintenance of Equipments etc.	=	Rs. 50,000/-

Total expenditure: = Rs. 8,20,000/-

- (ii) no additional financial assistance and manpower would be provided to the department and the total recurring expenditure shall in no case exceed the revenue generated from this course and a report in this regard shall be submitted by the in charge of the course after the end of each session for consideration of BOF.

NOTE: 1. On the recommendations of the Faculty of Arts in its meeting held on 19.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXI**) (**Page-58 to 64**), the Syndicate approved the reintroduction of Post Graduate Diploma in Women's Studies (Semester System) in the Department-cum Centre for Women's Studies & Development, from the academic session 2017-18.

2. The department has confirmed that no additional manpower shall be asked for.
3. The examination and other evaluation fee will be as per University rules.

Item 13

That to utilize the already sanctioned amount of Rs.5.00 lac out of interest earned on 'Foundation for Higher Education & Research Fund' for purchase of furniture for the classrooms of USOL instead of Guru Teg Bahadur Bhawan as sanctioned in the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 19.02.2015.

NOTE: The audit has observed that the re-allocation for purchase of furniture for the classrooms of USOL instead of Guru Teg Bahadur Bhawan be got noted from the Board of Finance.

Item 14

Noted and ratified the decision of Vice-Chancellor that the Internet Lease Line Connectivity (ILL) be upgraded from 20Mbps to 170 Mbps instead of 20Mbps to 100 Mbps at PUSGRC, Hoshiarpur within the already available budget of Rs.25.00 lac out of "Development Fund" sanctioned in the meeting of Board of Finance held on 01.08.2016.

- NOTE:**
1. The proposal regarding up-gradation to 100Mbps was sent in November 2015 and with the increase in the number of students (users) and other campus requirements bandwidth requirement of 170 Mbps was processed in December 2016.
 2. The audit has observed that the up-gradation of Internet Lease Line Connectivity (ILL) from

20Mbps to 170 Mbps instead of 20Mbps to 100 Mbps be got approved from Board of Finance.

Item 15

Noted and ratified the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 Para 33 that the following budget estimates of two Constituent Colleges at Dharamkot and Ferozepur for the year 2017-18 with the modification that excess of expenditure over income of these colleges would be recouped from the grant to be released by the Punjab Government. **(Appendix-XXII) (Page-65 to 69). The Vice-Chancellor brought to the attention that the new colleges are being administered by assigning this duty to two temporary teachers** (appointed on yearly basis since the start of constituent colleges) whose salaries are charged to the first set of four constituent colleges. The Vice-Chancellor recommended the payment of suitable honorarium to these two teachers for the additional responsibility. An honorarium of Rs. Four thousand had been paid to the Honorary Director of PURC, Ludhiana in the past.

Sr. No.	Details of Expenditure	P.U.C.C., Dharamkot	P.U.C.C., Ferozepur
1	Salary(GuestFaculty @ 25,000/-) April 2017 (I month) July 2017- March 2018 (9 months). Pending payments of Guest Faculty for the session 2016-17.	1,75,000/- 36,00,000/- 6,00,000/-	2,25,000/- 36,00,000/- 2,00,000/-
2	Office & General Expenses (Including Advertisements, Admission Prospectus etc.)	2,50,000/-	2,50,000/-
3	Out-sourcing of Clerk- cum- DEO, Helper, Cleaner & Security Gaurd	4,00,000/-	4,00,000/-
4	Running, Repair, Maintenance & Purchase of minor Equipment/ Furniture e.g. Black Board/ Projector, Water Cooler, RO system, audio- address-system, Hiring of buses etc	6,00,000/-	6,00,000/-
5	Electricity & Water Charges	3,50,000/-	3,50,000/-
	Total Expenditure	59,75,000/-	56,25,000/-
	Revenue Receipts	40.00lac (approx.)	40.00 lac (approx.)

NOTE: 1. The Board of Finance in its meeting held on 19.01.2017 approved the Budget Estimates of Constituent College, Dharamkot and Ferozepur for the year 2016-17 up to 31.03.2017. It was also resolved that the provisions for the next financial year 2017-18 shall be considered

separately after the signing of MOU with Government of Punjab.

2. The process for signing of MOU with the Punjab Government is under process. Till that time the shortfall shall be met out of the grant to be released by Punjab Government for four Constituent Colleges.

Item 20

Noted and ratified the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 vide Paragraph 2(ii) that after counting her past service as Assistant Professor (temporary) in the Panjab University from the session 2007-08 to 2009-10, the date of promotion of Dr. Namita Gupta be preponed and she be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. 14.8.2011 instead of 20.07.2014, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The promotion would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her (**Appendix-XLI**) (**Page-141**).

- NOTE:**
1. The term of appointment of Dr. Namita Gupta as an Assistant Professor (temporary) in the Centre for Human Rights terminated on 01.07.2010.
 2. However, prior to the completion of her term as Assistant Professor (temporary), the Selection Committee in its meeting held on 02.06.2010 has recommended the name of Dr. Namita Gupta for the post of Assistant Professor (regular) after following due process of appointment as per UGC guidelines.
 3. That the said recommendations of Selection Committee were duly approved by the Syndicate dated 29.06.2010 [Para 2 (xix)] i.e., prior to the completion of her term as Assistant Professor (temporary).
 4. In view of the peculiar facts of the case as explained above, the ACLA observed that a clarification may be obtained from UGC that whether the service can be considered as continuous service for promotion under CAS.
 5. As per clause (f) of UGC Regulation 10.1, the adhoc or temporary service of more than one year duration can be

counted for direct recruitment and promotion under CAS subject to fulfilment of certain conditions. The copy of relevant extract of UGC regulation is attached as **(Appendix-XLII) (Page 142-143)**.

6. It is relevant to mention that her case was referred to UGC for clarification in response to which the UGC vide letter dated 01.02.2017 informed that the UGC regulation on this issue is clear and self explanatory and accordingly the case may be examined by the University **(Appendix-XLIII) (Page 144)**.
 7. Dr. Namita Gupta fulfils all the conditions of counting of her past service for promotion under CAS except that there was a gap of 19 days between the date when her term as Assistant Professor expired on 01.07.2010 and the date when she joined as regular faculty i.e., on 20.07.2010. So far as the gap of nineteen (19) days i.e., from 01.07.2010 to 19.07.2010 is concerned, it is submitted that the process of appointment of a faculty member involves due administrative procedure, which the University has to follow. Thus the gap of nineteen (19) days had caused due to time taken in completion of administrative procedures, while following the various channels of hierarchy. Otherwise there is no gap in between the termination of temporary service and the approval of regular appointment by the Selection Committee as well as by the Syndicate, because the regular appointment stands approved before the date of termination of temporary service.
- (II) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a small committee to look into the issue under item 16 with the proviso that extra gratia posts would not continue in the long run and desired ratio of promotees amongst the two cadres would get maintained; and
 - (III) a clarification be sought in respect of Item 19 from the Punjab Government whether the circular issued by the Punjab Government in 2011 for allowing the Secretariat pay to the employee working in Vidhan Sabha has been

invalidated later on by the Punjab Government by issuing any circular. If so, the said circular may be supplied by the Punjab Government and the matter will again be placed before the Syndicate otherwise the University ought not to stop the Secretariat Pay presently being paid.

(Minutes of the Board of Finance dated 01.08.2017 available in the separate volume).

The Vice-Chancellor said that this item **(Item C-2)** pertains to the recommendations of the Board of Finance for the current financial academic year. The members of the Senate are well aware as to why the September meeting of the Senate has become important when it comes to matters pertaining to the budget. They are today a part of the non-plan budget of Central Government when it comes to the grant released for us. Certain projection is made in the Central budget for all kinds of financial provisions that the Central Government makes. There are budget estimates and the revised estimates. The revised budget estimates in whatever form, have to reach the Government of India by September 30th every year. It is in that background that the September meeting of the Senate has become important because there has to be a ratification of what the revised budget estimates of the university are, which have to be transmitted to the Central Government. There is one difference which has emerged in this year's meeting and this year's budget estimates vis-à-vis the last year's meeting which was held on September 3, and today they are meeting on September 10, roughly at the same time. Last year, when they went through this exercise, the budget estimates presented were of the form that they had certain incomes. They had certain projected expenses and they had certain expectations from the Central Government to balance the budget and that they will need this much of money. They had put in a request of a figure which had earlier been decided at the meeting of the Board of Finance held on 1st of August 2016. This year the meeting was held on 1st of August 2017. When they met on 1st of August 2016, there were various stakeholders in their Interstate Body Corporate, namely, the representatives of the Syndicate, representatives of the Senate, representative of the Union Territory, Chandigarh representative of the Punjab Government, representative of the UGC and the representative of the MHRD. All had been passed and sent for endorsement by the Syndicate. Whatever Syndicate accepted, that has come to the Senate on 3rd of September, 2016. At that stage, their request to the Centre was to give certain amount of money which has been determined after participation of their representatives. Today, there is a slight difference. This year the Central Government has told them that they will make available to them a certain amount of money which is 5% more than what they made available to them last year to balance their budget. The Punjab Government has also told them that they will give them 7 crores more than what they gave us the previous year. Now, they have certain projections of their income. They have everything together and they have projected expenses for this financial year to balance this. Now, the Central Government's figure of Rs. 208 crores is 5% more than last year. They have given them a rationale as to how they have determined this 5% i.e., how they have arrived at that figure. They said that this money which they have been making available to them, as if it is their estimate of what they (University) need to pay to the existing teachers. What they need to pay for the salaries of non-teaching staff which is 1.1 times the number of total teachers that they maximally require. They have projected that they need some 1400 teachers or 1380 teachers. They are currently paying salaries equal to about 1100 teachers. They (MHRD) said okay and accept their figure of 1380, multiplied by 1.1 times and for that many number of non-teaching employees, every salary of non-teaching employees, average being computed on the previous year's figures, they have added little more to it because the inflation is something like 4% over the last year. So, they made 3% more money to UGC last year. But in their case they

directed the UGC that they should be given 5% and not 3%. One can have argument over the way they have estimated things, but in nutshell, they have given them this money and they have also said that they will give them, during the next three years, a 6% enhancement. They have computed this 6% enhancement though not explicitly said it, but implicitly said that they had demanded from the Punjab University during the last twelve months. What would be their projected expenditure over next five years. So, they have projected some expenditure. That projected expenditure was under certain conditions. The conditions that they had demanded out of them. The Panjab University should be seen to be continuously decreasing its expenses on all items other than the teachers' salary. They are expected to freeze the number of teachers and not to enhance the number of teachers, but progressively not fill up the non-teaching positions. Progressively, non-teaching positions should not to be filled up and people should be retired at the age of 60 years etc.etc. So they had imposed certain conditions on them. They asked as to how many people will retire in the next five years. How many people they can reduce by way of not letting the temporary people continue beyond a certain number etc. So, those projections that they have given, were under various stringent conditions. But they have taken those projections as real projections. Looking at these projections, they have drawn a straight line passing through those data points, that comes to about 6% increase annually over next 3-4 years. They said okay and take 208 crore rupees from them this year, add to it over the next three years and this is what they will give and with this the University can survive in a stagnant manner. Stagnant manner means, no new people will be added, no new development will be incurred. So, they (PU) will be where they were and this is all that they have. Whatever extra they need, make a case, as and when the 7th Pay Commission will come, they will talk over it, but as of now, this is what the situation is. The previous shortfalls which remains i.e. some 17 or 18 crores, it is left to Panjab University and the Punjab Government to make up for this previous shortfalls by having enhanced income or enhanced release by the Punjab Government in whatever manner, as if they have washed their hands from the previous shortfalls. At the moment, the Central Government is *prima facie* committed to providing salaries of all our existing teachers and 1.1 salaries of the non-teaching employees and rest they have to manage on their own. Someone asked him, have they made a progress in improvement of financial condition. The answer, unfortunately, have to be 'very little'. But they have survived. Last year, unfortunately, he had to state in this House that if the grant from the Central Government does not come as they were requesting them, they would not be in a position to pay salaries till the end of the year. But, today if they endorse the recommendations of the Board of Finance, if they accept the endorsement of whatever the Syndicate has sent, then they would be in a position to pay the salaries to everyone till the end of the year. In the meantime, for the future, the reconstituted Think Tank is already doing its job. Three sub-committees have been formed to look at how the income from the examination fee, tuition fee etc. has to be incrementally increased every year. Those Committees have met once, but their deliberations are on. Their deliberations have to come back to them by December, 2017 so that the budget estimates for next year can be sent to Government of India before the budget exercise for the next year commences. They are told that last year the budget was presented a little earlier. This year's budget would be presented even earlier than the last year. So they are committed to send the budget estimates for the next financial year well before end of December 2017. Those budget estimates, as far as the Central Government budget is concerned, it would be Rs. 208 crores plus 6%. So it would imply that the Central Government contribution is predetermined i.e. Rs. 220 Crores. They have sent certain request to them that the number of teachers is decreasing so permit them to retain the same number of teachers as they were having during the last three years. It means that all those people who have retired ever since they enhanced the re-employment age from 63 to 65 years, they have requested for permission to fill up all those positions, otherwise the number of teachers will go down. Already among the eight top universities of India, in

the Times Higher Education Ranking, Professor Rajivlochan made them aware of it, Panjab University has the worst teacher to student ratio. The other Indian Universities such as Jadhavpur University is in the 500-600. Jadhavpur is the best premier university of West Bengal, it has a teacher to student ratio better than them. Though it is a State University, but it has teacher to student ratio better than Panjab University. All the Central Universities in 600-800 band have teacher to student ratio better than them. Our teacher to student ratio is really poor. The number is between 23 and 24. So, if the Central Government does not permit them to fill up the 50 odd positions, the people who have retired in the last 5 years, our teacher to student ratio will further deteriorate. They are vigorously following it up with the Central Government that in order to retain our standing, they should permit the University to fill up the vacant positions. The Chancellor has asked him to give it to him (Chancellor) the executive summary of the needs of Panjab University for sustenance and improvement of its position. Therefore, he proposed to meet the Chancellor after the budget is passed by the Senate and he would go with this input to the Chancellor and seek his help to see that before they reach the December end 2017, they have some assurance from the Central Government that extra money will given to fill up these few key positions like the Medical Officer. There is only one regular Medical Officer. The Hon'ble Chancellor has offered to help them. The Chancellor would be coming to the University in February, 2018. May be, he would have little more hopeful news to give them when they would meet in December as to how the University can progress to remain competitive to its peer institutions nationally. This is the framework in which the budget items stand presented to them. After this, he requested Dr. Gurmeet Singh to give his views.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he has to make a suggestion relating to transgender students regarding their tuition fee and examination fee. There seems to be a good increase in it. He informed that there are some transgender students studying in Panjab University. He has been given to understand that in Indira Gandhi National Open University, there is some provision for fee concession i.e. tuition fee and examination fee to such students. They reach to this level with a great difficulty and they should give them encouragement. He, therefore, requested that such provision should also be made in Panjab University for transgender students.

Referring to **sub-item 5**, Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that a proposal has come up for making the Centre of Media Studies at the School of Mass Communication. One of the Rajya Sabha member, who has now completed his term, has given a grant of Rs. 40 lakhs in 2015, but the same has not been materialized so far. In this connection he has to say that in the minutes of Syndicate and Board of Finance, it has been mentioned in those minutes that this Centre would be a self sustaining Centre and that it would not put any burden on the university budget. Either, they should not say that this Centre would be self sustaining Centre and it would not put any burden on the University budget or they should once read it because they have just given the projected figures. They have mentioned about very ambitious projects and also that many courses would start and many conferences would be held. They expect projected income of Rs. 7 lakhs from these projects. But the recurring cost of about 14 lakhs. So this is not possible and in place of this, he suggested that, with the concurrence of Shri Dua ji, some one-time facility could be created. He suggested that it would be better if they try to make a Media Centre instead of Centre for Media Studies where their media people could sit and if some department has to hold a conference, they could come there. In the past, there was a room for them, but now it has also been closed. There is budget head in the name of EMRC which could not run so far. Some rooms were built, but these are unutilized. He wanted to suggest that this should be taken care of or a Committee could be constituted which could see how to utilize this money in a proper way. If they are able to build a Media Centre where the University Act is available, Library is available etc.etc., to his

mind, it would be much better. The third and most important point, which the Vice Chancellor has also said. A new formula from the Centre has come where they have said that they will pay the salary component. One thing is clear that the understanding which was made in 2011, a major shift has been done from that. The understanding at time was that by adding the grant given by the Punjab Government plus the income of the University, rest of the deficit will be given by the Central Government. But now they have put a rider on their salary expenditure. He was of the opinion that the salary figure is dynamic. If they have committed to give us Rs. 207 crores and if the expenditure on our salary is Rs. 200 Crore, may be due to retirements, then they will give only Rs. 200 crores and not Rs. 207 crore. This is his understanding, the house can peruse it. As the Vice Chancellor has himself said that they will give them 6% increase annually for three years, but in the letter, the word 'onward' was written. But, what will happen after that. They have also written that they can reduce it, depending upon the situation. So this is a very big issue as they were not be having money for plan expenditure. He said that the Vice Chancellor has told that he has met the Chancellor who has come from the political background and is very well aware of all the things. He said that the Vice Chancellor himself informed that he will go to the Chancellor with a summary of budget estimates. When they are asking us to implement CSR rules, MHRD financial rules, CAG rules, then what is left. If they talk to them for grant of Central University and if they do not agree to it, they can grant Central Status to this University. A resolution to this effect is already there. Although there is very meagre hope of its being accepted. He further said that the Item No. 70 of the agenda, which may not be considered today, is very important. As the Vice Chancellor has said that they are in a stagnant conditions and with this they be able to just pay the salary. Dr. Gurmeet said that they are not working only for salary. They have affection with this institution and they want that this institute should touch new heights. So he urged the Vice Chancellor that he may not bring this item in the agenda of 24th September meeting, but at least they should start considering this option. He said that he appreciate and feel happy if these suggestions taken care of.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that they should consider the agenda item-wise so that proper discussion could be had each item.

The Vice Chancellor said that first of all they are discussing the comments on the overall budget. They can go through item-wise and he is okay with it. He requested Professor Akhtar Mahmood to give his views.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that the funding for the university has been discussed many times earlier also. The Think Tank is also looking into that aspect. One of the issues is, how to increase the input for the foreign students. Many countries earn millions of dollars by taking students from other countries, but we are not taking it seriously. They should attract more students from other countries, so that they can generate more resources. Countries like Australia, Malaysia and Singapore make to the tune of billions of dollars, they why we cannot do the same.

Dr. Parveen Goyal while referring to page No. 39 of the minutes of the Board of Finance dated 1.8.2017 said that four cases relating to Ph.D. increments have come.

However, the Vice Chancellor intervened to say that the discussion should be focused only on budget and this is a very minor part of the budget.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that though it is a minor part, but the University teachers are very much worried due to this.

The Vice Chancellor said that first take the budget. Do they endorse the budget as presented to them. These are very minor and microscopic things. They affect the budget in a very minuscule way.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa seconded the opinion expressed by Dr. Gurmeet Singh in which he has said that special treatment should be given to the transgender students as they have the right to live with pride and all the social status. This will be a very humanitarian and welcoming step and it will be a good boost for that community.

The Vice Chancellor said that students welfare is already there and they will take care of it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar read out some lines from the first page of the minutes of the Board of Finance, i.e., “we are now presenting our income and expenditure in the background of the availability of grant(s) from the government(s)”. With reference to this para, they continued to add that the University has recently constituted a Think Tank and the University had also appointed a new Committee to rationalise its various sources of income, which largely comes from examination fees, tuition fee, etc. He then referred to Appendix-II page 2 and said that the original fee of examination has been stated as Rs. 13645/- and revised 15000/-. He said that during the Fee Committee meeting, the Principals who were the part of the Committee, particularly Principal R.S. Jhanji, it was observed that this year there is a fall out of 20% in the students strength. The enrolment of students in the affiliated colleges fell down to 20% this year. So, how they have this revised projection keeping in view the fall out of the number of students in their colleges. He was of the opinion that in this background they have to have a re-look on the revised estimates because they have projected about Rs. 22 crores revised income.

The Vice Chancellor said that the FDO has been asked to put together what the income is from the examination fee, semester-wise for the last three years and the number of students who paid that fee and he is compiling that. So, their this year's income is what the income they had in the previous semester and income that will accrue to them in the month of November/December. The income that will accrue to them from the examination fee in the second semester, actually will go to the next financial year largely some part of it. So, the Finance & Development Officer is already doing that exercise. The number of students who appeared in the examinations in the last three years was going up. In view of the projected less admissions this year, it is possible that this number for this year could go down further of the previous year. The students who joined a 4-year course, their number is not going to go down. The people who joined a 5-year course, their number is also not going to go down. Number will go down of this year's students only, who are enrolling in B.A.-I and M.A.-I. This is an evolving thing. This is why when they come to the month of December, by that time they would know, what the situation is. Now this revised estimate, which they submit in the month of September, they would see, if they look at the number of last three years that the revised estimates sent in September end, but the actual Utilization Certificate that they submit in June, there is again a change. These are all projections. At the moment, these are projections and the budget is balanced as per projections. What will happen when the money will get utilized, there would always be a little bit ifs and buts. They are conscious of it. At least the F.D.O is conscious of it. He has been talking to him on this thing. This is what they will get informed to the Senate via the November meeting of the Syndicate as to what the income of the first semester examination has been. By that that time they would also know what is the income of the University has been from the tuition fee, because the admission process for this year would be complete. Numbers would get compiled and so on. So they would have an opportunity to look at all these numbers during the next two months. They will also have the opportunity to review all these things in the month of December, 2017. He hoped that he has clarified everything.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they are not going to increase the fee for examinations this year. Last year they have decided that the students below a particular

income level, they were to pay the previous fee structure for examination fee. Will that continue to this year also, he asked. Secondly, the practical examinations for some of the subjects were not held in December, but they were taken up at the end of second semester or the even semester, what would be the practical fee being charged from those students.

It was clarified (by Controller of examinations) that this matter was raised in the Senate meeting of December 17, 2016. They have already sent one notice two days back to the effect that if there is any issue relating to the fee that will be done. Similarly, it will be for 2017-18. So, there will not be any fee for practical subject if no practical is conducted. If it is in the end of semester, then it will be taken in the second semester.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu further asked as to what will be the examination fee for students coming from the low income group. He informed that last year those students were exempted from the hike.

The Controller of Examinations further clarified that it was applicable for the last year, if it is to be continued, he will request the Vice Chancellor to look into the matter so that a proper communication is sent to all of them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that there is a typographical mistake in point (iii), sub-section (i). The name of the post of Chief of University Security has been written as Chief of University Staff, which may be corrected.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they are discussing the budget estimates. She appreciated the concern shown by the Vice Chancellor in the opening address, the kind of fiscal health that the University is suffering from, at the moment. There is an item C-70 regarding resolution on Central Status to the University. She said that she would like to request if that item could be taken up early. That would be fine.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to mix up these two things. All that he can say is that they can have discussion on Central University Status at 4.00 p.m. for one hour to which Professor Rajesh Gill said, thank you.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested the Vice Chancellor to take the issue of Colleges as stated by Dr. Dua.

The Vice Chancellor said that 5.00 – 6.00 is for zero hour.

Professor Mukesh Arora said as the Vice Chancellor has given time to consider the item relating to Central University Status, in the same way he should also give time for colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as the Vice Chancellor has given time to discuss Central Status issue, he should also give time to discuss issues relating to colleges. He informed that the discussion on the issue of Central Status to the University is being held since the last 5-6 meetings Syndicate and now he is giving one special hour for that, but he is not giving time to discuss the issues of colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that he can only say that 5.00 -6.00 is the only time for discussing this issue. He further said that Central University Status issue could be discussed on 8th October.

Professor Rajesh Gill said it is wrong if another person speaks for time, then he negates the first one. He should honour his words.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can switch, let it 4-5 p.m. for Zero hour and 5-6 p.m. for Central Status issue which was agreed to.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested that less than 5 minutes are given to each person which is not sufficient time to convey or complete the issue. He, therefore, requested that zero hour should be for two hour so that the issues could be properly debated upon.

The Vice Chancellor, however, did not agree to it. He said that the zero hour is just a tradition and they are just honouring that tradition. Zero hour during the last five years has been of one hour.

Dr. D.P. Randhawa said that it is a good tradition, but can they change it as a law to which the Vice Chancellor said, bring a resolution and change the calendar and go through the process.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Item No. C-2 (1) pertains to revised budget estimates. He asked the members if he should take Item No. C-2(1) as approved to which the members said 'No'. The Vice Chancellor then invited the comments of the members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that as he has seen the budget, he would like to have some clarifications. It is very good that they have earmarked Rs. 11.40 crore for gratuity and leave encashment. Secondly, it was there in the newspapers that the Punjab Government is giving Rs. 33 crores, what here they have shown only Rs. 27 crores and the rest of the amount of Rs. 6 crores, he thinks, is for the constituent colleges. This time the admission of students has fallen 20%, as has been said Dr. Dalip Kumar also. He has heard about the zero base budgeting which means that the budget should start from the zero. But, he thinks, for zero deficit, they have just taken up the total income and total expenditure and after balancing it, it has been made zero deficit. It is my feeling. It is a financial magic. On one hand they were saying that they were not having money with them and they were running after the courts and government and on the other hand, it has happened that they have presented a zero budget. It seems that they have matched the figures. This is his feeling. Secondly the deficit of Rs. 18 crores should have been shown in the expenditure which they have to recover. They have not shown that amount anywhere. They have increased the income. The estimates are projected, these may or may not happen. He wanted to know whether the students were given concession in fee at the time of admission, he could not find any formula or scheme what they have done for them. If there is a zero deficit and they were having sufficient money, they are happy about it. But it has not been mentioned in the budget whether the expenditure to be incurred because of 7th Pay Commission recommendations have been included in it or not. If there is sufficient money, why the DA instalment is not being given, why the arrears are not being paid. If they have money, the Punjab Government has already given 50% interim relief, why the interim relief has not been given to non-teaching employees and that amount has also not been included. He wanted to know more about it and wished the Vice Chancellor best. He further said they would like to fill up the posts, they want to incur some expenditures, but he is not able to understand the intricacy of the zero deficit. He wished his best wishes for the Vice Chancellor. He wanted reply from the Vice Chancellor on his points to which the Vice Chancellor said that he has already given his input and he does not wish to add anything more to it. Continuing Professor Keshav Malhotra wanted to know about the interim relief to the non-teaching employees. When they have sufficient money, why DA has not been paid to them so far as it has been announced by the U.T. Government. When there are sufficient funds, why the DA is not being given to them and also why other payments have been withheld.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he is more concerned about what has been put on the screen. He referred to the third point, i.e., 'University shall send separate bills seeking permission from University Grants Commission'. Are the universities of the country at the merely of the University Grants Commission. Where is autonomy of the University. If the regular Vice Chancellor cannot run the University and fill up the posts as per the needs of the University, how the university can be run. There is a general moral principle for all

universities, especially for Central Universities, that in the last three months of the Vice Chancellor's term, he or she should not fill up the posts. The word 'should not' has been used. So, it is not binding. He has been saying for the last 5-6 months, as a member of the Senate, that every time they go to the University Grants Commission with a begging bowl. What is University Grants Commission. There is no U.G.C Parliament Act which directs U.G.C. which controls the Universities in such a manner. If they cannot fill up the posts without their permission, this is totally non-sense. He said that he condemns the U.G.C. if it is trying to run the Universities like that. He said he is putting it on record. The Senate should pass a resolution that whatever is the requirement of the University that should be fulfilled. U.G.C. is nobody to interfere into in such a blatant manner that the University should become a kind of a handicapped.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that he would also like to ask what has happened to the proposal sent by the Panjab University to University Grants Commission. What is its status and how much time it will take.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot say anything about it. He took it up with the MHRD three weeks ago. They said they are looking into it. At the moment they received for this financial year Rs. 20+ 20 crores. Now they have received a sanction for another 20 crores. They have received a communication from the Punjab Government that the first instalment of 8.9 crores would be sent to them. The remaining three instalments will come as the time will progress. This is where the situation is at the moment.

Shri Sandeep Kumar requested to speed up the process of filling up the post as it is a very important.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot fill up the post. If he fills up the post, then he will be on the wrath of Central Government. The Central Government is still giving us 208 crores. Though their income is huge, but they are still dependent on them. When they will come in the Board of Finance and got it recorded, he cannot do anything. The Board of Finance is a forum which has representatives. He presides its meeting as Vice Chancellor, but the Senate has its two representatives separately. Syndicate has also two representatives separately. Punjab Government has two representatives, UT has representatives. U.G.C. sends an Observer and MHRD also sends a representative. All these things have been minuted. If he does any such thing, there will be complaints that the Panjab University is a law into itself and it can be a law into itself. This is the difficulty they have. If they have not paid the DA instalment so far, they have to have liquid money flowing into us in the background of what the apprehensions are that if their income is not what they have been projecting, they may be forced to take hard decisions in the month of December 2017. Centre is not going to give them more money and they have to be mentally prepared that the money given/promised to them is from the last year's financial budget. Unless they revise those numbers, these numbers are unlikely to be enhanced. So they may be forced in the month of December, 2017, once they know what is their income and if the income is less than what the projection is, then they may have to pass on behalf of the University that DA will be released as and when the Centre will announce. But even though they do not have means to pay. If the situation become worse, then even they have to take some hard decisions like that they will be paid some salary i.e. 10% or 15% extra would be paid as and when they will get some additional grant either from the Punjab Government or from the Centre Government. Central Government has given a directive to the Punjab Government they should come to the aid of Panjab University, namely, the deficit of the Panjab University should be squarely met by the Punjab Government. We had actually a much larger deficit. In view of larger income that they had, they had projected some more income. That went into reducing their deficit. As far as the University is concerned, internally they have already contributed to decrease their deficit. They have told Punjab Government that they are enjoined to give them 12.5

annualized increase from the year 2013-14 onwards. The Punjab Government owes them an amount of Rs. 15-20 crores. The Central Government has asked the Punjab Government to help the Panjab University. The Court has asked Punjab Government Counsel as to what is the view of the Punjab Government on this issue. Case is still continuing in the Court. The next hearing is slated in the 3rd week of September. Punjab Government Counsel is expected to respond to the Court to the directive or Central Government. The Central Government has given the grant and now the Punjab Government should also come forward. Just to increase Rs. 7 crores does not absolve them of their responsibility. So this is an evolving thing and today they are at the interim phase. As one of their learned member has used the word 'financial magic', alright, and he is not disputing it. There is some totality of income and they want to carry out expenses as they were doing in the previous years. So as they were doing it in the previous years, they did similarly this year also. In that sense, it is a balanced budget. If there are a few 'ifs' and 'buts', those 'ifs' and 'buts' will unfold themselves in two-three months. Right now, the University is enjoined to submit to the Central Government some revised estimates in the background of Centre having given us 208 crores. If they do not send the revised estimates, the Central Government will say that they have given Rs. 208 crores, why they have not sent revised estimates. They may start re-think on whatever has been promised. This is the difficulty which they are considering and discussing these things.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since it happened to be his first meeting in the year 2017, he wanted to know from the Vice-Chancellor through the Finance and Development Officer as to how much grant they have received from the UGC during the previous year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have got Rs.197.8 crores. At the commencement of the financial year, an amount of Rs.176 crores was promised. Before the end of the financial year, they got Rs.20-22 crores more. On a query by Shri Raghbir Dyal about notional increase of 8%, the Vice-Chancellor said that they never got 8% notional increase. They got a notional increase of 8% only in the year 2014-15 and that also on a figure of Rs.163 crores which was arbitrarily determined. It was not the actual expenditure during the year 2013-14. The expenditure during this year was little bit more than Rs.171 crores and 8% of this would have been higher than the figure of Rs.176 crores which they were given. So, they started the year 2014-15 with a deficit and the grant has remained frozen at Rs.176 crores. Ever since they moved from the Plan Budget to the Non-Plan budget of the UGC, the grant remained frozen until the year 2016-17 and only with the intervention of the Hon'ble High Court and later on with the intervention of the Hon'ble Supreme Court if the UGC had not filed an SLP in the Supreme Court and had continued to defy the directive of the High Court, they would have ended up with just Rs.176 crores.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that now they are having a zero deficit budget. He enquired as to why the audit report has not been attached with revised estimates whereas the same was attached for the year 2015-16 and 2016-17. They have a tradition that as per the provisions of the Calendar, when the budget is presented in the Senate meeting in the month of March, the audit reports are presented at that time. When the revised estimates were presented and sent to the UGC in the month of September, the audit reports used to be attached even then also. He enquired as to why the audit reports have not been attached.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that it is correct that the figures of the previous financial years are being presented in the Senate meeting which is held in the month of September for the last two years. But this year because of the fire incident, the process of auditing got delayed and it has been got recorded in the minutes of the Board of Finance. Now a date has been fixed and the auditors have been requested to expedite the process of finalisation of the audit and they have to reconstruct the

records. The auditing is going on and it is expected that the same would be finalised before the end of this month.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the University is stagnant. Whenever they talk about the fiscal health, the Vice-Chancellor said that he has constituted a Think-Tank. As far as he remembered, as he was also a member of the Syndicate, during the last two years, only one meeting of the Think-Tank has been held and in that meeting also, nothing concrete could not be suggested. When no concrete suggestions were put forward, then it was suggested that the examination fee should be hiked. He suggested that it would be better for the financial health of the University if the meetings of the Think-Tank are held regularly and some concrete suggestions are put forward. He had been raising 3-4 issues like, alumni, foreign students and academic audit, on which perhaps they have not acted upon and not much progress has been made on these issues. They are going to implement the Choice-Based Credit System (CBCS) from the next year. According to him, with the introduction of CBCS in big Colleges of Chandigarh and Ludhiana, they should dismantle the B.Sc. Honours school from the campus.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to confine to the agenda and the general issues could be taken up during the zero hour.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is concerned about the income and expenditure of the University and he is not speaking anything else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the item which they are considering is the revised estimates. He requested as to what is the connection between the CBCS and the item.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is providing solutions as to how the University could survive in the years to come. What is the fiscal road-map and how could they come over the stagnation? When the budget of Central Government is presented or the revised estimates are presented, the discussion takes place. For example, prior to this year, the Railway Budget used to be presented separately. It was a tradition that the passenger and freight charges used to be hiked due to which the revenue was enhanced. Then the Hon'ble Members of Parliament used to say that since the charges have been enhanced, whether they are going to enhance the facilities also. Then the usual reply of the Minister used to be that it is better than earlier. Out of the projected income of Rs.293 crores, they are collecting Rs.150 crores through the examination fee from the students of the affiliated Colleges and the teaching departments of the University. Whether they could say surely that they have improved the examination system? If they are collecting the revenue, are they providing the facilities to the students. He had performed the duty as an Observer for two examination, one was CET (PG) and the other for the B.Ed. examination. He did not know whether it had been discussed in the Syndicate or the Senate as it is concerned with the revenue of the University. In one of those examinations, the OMR was wrong as there was no space available for answering the questions of the subject of Forensic Science. Who would take this responsibility? In the B.Ed. examination, the serial number of the questions differed in the English and Punjabi version. Have they discussed this either in the Syndicate or the Senate? Why the students of the affiliated Colleges and other students are suffering due to this in spite of having paid hefty fee to the University? Who would answer to this query? Is this not concerned with the budget of the University or not? In the recently conducted examinations, the title of the question papers on the envelope was something whereas the question papers inside were something else. He enquired as to whether some heads would roll on this issue. He would talk later on the issue of not granting the extension to the Dean of University Instruction. The Dean of University Instruction was fired out only on the pretext that he did not perform his duty properly just for a day. But on the issue of examination mismanagement, a period of four months has passed, what is the action

take till date and the Vice-Chancellor is saying that it has no connection with the budget. Should the students file writ petitions in the High Court for refunding the money? Who is responsible for this hell which is going to fall on the students of the affiliated Colleges for the last four years? Who would take the blame? There is no organised system. When a query is made about the examination being conducted, someone says that the paper of Punjabi should be solved by the students while the other person says that this could be solved in Hindi while the third one says that it could be solved in English. What is this going on? Now he would not discuss the budget. He enquired as to whether any Committee has been formed on this issue or accountability of any person has been fixed. Is he aware of these things as a Vice-Chancellor that these things are happening in the University? These are two very prestigious entrance tests, one (CET) for the postgraduate courses from which they earn revenue for the University. They could enhance the revenue in other ways like reducing the retirement age from 65 years to 60 years and by introducing the choice-based credit system in the Colleges. By adopting these measures, the University would be in surplus within 3 years. He had been a member of the Board of Finance. Whether they have adopted the measures like reducing the non-teaching employees which is about 3400? Whether outsourcing of the examination system has been done as the students are suffering because the results of the students are not being declared even after three months whereas the rule is that if a student qualifies at least 50% of the papers of two semesters, only then he/she could move to the next semester? The Punjabi University has a rule that if a student qualifies 50% papers of the first semester, he/she could be promoted to the next semester. But the Vice-Chancellor is saying that this problem is just for a year. If the number of students taking admission has reduced, it would affect for period ranging from three to five years depending upon the courses offered. He was feeling happy that he could not attend the meeting for about 8 months and the budget of the University has become zero deficit. In this way, if he did not attend the meeting for two more years, then the budget of the University would be surplus by about Rs.50 crores.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has listened to everything and would reply to all these questions at an appropriate time.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he wanted a reply from the Dean College Development Council and the Controller of Examinations as to why these things are happening.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not permitting the Controller of Examinations to answer these questions.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to who would answer these questions.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that he wanted to reply on the issue that everyone is blaming the non-teaching staff.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is not blaming the non-teaching staff.

Continuing, Shri Deepak Kaushik said that no one has seen or said that the strength of the non-teaching staff prevailing in the year 2005 should have been doubled with the introduction of semester system. The posts should have been doubled. It should not be so, that anyone could say anything against the staff. The strength of the staff should be seen in the context of the number of the students also.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Deepak Kaushik to speak on the issue on his turn.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he just wanted to know who is responsible regarding what is happening during the last years regarding the examination system. He said that if the Vice-Chancellor did not want to answer anything, this is not fair.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice-Chancellor has to decide to whom he is to respond and to whom not to respond, probably they would not be reaching the right conclusion. Let them not think as a Vice-Chancellor he has no responsibility to satisfy those from whom he wanted to get the recommendations of the Board of Finance approved and if the Vice-Chancellor did not have any proper response to any query, he could say that right now he is not in a position and would have to look into it or if they wanted to look into it, the Vice-Chancellor should appreciate it, but he completely overruled the query raised by someone. The Vice-Chancellor should not think that anybody is against the University, the Vice-Chancellor or the Board of Finance or the Syndicate. Sometimes when the Vice-Chancellor makes some comments like there are two elected representatives on the Board of Finance, two elected representatives of the Syndicate, representatives of Punjab Government and Government of India meaning thereby that the Vice-Chancellor is directly trying to give a hint as if they as members of the Senate do not have any right to raise doubts about the ifs and buts of what the figures say. If that is the case, he had said twice in the earlier meetings also, if anybody thinks that if they do not have confidence in the working of the Vice-Chancellor, he is ready to say that on behalf of at least some of the members of the Senate that they are ready to surrender all the rights of the members of the Senate to speak even a single word in the meeting if the Vice-Chancellor wanted so because they wanted to give all the powers to the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate that whatever he does, that they endorse what to talk of discussing, without even looking into the pages whatever is mentioned there. But if the Vice-Chancellor really wanted as he has been claiming, he wanted collective decisions to be taken and transparency to be seen at least in the society that this is how a democratic body like Senate of Panjab University works, probably he would have to give this concession to the members to be satisfied when they leave this House after the meeting. If the Vice-Chancellor says that he would decide what is to be answered and what is not to be answered, that probably is not going to create a very peaceful atmosphere. If allowed, he simply wanted to ask a question, he has yet to see any organisation and that too an organisation as big as Panjab University, where the budget figures of expenditure and income have been given in such a way that there is not even one rupee difference between the income and expenditure as if they have so meticulously designed that they would be earning Rs.100 and would be spending Rs.100. He has not come across even if it is estimated. If that is the case, he wanted to remind the Vice-Chancellor that he (Vice-Chancellor) was the lone crusader in meeting of the Senate who tried his best that the tuition fee of the students should be increased and it was raised to that extent that almost in unanimity, the Senate rejected that proposed hike in fee. Now, he simply wanted to ask the question that had the Senate not taken a conscious decision of withdrawal of that enhanced proposal, would the University not have been in surplus. That means the proposal enhance the tuition fee was to create a situation where the University could earn profits out of the pockets of the students or was the Senate being misled that in case the fee was not raised, the University was going into soup. So much so that an explanation was given that at that particular time as the case is pending in the Punjab and Haryana High Court, it was said that it was pending in the Supreme Court also that it is going to demolish the Panjab University' case in both the Courts. But, somehow the Senate took a conscious decision and decided to withdraw the hike which they had decided in the prior meeting. After seeing the figures, he felt, though in dark, though in the name of the excesses to be committed against the students, the Senate decided that they did not want to effect this hike, the Senate, though working in dark, in fact successfully took the appropriate decision of withdrawing that hike. Why this figure has come like this?. Here the Vice-Chancellor has said that Punjab Government has given Rs.27 crores instead of Rs.20 crores, meaning thereby, there is an increase of Rs.7 crores. Is he right, has he received it correctly that instead of Rs.20 crores, it is Rs.27 crores and Rs.6 crores for 4 Constituent Colleges. Is he right that Punjab Government is going to give a total grant of Rs.33 crores or it is Rs.36 crores.

To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that it is Rs.33 crores.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it is Rs.33 crores, why it is not mentioned that the amount of Rs.3 crores is for 2 more Constituent Colleges which they have agreed to run for Punjab Government. They are saying that instead of Rs.20 crores, the grant has been increased to Rs.27 crores. Should he feel that there is no mention of even a single pie relating to those Colleges which have been added subsequently or should he presume that Rs.1.5 crores for each College is also calculated in this also. If that is the case, then it is not Rs.27 crores but it is Rs.24 crores. He is trying to say that, not saying that it is an intention, but the end result is that the Senate who is to approve this budget, according to him, they should be satisfied that what they have approved, they approved the same consciously and not carried away by as the word 'magic' used by Professor Keshav Malhotra that they were hypnotised. Secondly, he was just looking at the figures. If they are having a deficit of over Rs.17 crores as on 31.03.2017, it does not find any mention by saying as if this budget is only for 2017-18. Gone if bygone whatever has happened up to 31st March, 2017, they are not to take into consideration. If they are not to take into consideration that there is a deficit of Rs.17 crores, it is mentioned in the footnote that as and when they get from the Punjab Government, it would be adjusted. It is a question of spending and earning money. Wherefrom that Rs.17 crores has come and wherefrom they managed? He has seen the revised budget estimates of the Board of Finance minutes of August 2016 which presented in the Senate in its meeting in August or September 2016 where it is specifically mentioned that net deficit desired to be met by MHRD/UGC is Rs.232 crores and uncovered deficit of previous years is Rs.45 crores and the total deficit which was given in the revised estimates was Rs.277 crores. But very interestingly, this year in 2017 only, even they are not taking into consideration what happened in the past, they have very smartly shown that income is equal to expenditure. If they pass this and that too, he would not say on projected figures, on imaginary figures, would they be taking the right decision especially in view of the fact as pointed out by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu, that the admission has fallen and he is sure that the admission has fallen much more in the Colleges of Punjab compared to the Colleges of Chandigarh to which the Vice-Chancellor aptly replied that the Finance and Development Officer is compiling meaning thereby that on compilation, may be the figure calculated would be totally different from what they are projecting here. These figures have been projected without even taking into consideration what number of students they would be having who would be appearing for the examination and as the Vice-Chancellor stated that it is based on the last figures that they have increased proportionately. If it is a fact that the number of admission of students has fallen, do they not know on 10th September only that these figures are not practical. Are they not supposed to correct the figures now only instead of getting it approved from the Senate and sending to the Government of India and thereafter the Government saying that what they have sent to the Government and what they have achieved? What would they then say that their calculations were wrong? Then the Government could say that it is their fault if they did not calculate properly and were supposed to know as to what number of students they were admitting. The question is probably on 10th September also, this University does not know how many students have been admitted in the 190 Colleges and the campus. Why is it so, because the returns are yet coming and the last date of admission even in the semester system is being increased to 15th September when the examination is going to take place in the month of November/December. If the last date is extended to 15th September, the admissions would go on and the Colleges would send the returns only after 15th September to the R&S Branch and may be some time in the month of November, they would come to know what is the actual strength of the students and that too not from R&S branch but from the examination forms which they receive in the Examination Branch. Thereafter, they would come to know whether the figures were realistic or not. In this regard, he suggested that if they are really aware of the fact that these figures have

been reached without, in fact, looking into the expected number of students keeping in view the claim by the Colleges Principals that the strength has fallen even beyond 20%, then straightaway they have to reduce the projected revenue from the examination from Rs.15 crores to at least Rs.12 crores. Then, they have to see how Rs.3 crores has to be reduced. If the income has come down, it is only for the first year. There is a footnote where in the year 2016, it has specifically been mentioned that whatever was the uncovered deficit, that was Rs.45 crores and the deficit of 2016-17 that was Rs.230 crores and it was claimed that they would like to claim Rs.277 crores from MHRD. This year, as explained by the Vice-Chancellor, since they already know, the fixed grant to be given by the MHRD. So, they have taken into consideration that Rs.17 crores which is still uncovered for the last two years, instead of moving on to MHRD because they know that the MHRD is not going to give anything beyond Rs.207 crores, they have put a footnote towards Punjab Government. That is also not sure whether they are going to get from the Punjab Government or not because in the name of Rs.27 crores, in fact, it has given Rs.23 crores. His simple query is that how the deficit of Rs.17 crores has been met till now.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would reply to it.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that where that Rs.17 crores is which is shown as deficit up to 31.03.2017. Has it been managed from some funds which, in fact, they are not supposed to use or re-appropriate because it does not find any mention either in the budget or in the revised estimates and why it has been said that Rs.17 crores as and when they would get, it would be against whom. He is not sure as to wherefrom this Rs.17 crores has come but his pointed question is that, he is sure that the Provident Fund of the teaching and non-teaching staff is not suffering on account of this Rs.17 crores, their pension fund is not suffering, the accounts which were supposed to be credited, instead of crediting those accounts, Rs.17 crores have been met to meet other expenditure in the name of uncovered deficit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would answer his queries.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they have been discussing that how come that the budget expenditure and the grants are matching. In fact, they have to go back to the month of January, February and March, 2017 to have a complete picture of the financial crisis of financial health of the University. In January, there was a situation that the staff might not be able to get the salaries or the University would be in trouble to the extent that it might be closed down. It was only then that in the Senate meeting they had a very deep engaging discussion on this and became conscious of the view to enhance the tuition and examination fees. There were so many understandings and conflicts relating to the stakeholders as well as the funding agencies. The financial position was very-very serious at that time. They were running short of funds to take care of the University, besides the salaries, all other things were totally frozen. So, they decided that the only way through the Think-Tank was that there should be an increase of fees to some extent. There was a time when they started complaining that private universities are mushrooming in the vicinity of Panjab University and started saying that the students might shift to those universities. Then they started collecting data from other universities of India, both the State and Central Universities. There were lot of comparative studies going on. It was found that they were struck at Rs.176 crores whereas they needed Rs.197 crores. Therefore, there was a deficit of Rs.20 crores. Then they started thinking that if this Rs.20 crores comes from the students, the things would be corrected. Then everybody used to say that it should not come from the pocket of the students. The question was only of Rs.20 crores and not more than that. Then they started bothering as to what would happen to the University infrastructure and they were thinking of paying the salary with that money. It was at that time, that from the Chair itself, that the issue was raised that the University would be closed and in the next few days *suo moto* notice was taken by the Hon'ble High Court. The matter was taken up and the Court took a decision that the

University may be bailed out. Neither the funding agency nor the stakeholders were able to find a solution except the Court which said the University should be immediately bailed out. The Court took a decision in order to have a counterpoint to the SLP filed in the Supreme Court by the UGC that how could the Court dictate that the money be given to the University. The UGC, which was expected through MHRD/MHA to give the money to the University, kept sitting idle. They could pass a resolution in the Senate but that is not going to bail out of the crisis.

Raising a point of order, Shri Raghbir Dyal requested Professor Ronki Ram to stick to the budget point.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal not to interfere.

Continuing, Professor Ronki Ram said that the budget estimate was Rs.176 crores and they needed Rs.20 crores more. This is what they need to discuss where the problem began. As Shri Ashok Goyal rightly said that how come this thing has come. Why they want to increase the fee? If they had increased the fee, they would have been in surplus but that was not approved. If at that time, the High Court would not have directed to give Rs.20 crores and the Supreme Court had not given that, they would not have been in a position to pay salaries for the month of March. At this moment, when they are talking about this money, the budget that they are estimating, they have to keep in mind the amount of Rs.270 crores and Rs.197 crores and has to be looked into properly because if they do not keep their constraint given the economy of the University, if they are not strictly following those, they would be falling in deficit because the UGC has accepted to give this much amount to the University and that is going to take care of the salary. On this account, what annual estimates they have, those estimates are not projected but are prepared on the basis of what actual number of students they would enrol, they have calculated on that basis. Whatever estimates they prepare, they could not go beyond that. They have to show their resources also. On this basis, they could point by point as to what would be their income.

Shri Ashok Goyal thanked Professor Ronki Ram that instead of the Vice-Chancellor, he has replied to his question

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would reply to the question raised by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he has a certain kind of warning to the governing body of this University because he feels that the most important agenda that they should have before them is the filling up the posts. When he talks about the filling up of the posts, he personally feels that running to the UGC/MHRD every now and then by the governing body seeking permission is nothing but facing a demise of the autonomy, something that Professor Chaman Lal also mentioned. This is a paradox under which they are operating. He warned the House also that on one side they say that it is a democratically elected House and on the other side a contradiction that the House is totally losing its autonomy. Therefore, the governing bodies of the University have to decide as to how much they are going to give in to the UGC and MHRD so that every time they need to fill up the important posts, they have to go with a begging bowl and ask for permission. According to him, if they look at the history of the University, they never faced such a situation. His warning is that if they continue to passively accept this, then they are in for absolute strangulation, absolute emasculation. He wanted the response to this from the Vice-Chancellor as he has raised a very important issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that wherever possible, he would give the response as the meeting concludes in two sessions, today and October 8.

Professor Shelley Walia said that then he did not see any need for this discussion if he is saying something and that is pushed under the carpet. He would like the House to respond if the Vice-Chancellor is not responding. Anyone is going on just saying things. He feels that he is speaking to a damn wall because if he is making a point and that point is so important that their autonomy is being challenged. He said that he feels suffocated in this House today.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that if his turn had come earlier, he would have said what Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed that there is no provision for the Dearness Allowance and Interim Relief in the budget estimates which has already been announced by the Punjab Government. Since they are following the rules of Punjab Government, the DA since January 2017 has not yet been paid. The payment of Interim Relief is related to the non-teaching staff only whereas DA is to be paid to all the employees. The employees also have a feeling that no provision for the Interim Relief has been made in the budget. There is a feeling of uncertainty on the payment of Interim Relief as there is no response from the competent authorities. When the authorities were approached for payment, then it was said that in the first instance, the DA would be taken care of and thereafter the Interim Relief. The employees have a feeling that somewhere there is discrimination between teaching and no-teaching, why it is so. He requested that he be heard carefully as he is the only representative of about 4200 employees. The feeling of the employees is that since the Interim Relief is to be paid only to the non-teaching employees and that is the reason that the authorities are not paying any heed to it. He requested that as announced by the Punjab Government, the interim relief should be paid to the employees. He said that whenever the instalment of the grant is released, the DA and Interim Relief should be paid and the employees would have a good feeling.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that this should be paid before the festival of Diwali.

Shri Deepak Kaushik also favoured it.

While referring to **sub-item 1 point (iii) (ii)** “for the posts of Assistant Professors which got vacated after completion of 65 years”, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that many times he has raised the issue against extension of employment from 60 years to 65 years. He was told at that time that it is not going to affect the fresh employment. But now, if they pass this item, they could only permit to fill the post after it is vacated after the age of 65 years. His point is that it should be 60 years so that the fresh persons should not suffer because of this extension of 5 years as the actual age of retirement is 60 years rather than 65 years. Secondly, he strongly seconded the opinion expressed by Professor Chaman Lal and Professor Shelley Walia that the autonomy of the academic institution should not suffer because of not responding by any of them or by not acting upon it.

Dr. R.S. Jhanji has raised a very vital issue and by incorporating point (ii), they are already accepting that the teachers of the University are continuing up to 65 years although there is a condition of extension of 2+2+1 or 3+2 years. According to him, it should be modified. If the age is 60 years, they accept it. If the people are going to retire at the age of 65 years, it is going to affect the fresh appointment as they are going to seek the permission. It should be 60 years instead of 65 years.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that from the discussion what she has made out is that actually the figures are very wrong if they look at the total revenue and the total expenditure. She asked that if they did not have the money for paying the enhanced DA to the employees, if there is no money to pay DA arrears to the employees, if there is no money even to pay the revised pay scales on the pattern of 7th Pay Commission as and when it is implemented, she would like to just know is it appropriate to ask for

recruitment and filling up the posts. How are they going to meet the expenses because there is something which seems to be concealed in these figures?

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that major part of the revenue is from the examination fee. As pointed out by Dr. Sidhu, the fee for examination having practical is Rs.2500/- and without practical, it is Rs.1500/-. Some of the Colleges have submitted the forms with Rs.2500/- while others with the fee of Rs.1500/-. The Controller of Examinations had recommended the forms to the fee section. The DMC of some of the students are held up and now-a-days the admissions are going on. He requested that the Fee Section be instructed to clear the cases so that the results are declared and the DMCs are released and the students could take the admission.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out this year, the admissions in the Regional Centre at Hoshiarpur have been made only between 35-38%. As they are seeking the permission of the UGC to fill up the posts, according to the UGC norms, there would not be the minimum teaching load of 16 hours per week at Hoshiarpur. The admissions during the last year were made up to 45% whereas this year only about 35% admissions could be made. He requested that this thing should also be kept in mind.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as pointed out by Dr. Parveen Goyal if there is not adequate teaching load in some of the departments, the teachers should be shifted from there to the Departments like UIET as in these Departments, the teachers are having appropriate teaching load. Secondly, as they are talking about filling up the posts after the age of 65 years, they could fill up the posts only then. There are so many Departments where only one teacher is working. Therefore, they should accord priority of filling up the vacant posts in those Departments which are on the verge of closing down. He requested the House and the Vice-Chancellor that they should consider all those Departments where the strength of teachers is not adequate. He requested that they should also try to fill up the vacant positions in the departments having acute shortage.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that this item, that they have to go to the UGC to take permission for filling up the post of Dean College Development Council, which post was actually created on the proposal made by the UGC and also the Chief of University Security, it is very disturbing. The Government could fix the amount that it has to give. After fixing the amount (say Rs.208 crores), the Government could not insist that the University should give up its responsibility of filling up the posts which are necessary and what the teaching requirements are. He is very disturbed that they have to take the permission to fill the post of Dean College Development Council or the positions to be vacated by the people who would be retiring. When the case comes to the Court next time, perhaps the University counsel may be advised to bring it to the notice of the Court the type of restrictions that the UGC is imposing which they should not. The mandate of the UGC is to determine and maintain the standards of teaching and research but the mandate is not to do thing which is against the teaching and research. If they do not have the Dean College Development Council, then there would be problems in the Colleges. If they do not have the Chief of University Security, then there would be problems for the campus security. If they do not have teachers in the Departments, the teaching suffers. Therefore, when they go to the Court next time, the University counsel be asked to bring it to the notice of the Court that the type of restrictions the UGC is trying to put on the University are not very desirable and these are against the academic considerations. It is also disturbing that they have to go to the UGC to seek permission.

Professor Shelley Walia said that this was also disturbing him.

The Vice-Chancellor while responding in a collective manner to whatever he has listened to and whatever he could respond said that it is quite possible that few things may remain. But, at the moment, he would respond to matters pertaining to Item No.1. He took the issue one year back in September 2016 when they went through this exercise.

It was in that background that they were expecting certain income in the background of the examination fee having been enhanced. So, they made certain projections. At the end of the year, they projected certain deficit and that deficit was actually quite large (larger than Rs.176 crores provision for which stand made in the UGC budgets). But as the year progressed, their own income turned out to be more than what they projected. The income turned out to be more than what they projected because they stopped the recruitment, they curtailed all kinds of expenditure. So, they sent the revised figure in December 2016 again a re-revised figure in February. There is an ultimate figure that they presented to the Court, on the basis of which Rs.20.7 crores was released when the last re-revised figure was Rs.198 crores, that turned out to be Rs.8 crores less than the previous actual expenditure which was about Rs.204 crores. Since they had enhanced income, they had less deficit and part of this enhanced income actually ultimately enabled them to take care of the deficit which was accruing from the previous year. So, here is a deficit. When they presented a larger figure to the Central Government in the beginning of last year saying that they would be short of Rs.101 crores and that amount would have left them (in a State) as if they would not have the salaries for the last three months. But, actually at the end of the year, the need of Rs.101 crores had come down to Rs.20 crores for 2016-17 (from the Centre). Now Rs.80 crores is the uncovered deficit. Some part of that they have covered. So, that the deficit of Rs.101 crores had actually shrank and become of the order of Rs.60-70 crores. Out of that, Rs. 20 crores came from UGC/MHRD and they were left with deficit of about Rs.40-45 crores. Out of that some part of the deficit, they have covered because of the enhanced income in 2016-17. The only uncovered deficit is that which the Centre has said that it would not cover it, it is to be covered by the Punjab Government or by the University by enhancing its income and the enhanced income of the University has already covered a part of it because the income turned out to be more than what they had projected. They have asked Punjab Government as to why they are demanding more from it that it should go back to the figures of 2013-14 and should give a 12.5% increase every year by which the University has enhanced its annual income. The Punjab Government has given only Rs.7 crores extra for 2017-18, whereas the claim of the University is Rs.43-44 crores. The claim of the University towards Punjab Government is of Rs.16-17 crores more. That is what the Punjab Government has to reply to the Court when the Court meets on the next date. This is all and there is no jugglery of figures. There is no deception in the figures. It is just a need to comprehend these figures. He had said these things as he had said in the beginning of the meeting today. He is just once again reiterating that in the background of the fact that they had effected a quantum increase in the examination fee which ultimately gave the income which is more than what they had projected. That enhanced income and shrinkage of expenditure enabled them to meet part of the earlier deficit and this is where they are today. The apprehension today is that this year they are unlikely to have the projected income. Last year, the internal revenue was Rs.271 crores and they have projected Rs.293 crores. They have projected Rs.22 crores more which could come from the increased tuition fee which would be around Rs.7-8 crores and they are expecting Rs.15 crores from the examination fee. The examination fee is not given during this year which they would know only when the time progresses. If they do not realise the projection of internal income till the month of December, then they would have to come back and take a hard look at as to how to curtail the expenditure. Either to curtail the expenditure or go back to the Central Government and ask it to say to Punjab Government what is to be done. As of now, they are having a Court case going on, many people are continuing beyond the age of 60 years for whom the Provident Fund, Gratuity and other retirement benefits are not being released. So, they have kept aside some money for this. But if the Court case continues for one more year, then this money would not get released. So, there are lots of ifs and buts and uncertainties in these figures. So, these are the compulsions of life and the University. Gone are the days when the University was in pre-independent India when the British Government gave nothing. The

entire University was run out of the earning of the examination fee and the University decided everything like what they have to pay to the teacher, what is to be paid to the non-teaching staff. At the end of the Second World War, the University enhanced the examination fee by 15% and nearly doubled the salaries paid to the teachers and the number of teachers at that time was 15-20, and the doubling the salary of those teachers could be met by just enhancing the examination fee by about 15%. They also had enhanced the salary of the non-teaching staff also which was also met from the hike in the examination fee. When they were financially completely autonomous, they could do whatever they wanted. In independent India, as the University evolved and the number of teachers kept on increasing when the University was recruiting teachers rapidly in the 60s, the University was still conducting the Matriculation examination. The UGC was expanding at that time. The universities were to give the proposed requirement of teachers for opening a new department, the UGC would give the money for five years and say that after that the University would absorb these things. So, the University got many posts created in this campus in the background of University doing academically well. The University was doing academically well, that is why the University was allowed to have the posts of Professors and Readers. If the University was not doing academically well, they would not have got these things. In the background of University doing academically well, the University continued expanding the faculty and got resources from outside. Today the situation is that they created many positions in this University. In order to enhance the University income, many new self-sustaining courses were started in the University, in the sense to have additional income which would allow them to pay the salary of the teachers in the traditional departments and it will also permit them to start paying pension, they did not have a pension scheme. The Government of India gazetted Panjab University Pension Scheme. Their pension scheme is not their creation alone. It was created with the permission of Centre Government and also gazetted by the Centre Government. But the stark reality is that when the Centre has computed this figure of 208 crores, they have not taken into account the pension liability of the University. The pension liability which was assumed by the university, because it was gazetted, he did try to plead with the Centre Government that the pension liability should be taken over by the Centre Government. This is not something that they should wish away, but he did not succeed. These are the matters which they can take up with the new Chancellor. They can also take up with the new Chancellor, the restrictions like, whether they should have the statutory positions like the Dean College Development Council, and Chief of University Security. The U.T. Administration wants them to have tight security across both the campus. They want them to raise the boundary wall of the University and that there should be a corridor all across the boundary wall and a motorable road where patrolling could be done. The U.T. Administration has this concern because they (University) are having fifteen thousand young people coming from all across the world who are staying in the residential campus. So they want the University to be as secure as possible. The requirements are many, but they do not have money. So they have to go back again, via the new Chancellor and the UT Administrator that if they are a city within the city, the civic needs of this campus have to be the responsibility of the UT Administration. That is why, in the Court they have pleaded that when they (UT Administration) say that if the Panjab University is a part of the larger city, then they should either accept the responsibility or make the grant available. But at the moment, they have to do everything from the internal income of the University and internal income of the University can come only by enhancing the burden on the students. When they enhance that burden, they have the difficulty that as a national institution, as a State created institution, they have to be inclusive. Inclusive means, opportunities to young people in India should not depend upon what their parents' income is. So, this is the task of the Think Tank to have an algorithm as to how there can be cross subsidy from those who can pay for those who cannot pay. The Vice Chancellor said that Think Tank has been reconstituted. Three Committees have been reconstituted. There are Committees for

looking at what should be charged from the students in the Campus, what should be charged from the students in Chandigarh city, what should be charged from the students who are enrolled in the affiliated colleges in Punjab. There are different financial strengths and their expenses are also different. That is why these Committees have been constituted. The first Committee has to give us the input as to how will the affiliated colleges in Punjab and UT would survive. The tuition fee in Punjab is determined by the Punjab Government and that tuition fee is the same whether the colleges is affiliated to Panjab University, or to Punjabi University, Patiala or to Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. Union Territory has its own tuition fee. There is a factor of three in the level of tuition fee charged by a college in UT viz-a-viz a college is in Punjab. When a student is enrolled with a first degree, the outflow of the college in Punjab is one number, UT is two number and enrolled in the campus is the third number. Should there be some synergy, should there be some formula? Should there be some formula? Have they given a thought to it whether it should be equal or all should be unequal. This is the job the three Committees have been doing. At the moment they are in a situation which is evolving and the solution to large number of open questions have to be sought. They were there last year, but the only difference is that last year they were asking the Centre to give them more money, but today they cannot ask the Centre to give them money. They have to have some figures and these have to match. If these do not match, the Centre has the right to increase or decrease that they have promised. This is their difficulty. All this discussion is going to be recorded and this transcript will also be submitted along the estimate of revised budget to the Centre. So, it is in that background that this Item No.1 is before them. The broad income and expenditure statement where the figures stand presented as if it is a zero deficit. What is zero deficit? Rightly, it is just matching. They do not know how much DA has to be paid. As regards interim relief, at the moment, they cannot give that (automatically), as their employees are paid as per the Punjab Government rules. If the interim relief has financial implications, it has to go back to the Board of Finance. Then somebody has to step in. They are an Interstate Body Corporate and that character cannot change. So the stakeholders have to get together and respond to the needs of the non-teaching employees, that they are governed by the Punjab Government rules and that whatever interim relief is released by the Punjab Government, that has to be given to them as well. But, the Punjab Government would have to make available to them some *ad hoc* amount, only then they can pay the interim relief, which would get absorbed in the eventual pay enhancement as and when the 7th Pay Commission recommendations will come for implementation. The problem is that if Centre does something, they cannot implement, if State does something they cannot implement because they are dependent on both of them. They do not have an algorithm in place as to how they have to financially survive. So, this is the responsibility of the Governing Bodies of the University. On behalf of the Governing Bodies of the University, they gave him the authorisation. He has constituted a Think Tank and these Committees. Those Committees have to give a feedback. He has explained everything, and if he has left something, they can suggest.

Professor Rashpal Malhotra said that after listening to his distinguished colleagues who have shown their concern, he thinks there is only one thing missing, i.e., communication gap. The information which has been provided now formally, he wished that there should be a mechanism that everyone, even a Peon in the Institute knows, from where the money is coming and where this is being spent, how is it being spent. He suggested that they should develop a mechanism. He (VC) has constituted Committees. He must have a mechanism to interact with the members of the Senate who have shown lot of concern and supported him on the issue. In fact, individually, everyone is aware of, what you (i.e., VC) have done for the University. He suggested that there should be no gap of communication. Consequently, all this criticism has come in the form of suggestions and support. Secondly, he talked about autonomy. What autonomy they are

talking about. A small Clerk representing the donor institution may say that he has been ordered to issue this much of amount. Whose autonomy they are talking about. Autonomy is something which comes from the intellectual power. It comes from the intelligentsia, it comes from the people concerned. Then there is a voice. Where their voice is heard. They are only addressing him. What he has done, according to him, he would say openly, what he has done, in fact he has been going to the Court. How they survive, he does not know that. Therefore, he (Vice Chancellor) must make a point to inform, outside the Senate meeting, a mechanism to the members of the Senate who have deep respect for him and who understand and who want to support him. As a result of that many of the problems will get into perspective and he will get lot of support.

Shri Ashok Goyal while thanking Professor Rashpal Malhotra said that is what he also wanted to say that while approving something, are they not supposed to know the minor details, where from the money is coming and where the money is going. Though he (Vice Chancellor) has explained everything, but his moot question is this to let them know the kind of efforts that he has put in, especially by going personally to the Court and arguing the case on behalf of the University. He is sure that this uncovered deficit Rs. 17.98 crores which they are expecting from the Government of Punjab, which he is also hoping that may be the Court orders Punjab Government relieve them immediately. He simply wanted to know that if they get 18 crores, where will it go, there has to be some liability. They say uncovered deficit, where from that 18 crores they have met till now. He said that he is sure that they have raised some loan, they must have debt from somebody, some debts must be outstanding then. He simply wanted to know where is that 18 crores right now which they say uncovered deficit and put those saves and it will be adjusted as and when it is received from the Government. Adjusted against what, he asked. He is sure that it must have been mentioned in the balance sheet, but the balance sheet is not before us. So while explaining this 17 or 18 crores, (it) must be explained to them because his worry is that he want to be sure that this 18 crore is not being met out of the funds which are meant for crediting into the accounts of teachers and non-teachers or component of any salary. This is his concern.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they permit him, Mr. Vikram Nayyar, Finance and Development Officer will reply to it.

It was clarified (by Shri Vikram Nayyar, F.D.O.) that there is no imagination or magic. There is a change of mechanism, the way they have been making budget in the past. They used to project their expenditure, they used to project their income, but they were not sure about how much grant they were going to get, so they project the deficit. But now the total mechanism has changed. They now project their income, they know what grant the government has fixed for the university. So, now they know what is the total availability of the amount for a particular financial year. In that availability, they have to fit in their expenditure. Now from this year onward, they have to have zero deficit budget. They have to make a zero deficit budget because they cannot project an expenditure without having source of the income.

Professor Rashpal Malhotra asked if they have shown that this has a liability anywhere the payment of pension, the payment of gratuity, the payment of DA and the payment of arrears.

It was further clarified (by Shri Vikram Nayyar, F.D.O.) this 17 crore figure was outstanding as on 31st March, 2017. Now, as they progress, that liability will be mitigated in the next financial year.

However, Professor Rashpal Malhotra said that that was not a point. He wanted to know how much liability he is anticipating in terms of gratuity, pension, in terms of arrears of DA etc. As he has said that this much amount is a liability which he can show as liability and he can still show the budget as zero deficit budget. Nobody stops him

from doing that. What how can they wash away the fact that they owe so much of money already to the people as an when it comes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is the point.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that they have minus 17 crores. Now the expenditure has been met. Where from the expenditure has been met, he asked.

It was further explained (by FDO) that the expenditure was liability as on 31st March. As the next financial year started, they received the grant and met that liability. But every time, as of now, they have a liability to the tune of 20 crores. So, there is always a liability.

Professor R.P. Bambah asked they have minus 17 crores liability and then the grant came.

It was replied (by F.D.O) that it is next year's income.

Professor R.P. Bambah further said that he has used that money. Therefore, as far as this year is concerned, they have 17 crore less income than what has been projected.

It was replied (by FDO) that they have used this year's income to meet that liability which was pending as on 31st March, 2017. So, this is a continuous process. As of now, if they ask what is the liability, this would be more than 20 crores.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked if he (FDO) has shown that liability, which was replied (by FDO) that he has shown it in the agenda item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his version should be listened to. He is going to help the University. The only difference between last year and this year is that earlier they did not know how much grant will they get from the Centre Government. But now they know it. So as has been explained by the F.D.O., that is why they have made zero deficit budget. He is saying that the liability of last year i.e. 17 crores or whatever it is, if it is to be met out of the revenue to be generated this year, that does not amount to expenditure of this year. If it is so, then why this 17 or 18 crore is not shown as expenditure for the current year so that they could say that the net deficit is of 18 crores. What they are showing here is that they do not have any deficit. Now to specify, they say, they are only talking of 17 or 18 crores. They do not want to discuss anything about what has happened upto 31st March. That probably will not be discussed. Now they say, it is mentioned, what is the liability. He said that he simply wants to suggest that under Item No.1, where the details have been given, as were given last year also, there the uncovered deficit was added, but this time this has not been added. This should be detailed here only that besides the projected expenditure, it shown as added liability of this much which is detailed as follows, is also to be met out of the revenue to be generated for this year so that they know that this is the exact financial position.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that he would like to carry on what Shri Ashok Goyal ji has said. As the Vice Chancellor has rightly said that on 31st March, 2017, they had a deficit of about Rs. 17 crores and the Vice Chancellor wants to put it in the Court that the Punjab Government should meet the deficit. He wanted to ask if the deficit is for one year only or it shall be carried on for all the years. If it has to be carried on for all the years, then the grant has not for the years to come, then they should show that deficit for the years to come also, otherwise their deficit is only for one year and that grant be not carried forward for all the years.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that the budget is never zero deficit budget either it will be in loss or in profit. They can see the budge of any government; it may be Centre Government or State Government. Secondly, he asked have they ever thought of loss in the internal revenue or the less admissions of students. The only reason for this is that

their children are going abroad. They are taking IELTS Coaching. He requested and also suggested that if they start English and the subjects of IELTS in colleges, it will check reduction in the admissions in B.A. In the morning, teaching of B.A. classes could be done and in the evening IELTS coaching could be done. With this measure the number of colleges will increase. If the number of colleges will increase, the income of the University will also increase. Lastly, he said that there could not be zero deficit budget.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she just want to have a simple clarification that in the internal revenue from the original to revised figures, there is an increase of about 21 to 22 crores. She wanted to know, as the Vice Chancellor said in his address, is it only a result of increase in the examination fee or it is also a result of some transfer of money from some other accounts, hostel funds or something.

It was replied (by the FDO) that because the examination pattern is not commensurate with the financial year. There is always some kind of carry over. They have to take into account that carry over. The second thing is that it is not only admissions, it is examinations also. In the last year they have been in the transitory stage. Some annual system was going on and some semester system was going on. Still now, as confirmed from the examination branch, there are re-examination of annual system and semester system also. So, though the number of students may not enhance, but the number of examinations is increasing. On the basis of that they have projected. These projections have certain carry overs because the certain fee relating to the previous year but received in this year that has been projected, as well as the number of examinations re-conducted.

On a query by Professor Rajesh Gill if it is only examination fee, the F.D.O said "yes". He further said that this is a consolidated figure and also there is a head-wise break up of this figure. Professor Rajesh Gill also asked about the major resources of income to which the FDO said that it has been mentioned at numeric 2.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to make a suggestion that, not only the number of students, but the number of examinations has also increased and they are now allowing the students to re-appear in annual as well as semester examinations. Why these kind of explanations are not given in the Senate so that they know that the projected income is based on the right footing. He said that the details have been given as to how much income they expect. They should mention the present number of examinations and expected number. The number of students appeared in the examinations and the number of students now expected, so that they know it properly. He said that they are not saying that they (PU) have done something wrong, but saying that in spite of the fact that they have done everything meticulously, but they are not able to understand.

Shri Jarnail Singh that the Vice Chancellor as well as the FDO has mentioned in their reply that their income has increased and it has increased more than the projections, he is of the opinion that in the last three years, The reason is that with the introduction of semester system, the worst effect on the students is that about 50% students appear in reappear examinations. It is not because that the number of examinations have increased, basically the number of examinees have also increased. Just to clear one paper they have to appear time and again, sometimes they have to appear four times. For that, what they have to do is that they have to reduce the percentage of marks of supplementary examinations. They have allowed the candidates getting two compartments to take admission in M.A. class. This is the ultimate solution. Let us not increase fees this way. Either there should be some annual review or they should evolve some system so that the academic standards are not diluted. He requested that it should be got examined and his apprehensions be taken into account.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he thinks that they have a case in the High Court. He stated that there are liabilities, but they should be clear what are those liabilities, otherwise the Court may not be able to do that. They must be prepared in order to ensure that something drastic does not happen.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know what are the liabilities and where it has been written to which the Vice Chancellor said that these are mentioned under the heading "Uncovered Deficit".

Professor S.K. Sharma wanted to know about liabilities towards what.

The Vice Chancellor said that this will come in the balance sheet. This is what the FDO has answered to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said while passing it, even if it comes in the balance sheet, the Vice Chancellor intervened and said it would come in the balance sheet. Shri Ashok Goyal said "would come" that means, they do not know as on date. He further asked the F.D.O. if he has the details now and asked that he should give the details after lunch. He would tell him why, because it is a very very sensitive matter, not for the employees and teachers only, it is a sensitive matter for the university also. If they are able to explain the details of those liabilities, may be, they will be able to strengthen their case in the Court also. But why they are shying away sharing with the members of the Senate.

It was clarified by the F.D.O. that it is not like that the uncovered deficit is based on the accounting, i.e. accrual based accounting. For example, they have booked the expenditure, it is not that when they booked the expenditure, the expenditure was 17 crore more. He has to see that on 1st of April, he has to pay the salary, that is in the next financial year. He said that it is not only 17 crores, but he has kept 30 crore. He has kept the liability of Rs. 15 crores more to pay salary. This is the process that they have to manage so that no activity of the University is stopped for want of money. He said that in the pension corpus there is a provision of Rs. 70 crores that they have to transfer this amount annually from the budget. They book the budget on quarterly basis and credits are booked depending upon the availability, they then transfer it in the pension corpus. Now that 70 crores has been booked on 31st March, then he transferred 55 crores out of it. In this way he has booked the expenditure, but he has kept Rs. 15 crores so that he could pay the salary for April. Then they received the grant. Then the amount which was withheld was released. In this way the liability of Rs. 17 crores must have ended so far, but it is a continuous process. If somebody asks him what he has to as on today, then he would say as on today he may have to put money in the pension corpus, he has to pay for the TDS etc. and what leverage he could take, he will take that also, so that University work should not suffer. Salary of no one may not stop. They have already made provision in the budget for paying DA. But he has to see, if he pays the DA, it should not stop the salary of someone. That he cannot do. He has to see that if he has put the income of Rs. 208 crore in the budget.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now he is clear what is the actual financial position of the University. What they are doing in the University, there are different companies i.e. government and non-government with them, that is why he is apprehending, after all wherefrom this 18 crores they have met with.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it is very much clear and why this story again and again.

On being interrupted by Professor Ronki Ram, Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice Chancellor, why he was not preventing him (Professor Ronki Ram) from interrupting him.

The Vice Chancellor said that the forum is not for politics, the forum is to progress to which Shri Ashok Goyal said then why anybody should interrupt him.

The Vice Chancellor said that they all do the same thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if he did it, he is sorry for it, but he has to tell him (Professor Ronki Ram) not to interrupt him.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does to stop each one of them. Even he had to do unpleasant thing of interrupting Professor R.P. Bambah.

Shri Ashok Goyal further said that if the University did not pay the electricity bill and say that they have to pay the salary, are they within the rights to do this.

The Vice Chancellor said that the F.D.O. is managing all this and no one's provident fund has been withheld.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked then where that 18 crore has gone. Why there is liability of 18 crores. Has the total pension fund been transferred to the corpus. He said that 17 crore is the liability, it has been shown up to 31st March, 2017 and he has been told that there is 28 crore credit which is missing from pension corpus. They want to solve the problem. He further said that as to what is due to pension corpus and what they have to give to the pension corpus. He requested to give him the details of it after the lunch break. They only want to be satisfied that everything is right. The F.D.O said that he will provide the details today.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he wants to suggest that someone should reiterate to the Punjab Government to restore the 60:40 grant which is a part of the Interstate Body Corporate, so why should Punjab Government deny it.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are the matters which they can discuss when they would take up the item of grant of Central Status to the University.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he would like to add that they had been discussing this issue for quite a long time. Now, there is a question of 18 crores. Their Finance & Development Officer has been telling about it. They see that some money is coming and some money they are spending. They also know that they are being given the grant by two Bodies i.e. Centre and State. But they were facing problem with regard to autonomy. Somewhere, they know that money would come at this and this stage. Now, in order to save themselves from the crises, the University under the name of autonomy, uses its discretion, as F.D.O. has said. Professor Bambah Sahib and Professor Rashpal Malhotra have asked teh FDO about what that dicretion was. He made his point clear which income is assured. What income is being received by way of grant-in-aid from the MHRD and the University Grants Commission. Although the grant-in- aid, they consider it as income. The internal revenue should also be considered as income. Now, out of that they have to meet the expenditure of certain Heads, i.e. salary and others. They knew very well that if they spend the entire money for the given head, they would be short of money and they are not going to get either from the Centre or from the State. If they do this, they would be in deficit immediately after the next month on account of salary and other heads. Keeping that in view, they are trying to make little shifts here. Those shifts are very much clear in their account books. When somebody will go to the Court, the Court would see these records. Shri Sibal is also sitting here, he would also say that these things could not be concealed particularly, the money matters as these have to be transparent. There cannot be any hanky-panky. Now on this account, if 18 crores have been spent from the income and shown, it is there. Accordingly, the 18 crore is not the liability. The money which has been used so late in the next year, he would again show it,

when the money would come. If the University is being managed well in this account, then where is the problem.

Professor Mukesh Arora stated that once he was listening to the lecture of Shri Rakesh Bharti Mittal who said that in life there is high risk high profit theory. He worked on that theory. The D.P.I. has told him that if he wants to purchase a car, they should first take the permission. He applied for permission to purchase the car, but no reply was received. Then he purchased the car and nobody asked him about that. The Vice Chancellor has asked the University Grants Commission/MHRD to grant permission for filling up the posts of Chief of University Security or Dean College Development Council etc. He said, send them one or two reminders and if no reply is received, then he should fill up the posts and said that the whole House is with him.

The Vice Chancellor then said, may he propose that the Finance & Development Officer will provide an explanatory note and the details pertaining to whatever is there in the two tables mentioned in the item. With those provisions and liabilities, which have been explained, that Item No.1 with notionally zero deficit budget, be approved for sending it to the Centre Government as a revised estimate for this year. Many members consented by thumping the tables.

However, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his dissent be recorded as he was not allowed to speak on the financial matters. Secondly, the audit reports were not presented and he (Vice Chancellor) is violating the Calendar as per his convenience. For the last 2-3 years, the University is in financial mess and he has not been able to project the fiscal roadmap.

Some members said that he should be given a chance to speak and everything should be decided unanimously.

At this point of time, the Vice Chancellor said that his (Shri Raghbir Dyal) dissent would be recorded and they would discuss it after five minutes.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to initiate discussion on Item No. 2 of the Minutes of the meeting of Board of Finance.

Shri Naresh Gaur requested the Vice Chancellor to allow Shri Raghbir Dayal to speak on item No.1.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa wanted to know whether the item No.1 has been passed as it is or there is any change.

The Vice Chancellor said that the changes, explanations and additions have to be added.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that he has to record a dissent and asked whether he should give it at the end or now.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor as to what his dissent is, Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that it is about the age of 65 of teachers to which the Vice Chancellor said that it has nothing to do with the budget.

Dr. Randhawa said that it has been mentioned here in this item.

The Vice Chancellor asked what the financial implications of that are. He wants to oppose the budget because he wants the reemployment scheme to be curtailed. Is that the reason? Should he want to vote against the budget? Does he want to disallow the reemployment scheme of the University? The reemployment scheme of the University was upto 63 years and the Senate passed and made it 65 years. It is a Senate decision and it seems that he wants to reverse the Senate decision. That decision is not to be reversed. Is that the reason to oppose the budget? He can oppose the budget, it is okay with him.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that when a seat is to be filled after 65 years of ones age, he is restraining the fresh professional students.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not restraining anybody, but the situation today is that he cannot fill any position whether a person retires at 60 or 65 years. For filling up a vacant position, he has to go to the Centre Government and take their permission. He asked him to understand the very difficult and strange situation they are passing through. In order to fill up vacant positions of all kinds, it may be because of retirement of a person, completion of re-employment of a person at the age of 63 or 65 years or due to any other reason, he has to go to the Centre Government and take their permission. He cannot declare a position vacant when a person is continuing in reemployment. He does not understand as to why he wants to oppose it.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa requested to give him sometime so that he can explain as to why he is opposing it. He said if they retire some person at the age of 60, the seat gets vacant and he can fill that seat. But they are treating the extension in service as regular service.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not done anything. Before he came, the reemployment scheme was upto the age of 63 years and all that happened in his tenure as Vice Chancellor is that the age for re-employment has been raised from 63 years to 65 years.

Dr. Randhawa further asked whether the re-employment upto 65 years is mandatory, or it is by choice or it is on merit.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is the decision of the Governing Body of the University. It is a right given to the people which they have to exercise and it is not a compulsion for them to take 5 years re-employment.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that he withheld the right of employment of the young professional and new entrants and held them up for a period of five years. They cannot enter into employment. Why he does not retire the persons at the age of 60 years.

The Vice Chancellor asked Dr. Randhawa to bring a proposal and he will put up it to the Syndicate to which Dr. Randhawa said why his version be not taken as a proposal. However, the Vice Chancellor asked him to give in writing along with the reasoning.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he has a resolution to move, but the Vice Chancellor asked him to give the resolution to him and he will send it to the Syndicate as it is not the time to move the resolution.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to give time to Shri Raghbir Dyal so that he could give his opinion and the everything could be done unanimously. They were also joined by Naresh Gaur to ask for time to speak for Shri Raghbir Dyal. However, the Vice Chancellor said that he has already given him time and further added that they have a duty to perform i.e. to consider the other items which pertain to governance of the University.

Speaking on Item No.4, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he remembers that such an issue had come up in the year 2016. There were some teachers of University Institute of Engineering and Technology who were non-NET and were allowed to continue. He said that he would like to draw the attention of Note No. 3 which is attached. He said that he would like to know that the non-NET teachers who are not regular and working as Guest Faculty or on contract, can they replace them. He informed that in the government colleges situated in Punjab, there are about 700-800 teachers who are not NET qualified, but they are protected by the Punjab & Haryana High Court that they can be replaced by regular recruitment from PPSC. This process is running in Panjab University also. They

appoint non-NET candidates. He wanted to know the legal position of the University in this regard. He asked whether they have replaced the non-NET candidates with the qualified teachers or can they do it in future.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have been asked to advertise such positions. If they get qualified teachers, these people would be removed immediately. They have said that there will be a rolling advertisement which means that the posts will be advertised again and again.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it means that the unqualified people who have been appointed as Guest Faculty or on contract basis, can be replaced with qualified people. He requested to check its implications.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Shri Raghbir Dyal is saying, he is saying it in view of the orders of the High Court. He thinks that it will be very well in their knowledge that any Guest teacher or teacher on contract basis, they cannot be relieved till they are replaced by the regular teachers. This is the order which is operating everywhere including Chandigarh. But here the question is altogether different that a person has been appointed on Guest Lecturer basis in spite of the fact that he does not fulfil the minimum qualifications. If they advertise the posts again, he said that he does not know how they will advertise every year in view of the orders of the Court. If they advertise that means the people already employed who are not eligible, can be replaced by the eligible persons. Now, suppose next year, they appoint somebody who is eligible, according to them, again the post will be advertised.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the person appointed is eligible, then they need not to advertise the post again.

Shri Ashok Goyal explained if the person, though eligible, is again appointed as Guest faculty or on contract basis, the post will have to be advertised again. The decision is that they can be replaced with eligible people and the eligible people cannot be replaced till they are replaced by the regular teachers. This should be clarified by way of sending these instructions to the concerned departments.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he will talk by attaching the 3rd item with the 4th item and said what Shri Ashok Goyal ji and Shri Raghbir Dyal has said, he is fully agreed with that. He observes another problem in item number 3 where the salary of a Technician has been raised from Rs. 11000/- to Rs. 20000/- which is a Class-III post with a condition that if the DC rate increase, his salary would be increased accordingly. He informed that in all colleges of Punjab, there are about 500 computer teachers out of which only about 25-30 teachers are eligible and the rest of the teachers are ineligible who teach the classes. From the last 10-12 years, these teachers are teaching in the Colleges. He stated that the salary of Technician has been raised from 11000/- to 20000/- and here the audit department does not raise any objection. There is great shortage of qualified teachers and even in his college he is not able to get qualified teacher in spite of the fact that the posts have been advertised many times. He stated that regarding the appointment of non-qualified computer teachers, the Audit Department has given a note where it has stated that it may be taken up with the UGC and also the rate be got decided for the Lecturers. He stated that for Class-III post of a Technician, they are giving Rs. 20000/- but for a computer teacher they are giving 15600/- only. In the next item No. 5, they are giving Rs. 25000/- to Audio Video Lab. Technician. He said that his contention is that they raise objection to pay a computer teacher the salary of Rs. 20000/- and ask for clarification from the UGC. He is surprised to know that a Technician is paid a salary of Rs. 25000/- and those who are making the future of their children, objections are raised on their salary. He again said that he fully agrees with what Shri Ashok Goyal ji has said and added that they cannot replace such teachers if they have his workload.

Shri Raghbir Dyal once again asked about the legal position of the University on this issue. He further asked if they replace these teacher with those who have NET qualification. According to his information they could replace such teachers only with regular teachers. He requested that he may be informed within a month or two about it after having consultation with the legal department.

The Vice Chancellor said that the UGC will not permit any Lecturer to be appointed who does not qualify the UGC regulations. UGC does not care whether the teaching could be held or not in the colleges. They have to face a ground reality. They have opened a College, they have admitted the students and they have to teach them. If they do not have teachers, they have to make an *ad hoc* arrangement. But if they continue *ad hoc* arrangement, the UGC or some RTI activist will say that this University is violating UGC. The UGC will constitute a Fact Finding Committee and stop the grant. In such a situation, they have to safeguard their position and say that they are not willingly violating UGC. If they advertise a position, only in some rare case a NET qualified will come. What will happen if they remove somebody with non-NET. They have to find a practical way and this is not a forum to discuss this practical solution. The practical solution is that they do not want that person to be out of the job. They should keep that guy so that he can continuously appear in the NET examination and hope one day he/she passes the examination. This is what they want. They have so many vacant positions which are not getting filled up. If, by luck, they get a NET qualified person, the non-NET persons could be adjusted where a positions is still vacant and encourage these people that they should continuously writing that examinations and enable them. There should be a tuition class started by the English Department and the Computer Science Department so that the Non-NET qualified people, during the summer months, can be given some crash courses. This would help them to pas the examination. Some practical solution has to be found. He is as concerned, about human issues, as they are. But they have to find some practical way of moving forward and also protect that complaints are not put in against the University that this University encourages or practices violation of UGC norms.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that what Principal I.S. Sandhu has stated, there is no mention in the UGC regulations whether they have to give 25000/- of 15000/-. But if they compare the salary of Technicians viz-a-viz the salary of Computer teachers, they can increase the salary of Computer teachers.

The Vice Chancellor, however, said that the job of a Technician is a full time job, therefore, he requested not to mix up these two. Depending upon the teaching load, if one course requires 56 lectures in a month, they can appoint two Guest Faculty, but they cannot give more than Rs. 25000/- p.m. to a Guest Lecturer. This is the dilemma. If one can pay 1000/- per lecture and pay up to the total load which runs into 56 lectures, then they can pay for 56 hours or 56x800. But they are not permitted to do as well. These are the practical difficulties for which there is no easy solution. They can continuously debate, but they have to conform to the dictates of the Regulatory Body. The Regulatory Body does not run a University, but it only regulates the University. If the UGC was running a University of its own, then it would know what is the problem of running a University.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that at point No. 4, it has been written the UGC will decide as to how much has to be given to a non-NET teacher.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is what the UGC Administration is doing. When the matter went to the Board of Finance, the UT representative said that they will overcome this problem by paying less than one thousand rupees.

Shri Raghbir Dayal and Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the UT Administration Colleges, there are not Guest Faculty rather they are appointing Resource Persons on full time.

However, the Vice Chancellor said that they are not asking them to employ people on full time basis.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they have full workload, but they cannot appoint them on full time basis to which the Vice Chancellor said that then they should appoint two persons instead of one.

Principal I.S. Sandhu further informed that the Panjab Government is giving 21600/- to the Guest Faculty and that he has raised this issue in the Syndicate also. While referring to Item No.3, he asked what was the need to enhance the amount of Rs. 11000/- to 20000/- for a Technician to which the Vice Chancellor said that he (Principal I.S. Sandhu) was also there in the Syndicate meeting. He further asked who is the person who has been getting this done.

The Vice Chancellor asked him not to mix up the things. His proposal is that they should reduce it. Does the Senate agree with it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu further asked that he may be told how it has been increased from 11000/- to 20000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has just presented to them the Syndicate decision and the Board of finance decision and he does not want to give any more explanation.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he has an objection to the decision of the Syndicate and Board of Finance and not with the Vice Chancellor. He asked, how this is being passed by the audit department. From the DC rate, it has been enhanced to Rs. 20000/-.

Principal Harash Batra informed that UT is paying Rs. 500/- per lecture to non technical person.

The Vice Chancellor said that they may be paying 500/, but the UT representative Mr. Jatinder Yadav told me that they are paying less than one thousand per lecture and they (PU) are paying 800/- per lecturer, it is okay with him and he has endorsed it. The Vice Chancellor said that UT representation i.e. Director Higher Education should have been present here today, but he is not here.

Referring to Item No. 5, Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that there is contradiction and desired that they should defer it once. It has been written in this item that the recurring provision would be restricted to the annual income that would be generated by the Centre. They are projecting an income of 7.5 lakhs which is still not realistic because the expenditure is to the tune of Rs. 14 lakhs. Therefore, he has suggested that some one time facility should be added to it. As he has already told that one media centre could be added.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is the money which has come from MPLAD Fund where it has been specified as to where the money has to be spent. Therefore, right now, this item is consonance with that.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh explained that the income to be generated from the Centre is less than the expenditure. The Vice Chancellor has himself said that they are not in a position at the moment, to run such Centres, whose burden would fall on the University. He further clarified that the income which has been projected is yet to be known whether it would be actually generated or not. They do not have more details about it. The

expenditure to run this Centre is double of the income. He requested that it could be reconsidered once again. The Vice Chancellor can talk to Shri Dua Ji on the issue. He further said that this money belongs to their country and it cannot be dumped just by purchasing computers. He said that he has already told them that there was an EMRC project which could not be run. He requested the Vice Chancellor visit the department and see himself. He suggested that they can authorise him, if his suggestion does not find favour with him, he may not do it. He requested that they should defer this issue and find an alternative. He further informed that some expenditures were also got reduced by Professor Navdeep Goyal, but still the expenditure is double the income.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the Vice Chancellor remembers, a discussion took place on 15 lakh also in the meeting of the Board of Finance that some positions like Clerk, Helper should be reduced.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh added that in spite of that the expenditure is more and suggested to withhold this project at the moment. Some people told him that there should be a good Centre where many could sit together and discuss the issues. For example, if he has to give some briefing to all the heads of the departments, in the Vice Chancellor's Committee Room is not sufficient for that. In such a situation, the meetings could be held in that Centre. Further, the media colleagues could also sit there. With an amount of Rs. 40 lakhs they can have a good set up. He (Vice Chancellor) can consult this matter with Shri Dua ji and with his consent take the matter forward to which the Vice Chancellor said that the Dua ji has since retired.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said if Dua ji not available, he can have a meeting to relook the issue and to know how this gap has to be filled. He informed that in the case of self-financing course, the same thing has happened and after that it used to become burden on the University.

Professor Mukesh Arora, Professor S.K. Sharma, Dr. Ajay Ranga supported the view point of Dr. Gurmeet Singh and urged the Vice Chancellor to accede to his request.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that a Committee should be constituted to examine the issue with Dr. Gurmeet Singh one of its member.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they wanted to get it implemented, he be authorised to constitute a Committee.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested the name of Dr. Gurmeet Singh for this Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, no issue at all.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal whether Item No. 6 of Board of Finance has been withdrawn or not, the Vice Chancellor said that this item was not recommended. The Vice Chancellor informed that with regard to Item No.6, it was resolved that a clarification from the Punjab Government be sought and fresh proposal should be placed in the next meeting.

Referring to Item No.7, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the proposal which has come in respect of Shri J.S. Rathore should be accepted. He further said that that his suspension was revoked and after that he put a request that for grant of pension benefit. He stated, had he not been suspended, he would have got the pension benefit. The reason, due to which this may not have been accepted, may be that most of the people now have started demanding the benefit of pension, but Shri Rathore had demanded it well on time.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had not demanded the pension in time and the MHRD has asked to consult the University Grants Commission before taking a decision and the University Grants Commission representative did not allow it.

On a request by Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Ajay Ranga, the Vice Chancellor said that they have the right to ask for referring the item back. So, it is okay with him and he will take it back to the Syndicate. The Vice Chancellor said he has received one more letter from Shri J.S. Rathore and he will use that letter to put back the case so that there is some more pressure on the Board of Finance, otherwise the B.O.F. would say why they have brought this case back.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they will explain to them that he has exercised his option within one year after the revocation of his suspension.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will take it back as he is not against taking it back to the Syndicate. He is bound by these people who contribute less 50% to the University's total income, but they exercise a veto. He said veto should be with the University, but it is other way round.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Ashok Goyal ji would prepare a note for this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying so to accept the proposal because the University Grants Commission has not given its view on this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the discussion on this item was going on, all the government nominees were opposing it.

Dr. Ajay said that both Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal would make a note on this issue.

Referring to Item No. 9, Professor Ronki Ram said that there is a request to provide various allowances like tiffin, uniform, washing and bonus to M/s Punjab Ex-servicemen Corporation (PESCO) to which they have entered into a contract for providing security. It has been mentioned that the Punjab Government is also providing these allowances to them. However, Professor Ronki Ram said that they do not provide any uniform, shoes etc. to their own University Security Officers. They perform their duties excellently even in the odd situations in spite of the fact that they are short of manpower. Now the University has two campuses and they have to perform duty in both the campuses. They work for twelve hours a day and there is very less provision for leave. They do not give them leave for performing duties on Saturdays, though they have now started to pay them overtime to them for Saturdays. So they are doing a very good service for the University. Is it necessary that if some government has outsourced these service, then they should also do the same. He questioned why they should follow them. If they can run their security well, it is good and they should repose faith in them. They would work well if they are under their own Security Officer. The outsourced person would have their loyalty to the Contractor and not to the University. If something is not going well, they will have to go to Contractor for its remedy. He further said that they hold parade ceremony on 15th August and 26th January and they see how confidently they come and perform their duty. He also stated that the security guards should be put under 'B' Category instead of 'C' category.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter is before them and if they want to bring it as an agenda item, he can.

Professor S.K. Sharma while agreeing to the version of Professor Ronki Ram said that it will create a problem for their own security people as they will say that if they are paying these facilities to the outside agency, then why it is not given to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that now this thing is over. That was a part of the contract and that has to be paid.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked that even if the contract is over, the decision is to be taken by the competent authority, may be in this Senate, as the remaining amount of 8 lakhs in this case is to be given.

The Vice Chancellor said that the contract is over and they have to pay the money. Now their difficulty is that they cannot increase the non-teaching employees. These are the things which have to be negotiated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter should have been brought to the Syndicate and get it passed.

Professor Shelley Walia said if the Vice Chancellor cannot fill up the posts, then pass the resolution that he has given to him.

Shri V.K. Sibal said he just wanted to know that when they entered into this contract, there was a condition that he must get it clarified from Punjab Government if these allowances are to be given. Now he has met the Finance Department and they have not responded to it. He asked, why does he not go to the Defence Services Department, they have all the information.

The Vice Chancellor said that Punjab Government is paying all this.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested the Vice Chancellor that he would like to speak on **Sub-item No.8** of the Minutes of the Board of Finance meeting. Dr. Ranga read out the resolve part of Item No. 8, where it has been stated that “the matter be sent to the University Grants Commission for examination/clarification”. Regarding this issue, as adopted by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology, Jalandhar, every NIT is offering this course work at their own level. Even when this kind of course work was not there in University Grants Commission, the University Business School was offering it and till date it is of one year. There is no need of any certificate that someone has done the course work, but even then this institute is giving the certificate to the effect that he/she has done Ph.D. with the course work. However, the matter was referred to the University Grants Commission for clarification. Why it is, he asked.

The Vice Chancellor said that he vehemently argued that this should not be done. They have received, in writing that MHRD has stated that the matter should be referred to University Grants Commission for examination and clarification. The Vice Chancellor said that there is a veto power that MHRD exercises. Once they write this and if he rejects it, then it will be said that Rs. 208 Crore grant will not given.

Dr. Ajay Ranga further said that they should send it to MHRD or wherever he wants to send, but send it with Senate approval that the Senate has shown its concern and they want to do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they cannot pass strictures against the University Grants Commission.

Professor Chaman Lal said that these are not strictures.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can express the concerns of the Senate, but such matters should not be sent to the University Grants Commission. Senate should be considered competent to take a call on these matters.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this is not the only case. There are about 250 cases where there is problem of Ph.D. increment. They have done Ph.D. from Panjab University, they studied in Panjab University, Panjab University has validated their degrees, they are serving in the Panjab University and even then the Panjab University does not give them increment. Is their degree invalid? The University Grants Commission has provided in their own regulations that in-service teachers at least three compound increments be given, but they are not giving. A letter was received during the tenure of Professor Shashi Sharma when he was then Dean Research that those who were registered for Ph.D. before 11th July, 2009, they are not required to Ph.D. Course work, but they have to fulfil some conditions which were given there. Out of those 9-10 conditions, they were required to fulfil only 7 conditions. In spite of that it is not being done. He said, to his mind, it seems the matter has not been pleaded properly which should have been. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor if he is ready to take the responsibility, Dr. Ranga said that he is ready to take the responsibility. He suggested for constituting a Committee and they will make the recommendations accordingly. He said that this matter should be sent with the concern of the Senate. They should approve that increment/s be given to all such people. It should then be sent to the concerned authority.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that efforts should be made to consider all such cases along with this case.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should bring all such cases to be taken to the University Grants Commission. The Vice Chancellor asked them to give him a draft letter and he will sign it. If necessary, they should accompany him.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested the Vice Chancellor that a mail should be sent either from the Vice Chancellor office or from the Registrar's Office to the faculty asking them to send all such cases.

Dr. Parveen Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to send the circular tomorrow only without waiting for the minutes of the meeting, which would take quite a long time to which the Vice Chancellor said that it will be done tomorrow.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are considering now the recommendations of the Board of Finance which has come to them through Syndicate. The Board of Finance has nowhere said that they are not entitled for advance increments. But he said, let it not be said that they have rejected. He said, it should be put in this way that, while accepting the recommendations, the Senate is of the considered opinion that they are entitled, as pleaded by the Vice Chancellor in the B.O.F. also, that different institutions have their own processes for admitting the students. But B.O.F. said that they should seek clarifications from the University Grants Commission. Now, if they say that clarification on the recommendation of B.O.F., it is different, rather than they should say it is the recommendation of the Senate that they are entitled, so they should accord their approval.

The Vice Chancellor said that NITs are created by Central Act. The Ph.D. degree given by the institution which is created by the Central Government Act., how they can say to have clarification from the U.G.C. It is a very strange thing. Why the MHRD says to

take clarification, it is not understandable. The U.G.C. representative who was there, they asked him to clarify, but he kept mum.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the representatives who come from the UGC or the U.T., he does not say that they are not competent, but they may not have knowledge on some specific subject, due which they face (P.U.) problems.

The Vice Chancellor said that just to save themselves from the R.T.I. activists, they play safe.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they evolve such a way where they neither say yes or no. Then it is like, just to throw it in the dustbin.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he wants to say few words on the issues they are getting into a trap, where it looks that Senate has no authority and everything is referred to U.G.C. and MHRD. He suggested that the University should refer the matters to the very senior legal people. They should read the Act of Parliament of U.G.C. and they should also read the powers of Senate and Syndicate and University Bodies. They should draw a line as to where the University authority ends and where the U.G.C. authority begins. To his understanding, the U.G.C. has absolutely no authority to interfere in any matter of the University. All the Universities have surrendered their autonomy to U.G.C.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not the U.G.C. which is coming in into picture, it is the dictates of MHRD. The U.G.C. does not want to receive anything. They say that they (Panjab University) are burden on them. Why they send everything to them. They say that the University has decreased the age from 33 years to 25 years for pension benefits. The regulations which have to be approved by the MHRD, it has sent all those to a desk of U.G.C. These are the matters which he has to take up with the new Chancellor.

Professor Chaman Lal said that MHRD is sheer root of the problem and it wants to control all the universities.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are problems which he wants to take up with the new Chancellor because he was a part of the government.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he has a concern in this regard. The R.A.O. who works under the Finance Secretary, U.T. and takes care of the audit of U.T. Colleges. There the approval is accorded, but here the R.A.O. who also works under the same Finance Secretary, he does not accord approval. Two persons are working under him, one person allows the things and the other does not. Why it is so?

The Vice Chancellor said he can do nothing in this matter and suggested that they should do introspection for this. The Vice Chancellor informed that a new Finance Secretary has come and he has sought a meeting with him. On a point raised by some members to invite the Finance Secretary to the University, the Vice Chancellor said that the Finance Secretary is not likely to come. If he goes himself to him, there are chances to take the issues ahead. If he kept on waiting, then he will retire.

Professor Shelly Walia said why he does not convey all these things to the Chancellor and seek permission with regard to making appointments.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever time has left with him, he will do everything to see that every problem which has come to his knowledge during his tenure is solved and he would not like to pass it to his successor.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she endorses the concerns shown by Dr. Ajay Ranga. There are number of teachers who are facing this problem and there are minor case to case variations which have to be handled very minutely. There is lot of frustration among these teachers due to this increment problem.

The Vice Chancellor suggested them to have a meeting of few of them and enumerate all such cases and present it to him. He will take it up. He said that he had been asked to meet the Secretary of the Chancellor first. The Secretary is a very nice person and he spent one hour with him on that day and he will take it up these issues with them. For this he has to first convince the Secretary and then the Chancellor.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that at the PUTA level, they have also taken it up. They formed a Committee and working on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is more than willing to sort out these cases.

Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that for these cases, he need not to go anywhere and do it himself to which the Vice Chancellor said that the R.A.O. does not allow to do it. Professor Bambah said that then he should take it up with the R.A.O's Officers to which the Vice Chancellor said that he has sought a meeting with the Finance Secretary. Professor Bambah further said that he should inform the Finance Secretary that the R.A.O. is a obstructive person and he will transfer him.

Professor Mukesh Arora stated that the Finance Secretary is the student of this University.

Professor S.K. Sharma said tomorrow there could a particular option for start up and there should be some system for the start up, but there are rules and they should look into it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have already one incubator working in the University and they have rules of the incubator as given by the funding agency which has enabled them to start the incubator.

Referring to **Sub-Item 15**, Shri Raghbir Dyal said the amount which they are claiming in 2017 for the Guest Faculty, the teachers may have to be continued because in the next year the examinations will be held under semester system, which will go upto May, 2018. He asked why the salary amount for this period has not been claimed.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, the F.D.O. clarified that the financial year will end in March, 2018 and they have to go by the financial year.

Shri Raghbir Dyal further said that till April they have taken Rs. 1.75 lakhs. He said now they are clamming Rs. 4.00 lakhs for nine months. He asked whether they are having work load of 16 teachers.

The F.D.O. clarified that the workload has been given by the Principals of Constituent Colleges on actual basis. Therefore, only the Principals could tell about the workload.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the estimate has been made for 16 teachers at the rate of Rs. 25000/- per teacher which seems to be on the higher side. He is not sure whether

in Dharamkot and Ferozpur College there could be workload of 16 teachers. He requested to check it.

The F.D.O. further said that it is based upon the input given by the concerned acting Principal of the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know where from they are meeting the expenditure being incurred on these two colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment they are meeting it from the grant they are receiving from the Punjab Government out of grant of Rs. 6 crores which they receive every year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Rs. 6 crore grants they are already receiving is for the four constituent colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that 6 crores are coming every year and they have a little bit of extra remaining and they have accumulated money in that account. They have taken up with them that separate grant be given for that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, if his memory is not weak, there was an MoU to which the Vice Chancellor said that the MoU could not be done. Shri Ashok Goyal further asked if the MoU could not be done, then why the Vice Chancellor has given a statement that if there is no MoU, they will not be able to run the colleges. At that time the apprehension was, once the Colleges are handed over to them, they are not going to own the liability of expenditure and it was not in the Syndicate and in the Senate, more than once it was decided that unless and until they release the money for these two colleges, the University will not be able to run the colleges. Now, he has been given to understand, he thought, may be out of that 27 crores, 3 crores have been earmarked for these two colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said, no, it is not like that. They have to give separate money. He had gone with the Dean College Development Council and had meetings. They are supposed to release the extra money. They have to give them money over and above 6 crores. They had a last meeting with the Punjab Government representative including Shri Manpreet Badal. It was told to the Finance Secretary and he had agreed to it. He told point blank to the Finance Secretary that these two colleges will run only if they would give extra money to which he said that he will consider it. The other day, he also talked to the Education Secretary on phone and reminded him. He asked the Dean College Development Council to enquire the present position two days ago.

As desired by the Vice Chancellor, the Dean College Development Officer stated that the latest position is that it was informed by the Vice Chancellor to the Additional Chief Secretary that nothing has been released for our two new constituent colleges. He was updated that the 11 new constituent colleges which were opened in 2016, not a single penny was released by the Government; however, this item is listed for the Cabinet Meeting to be held on 20 September, 2017. They got this communication only day before yesterday.

Professor R.P. Bambah said if they remember, it was decided that they should ask them that it was an undertaking that they will give grant to these Constituent Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that last year he had asked them for an MoU. They said that there have two other Universities and they have to sign MoUs with them as well. They stated how they can enter into any MoU with them. They said that they (Panjab

University) will get the money and asked them not to insist on MoU. The Vice Chancellor said that if the Senate decision is that without MoU they will close it, it is okay. They further said that if they have said that they have listed it for the Cabinet meeting, they should wait. At one level they want to cooperate with the Punjab Government. They are dependent on the Punjab Government, their lifeline is somehow with the Punjab Government. Politicians have their own limitations to work. They cannot work as per the time-table that they prescribe. So, they have to allow and they cannot take a hard-line. There are grey areas. They have to see whether the Cabinet takes a decision in their favour. If it does not take a decision in their favour, then they can consider the issue. They must give them the opportunity. Now the matter is in the agenda of the Cabinet meeting. On a point as to what is the agenda, the Vice Chancellor said that the agenda is that additional grant should given to all the 11 colleges that have been opened. Out of those only two have been given to them.

Principal I.S. Sandhu stated that all the colleges have been opened by the Punjab Government and the Punjab Government has to give the grant for all of them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has explained to them his situation. If they want to pass a resolution to close the colleges, it okay, but he is not recommending that.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the Syndicate and Senate meeting he and his colleagues have said that the burden is going to be on the University and requested that they should take care of it.

The Vice Chancellor said if he had not been taking care of this, then why he has been holding so many meeting with the Punjab Government to which Principal Sandhu said that they appreciate it. He has spent many days to hold meeting to do these things. They have to work with the political leaders of India. They have to understand their compulsions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Vice Chancellor is getting annoyed as if this is his responsibility only to which the Vice Chancellor said that they are putting the responsibility only on him. However, Shri Ashok Goyal denied it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are putting the responsibility on him when they say that it was decided by the Senate and the Vice Chancellor who is presiding over the Senate in the absence of the Chancellor of this University, is responsible for not implementing the decision of the Senate. Hence, it is contempt on him for not implementing this decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nobody has said it and he does not know as to why the Vice Chancellor is assuming all these allegation on him. He is saying that it is the responsibility of the Senate and the item has come for the consideration of the Senate whereas he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that they are putting everything on him. He requested the Vice Chancellor not to misinterpret the things, the way he is doing. Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is simply saying that it was discussed in the Senate and it was he (Vice Chancellor) who was saying that on one side they do not have money to pay salary to their staff, and that they cannot afford to have additional liability given by the Punjab Government. He said that he can show him the videography of that. Now if he is says the same thing, then Vice Chancellor says 'No'. The Vice Chancellor is saying that they have to work with the political leaders of India, meaning thereby that if the Vice Chancellor says the same thing, it is good and if he (Ashok Goyal) is says the same thing, then he is committing a contempt against him. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is simply saying that it was he (Vice Chancellor), which he still remembers that in the

Syndicate and in the presence of the representatives of Punjab Government, that unless and until an MoU is signed, they are not going to take over the liability. Now, what is happening. The item has come as part of the recommendation of the Board of Finance. This apprehension had also been expressed that tomorrow it may not become the regular part of the budget of Panjab University and slowly it is going to happen. It was also said that at least Rs.1.5 crores per College, as is being given for the other 4 Colleges, was the demand and the then DPI, Punjab in the Syndicate said that he did not commit the amount but they are giving it to the Panjab University. If he says that they must take into consideration that tomorrow it might not become an ongoing liability of Panjab University, is he speaking against the Vice-Chancellor of the University. He is simply saying that let them work together and pressurise the Punjab Government. The Vice-Chancellor is very right when he says that let them wait for 27th September. The Vice-Chancellor should not think that they are putting every allegation on him. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that he is again repeating that if he (Vice-Chancellor) takes it like that, he undertakes that he would not utter even a single word during the rest of the meeting.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when this House has passed that the API score should be extended further. After that there was a case that there is a misappropriation of funds. That case goes to the Chairman of the Committee in the office of the Chancellor. At that time, they had a difficulty. The question is that whenever the Senate passes a resolution, it should be passed in a way that the University should not suffer on one or the other count. Otherwise it could be said to be a case of misappropriation of funds as if it is embezzlement and they face the difficulty. All the cases in which the promotion was given, their cases were reverted back and there was a directive by the UGC that if the University wanted those candidates selection back, it would stop the salary to the Panjab University.

While clarifying the Vice-Chancellor said that he has put a claim of Rs.11 crores to the Punjab Government, Rs. 8 crores (Rs.2 crores each for the existing 4 Constituent Colleges) and Rs.3 crores (Rs.1.5 crores for each of the new Constituent Colleges). At the moment, the Punjab Government has not replied. The case is still in the Court and on the next date of hearing whatever the Punjab Government representative says, but he (Vice-Chancellor) would reiterate that the demand from the Punjab Government is Rs.11 crores and 12.5% on Rs.20 crores since the year 2013-14. Let that be accumulated and everything should be updated and particularly now when the Central Government has given a directive that the Panjab University and the Punjab Government would collectively meet the previous deficit as well. They are engaged in a dialogue and it is a kind of negotiation with their own elected Government. As the members of the Senate are elected so is the Punjab Government elected and there is also continuity in the Government. When a Government has opened certain Colleges, the other Government has not ordered the closure and have to be continued and all the liabilities have to be taken. So, it is an ongoing dialogue. He is just precipitating a crisis which would not help the cause of the University because so long as they are named as Panjab University, nobody could change this name. They have to work with the Punjab Government and stay in Chandigarh which is a capital city of both Punjab and Haryana. They have also to work wherever possible with the Government of Haryana as well as the 30% of the Ph.D. students are from Haryana. He is also trying to argue with the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh as 20% of the Ph.D. students are from Himachal Pradesh. Prima facie when it comes to the infrastructure needs of the University, since they are also serving the interests of Himachal Pradesh, it should also contribute towards infrastructural needs of the University.

When Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether the amount of Rs.27 crores includes Rs.6 crores for the Constituent Colleges, the Vice-Chancellor replied that it does not include.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that the charge of the Constituent College be given to some Principal as only temporary teachers are working in the Constituent Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the charge has already been given.

On a query by Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal whether the grant is Rs.33 crores or Rs.27 crores, the Vice-Chancellor clarified that it is Rs.33 crores. This is according to the budget speech.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that might be such a thing must have been mentioned in some letter, but it is not mentioned in the budget speech where it is mentioned that the grant of Rs.26 crores of Panjab University is being enhanced to Rs.33 crores.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in relation with this item, the representative of the Punjab Government came to the meeting of the Syndicate in the year 2016 and he had said that he has come specially to get this item approved. The Punjab Government had not even submitted the application form for opening these two Colleges. He (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) had clearly said at that time that they should not condone the delay of 8-9 months as they are not condoning the delay for other Colleges also and had also pointed out that no faculty has been appointed for these two Colleges. Everything in this connection is recorded. Even the Vice-Chancellor was told that if the faculty is not appointed, the whole burden would pass on to the University. After all these things, once the DPI was denied the permission. But thereafter under some pressure, a Committee was formed. The Committee comprising of Syndicate and Senate members was asked to approach the Punjab Government and get MoU signed for the grant. But no information has been given about the outcome of the Committee whether the MoU has been signed or not. The Committee members were sent there to grant the affiliation in spite of the fact that the session had already started and the faculty had not been appointed. Since a period of 1¼ years has passed and no faculty has been appointed till date, why they have granted the affiliation whereas in the case of private Colleges, they do not allow the courses to run under such circumstances. Is any Principal having the charge of two Colleges? If they do not have the Principal in these Colleges, then they have no choice. They already knew it that the faculty and the Principals are not to be appointed, even then they have allowed the opening of these two Colleges and now they would have to approach the Government for grants. If they would have taken the steps for release of grant, signing of MoU and other things, then they would not have faced such problems. Even after the passage of 1¼ years, no faculty has been appointed in these Colleges. When the Government had promised that the faculty would be appointed and the grant would be given, why these things have not been done. They have allowed the opening of these Colleges under political pressure due to which they are suffering now.

While referring to **sub-item 16** of the Board of Finance regarding ex-gratia posts which has not come in the agenda of the Senate, Shri Deepak Kaushik said that this item was in the agenda of the Syndicate and the Syndicate has formed a Sub-Committee. A note is also there. He requested that the previous practice be continued till the Committee gives its recommendations.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that at the moment nothing has been done in the matter.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that still they have to discuss sub-item 20 of C-2.

On suggestion by Shri Raghbir Dyal, the Vice-Chancellor said that let them go for lunch and thereafter discuss the item.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that the Government takes so many decisions which sometimes are not known to anybody. He requested that the room earlier allotted to the media in the office should be allowed to continue which would bring transparency.

When the meeting resumed after lunch, the Vice-Chancellor said that they would have then zero hour and discussion on Central University status and would close at 6.00 p.m. to meet again on October 8, 2017.

It was pointed out by some members that since Karva Chauth is falling on this day and it also being the autumn break, the meeting could be held on any other day. Finally, it was unanimously agreed that the meeting be held on September 24, 2017 at 10.00 a.m.

When the Vice-Chancellor announced Item C-3 to be taken up, Professor Rajesh Gill said that they were at C-2 (sub-item 20).

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that hundreds of people are affected with this item.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is something fishy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is nothing fishy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then why the Vice-Chancellor said that there is nothing to discuss in it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is nothing to discuss.

Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Ashok Goyal said that how could the Vice-Chancellor say so.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice-Chancellor to behave in a decent manner.

While referring to **sub-item 20**, the Vice-Chancellor said that this item pertains to someone who has a continuing service in this University. At some stage, she (Dr. Namita Gupta) was made regular. When she is made regular, then the meeting to make it regular happens before her irregular term comes to an end. But the letter of appointment is handed over to her after a period of 8-10 days. There is some gap. But as far as the UGC is concerned, there is a continuity in service. Such continuity in service, to his knowledge and personal experience, is counted as a continuing service in almost all other universities in the country. If this is the first case in this University, then this case should be approved and all other cases, if they are pending, also should be approved. This is what was stated in the Board of Finance and none of the Government representatives whether from the U.T. Administration or from Punjab Government or the UGC or anybody else had any problem in it. So, it is in that background, this item is here. All that one could have issue is that if there are similar issues in the University, all those also must be given this benefit.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he knows some such cases of the persons who have retired.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not do for posterity. All those persons who are in service, they could be given the benefit.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the benefit could be given in this case. He pointed out that in his case, there was not gap of even a single day and the experience was as a regular. He requested that he should also be given the benefit. His case has been rejected so many times.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is willing to give the benefit of regular service to people. Now everybody is talking about Government service. Most of the teachers in India are employed by non-Government Colleges. A large fraction of them might not be on the Government aided posts. But if a teacher has served in any College of India, where the selection has been done via a duly valid process of the UGC and a given College has accepted that individual as a teacher, then the benefit of continuous service should be given. He personally has no issue in it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested that they are regularly facing the problem of private and Government Colleges. The teachers do not get full salaries in the private Colleges and they know under what kind of conditions, people work in private Colleges. He suggested that the teachers whether they come from the private or Government Colleges or from other universities, all those should be given the benefit of past service.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, he could not give any assurance which is violative of UGC regulations. In this case, the UGC permits this as the representatives of the UGC and MHRD were present in the meeting. He requested to bring all such cases and he is ready to review and take to the Board of Finance and let him see the reaction of the UGC representative. He suggested that let the PUTA bring all such cases should be brought and could be approved.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is very sad that on a particular item, when they wanted to say something, one is not allowed and the Chair says nothing to discuss. Then why are they sitting here. She came to the Senate as representative of Professors from Arts Faculty. Today, she has also to play the role of President, PUTA as representative of teachers irrespective of the fact whether they are Professors or Associate Professors or Assistant Professors because for the first time, the unanimous decision resolution adopted by PUTA that the Secretary should be nominated and the name be sent to the Chancellor's office, was not sent and it is said that a vacant seat is lying there, PUTA representative is not there. The Vice-Chancellor did not have the courtesy to greet, to congratulate the PUTA, not her, but any member. This is the plight of PUTA. Then she came to the issue as President, PUTA. People are coming to her and asking that there are hundreds of teachers who are similarly placed, there might be some variations. There are some people in whose there is no break as Dr. Ajay Ranga has said. Another case is of Mr. Anil Thakur from the Department of Laws. There are so many people approaching her as to why there is pick and choose. Dr. Namita is dear to her but everybody is equally dear to her. All teachers in the University are equally dear to her. They could not do pick and choose. It is just eyewash. Her case of directly recruited Professor also came up two years ago. At that time, it was said that all the cases would be considered together. The decision in only case has been taken while all the others have been left out including herself being in the Senate. Till date, that has not been considered. Sometimes, it is said that it is to be decided by the MHRD and sometimes by the UGC and sometimes that the RAO is not approving. In this case also, a Committee was formed of which she was a member in the year 2014. The minutes were prepared and the office note was prepared where it was said that it could not be done as there is a break in service. The item is put up in the promotion cases whereas it is preponement of promotion. She (Dr. Namita Gupta) was appointed on temporary basis in the year 2007 and comes through walk-in-interview in 2007-08. For three years, walk-in-interviews are held and she is appointed.

According to the UGC regulations, one year completion of service is necessary. They are talking of violation, it is an utter violation as there are breaks in service. The item is put in such a manner that there is no talk of the breaks during the three years, i.e., 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 whereas the break of 19 days in the year 2010 is mentioned. Why the complete information has not been given? This is concealment of facts not only to Syndicate, Senate but to the Board of Finance also. She has also studied all the minutes of the Board of Finance where an assurance is given that the UGC rules are not being violated. The members of the Board of Finance depend on the Vice-Chancellor. What is their credibility? This particular case is picked up. How it is picked up, how it moves to the Syndicate, nobody knows. What about the earlier Committee, whether it has been dumped, nobody knows it. Where are the minutes of that Committee, nobody knows it. When this case is taken up, the proceedings (Syndicate dated 28.5.2017) say that "Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a case of Dr. Namita who has been recommended for promotion from 14.8.2011. She joined on regular basis in the University on 20.7.2010 and before that her service was temporary and there was a break of 2-3 days". This is a misrepresentation of facts. What is meant by 2 or day days? There was a longer break in three years. Further, the proceedings say "the Vice-Chancellor said that, that has already been taken care of, consistent with the UGC guidelines". The UGC regulations are attached according to which there should be no break, proper selection procedure should be there, walk-in-interview would not do. Therefore, the case should be examined in the light of this regulation. Further the proceedings say "Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if that is so, in fact, in the past they have one case of Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur of IETVE. In her case, there was continuous service and there was a break of only one day and in that case the Vice-Chancellor was authorised to examine the case and issue the appointment letter, if the case is found okay. If as per UGC regulations, the present case is okay, then that case is surely okay. They could approve that the appointment letters of these two cases be issued together. The Vice-Chancellor said, okay". Without bring the case to the Syndicate, Board of Finance and the Senate, he requested not to be so unfair and unjust to the other teachers as they are also human beings and have been appointed on merit. Everything should be done on merit and whatever is to be done, should be done following the UGC regulations. The present case should not be approved until the details of all such cases from all over the University are taken. All such cases should be put up together and simultaneously.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that there are some similar cases in his College also. The reply of the DPI and the Administration is that in the cases where there is a break of even 1-2 days, the past service would not be counted and the UGC regulations are misinterpreted. He requested that the UGC regulations along with the interpretation being adopted by the University should also be sent to the DPI and the Administration so that the teachers of the Colleges could also get benefited.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in this case, legal opinion was taken twice. A Committee was constituted and the matter was referred to the UGC which directed that the regulations be followed. The regulation 10.1(f)(3) says that the incumbent was selected, it does not say appointment, to the permanent post, ad hoc or temporary service without any break. This candidate, Dr. Namita was appointed on 2nd June and 29th June she was permanently regularised and her term was over on 1st July. So, saying that there is a break after she was appointed, is totally wrong. She was appointed when she was already in service. In the second case of Dr. Kanwalpreet, the nomenclature of the post itself says temporary but likely to be permanent. So, what inference they could draw out of it, whether it is a permanent post or a temporary post. But, later on such a nomenclature was also challenged before the Court and it was again taken up that such kind of advertisement should not be made in future and it should be treated as permanent post. So, saying that a post which was advertised with the nomenclature of temporary but likely to be permanent, be considered as permanent. So,

in these two cases, it is covered. If any other such or similar cases are pending, the same should also be looked upon. The present case be approved and all other cases be also called for and be examined and wherever the benefit accrues, the same be granted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in this case what had happened is that she was appointed. What Professor Rajesh Gill is saying is right that there was a break in service during three years. She was given the salary for the vacation period because the break was only during the vacation period. Obviously, if the same person is being selected time and again, then they could consider that break as notional break only and that is why the service must be counted. That was the whole thing. If they look at the UGC rules, the same do not say that this is not to be counted and certain guidelines have been given as to what should be the selection Committee. He believed that whether it is a walk-in-interview or anything else, the Selection Committee is duly constituted. The total length of service should be more than one year. When she was appointed as regular, that service was also there. At the appointment in this case, when she was selected, there was no break in service. That is why this case was cleared by the Syndicate and the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting was attended by the Dr. P.K. Thakur, Director (Finance), UGC who is now also the Secretary of the UGC. So, the meeting is attended by today's Secretary of the UGC and on that particular day, he was the Director (Finance), UGC. It was okay with him. All that one could say is that all such cases should be treated on par. Anybody who has that thing, such cases could be brought.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice-Chancellor not to mention the name of Dr. Thakur because all the papers were also not annexed with the item. Nothing was read about those three years when she (Dr. Namita Gupta) was working. Still no papers have been attached.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Finance and Development Officer verified that her case was referred to UGC for clarification and in response to which the UGC vide letter dated 1st February 2017 informed that the UGC regulation on this issue is clear and self explanatory and accordingly the case may be examined by the UGC. Therefore, the University has to take a decision on this.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired whether it was examined in the light of the UGC regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that yes, it was examined.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in the Government Colleges of Chandigarh Administration, the ad hoc past service has been counted. Therefore, the ad hoc or temporary service experience of any teacher needs to be counted. It is clearly mentioned in the UGC Regulations 2010 that the past service benefit should be given irrespective of wherever the service is rendered. It is right that very less teachers are getting this benefit and are suffering due to it. Three years technical break is allowed but the Chandigarh Administration is adopting the policy of pick and choose.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu to bring such cases to his notice and he would take up the matter with the current DHE, U.T.

Some of the members said that this benefit should be given to all such cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why they should delay this case as it is already passed.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if they approve this case, it would send a wrong signal to all the teachers.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it would not send a wrong signal because even if there is a break of a day or ten, at least the person is having the experience.

Professor Ronki Ram said that whenever a benefit is to be given to the teachers within the UGC rules and regulations, they have to see whether the required qualifications are fulfilled. If everything is complete and there is no doubt on that and if a teacher is getting his/her due right, then they should support it. Secondly, in this case as rightly pointed out by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa on a legal point, if in such a way, she is getting the benefit, all such other persons could also take the due benefit treating this case as a precedent.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all such cases must also be positively processed.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that a Committee should be constituted on other similar cases which they already turned down.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would constitute a Committee and there is no issue at all.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that all such cases should be processed and not only this one.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether there is a scheme of one free with another case as there is a mention of a case in the proceedings of Syndicate dated 28th May 2017 where "Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if that is so, in fact, in the past they have one case of Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur of IETVE". Whether any reply from the UGC has come in this case? Without waiting for the reply, it is being said that since the case of Dr. Namita Gupta is being approved, her (Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur) case should also be approved. He requested that instead of approving one case with another, they should approve hundred cases.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the nomenclature of that post is different.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to examine the cases.

Professor Keshav Malhotra thanked the Vice-Chancellor for getting cleared the case of Dr. Namita Gupta. He requested that all other such cases should also be collected and put together be again brought along with this case. He said that whether the reply to the clarification sought from the UGC has been received or not. If the reply has not been received, how the appointment letter in the other case has been given.

Professor Chaman Lal said that if one wanted to express his/her viewpoints, he/she should also listen to the views of others also. Once the Chair has allowed someone to speak and others do not stop speaking, it meant that they did not respect the fellow Senators. He requested the members to let the Chairperson regulate the meeting. In this case, the only thing which he has heard is different. It seems that there is some difference in perception by the Senators about the facts of the case. As far as break is concerned, according to him, this kind of break should always be allowed and the teachers should not be denied the benefit whatever is due to them. But, at the same time, the regulations also must be followed. There is one thing where there is a difference. Whether the walk-in-interview falls in the perception of the UGC as a properly constituted Selection Committee as generally walk-in-interview is not considered?

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that in Panjab University, the walk-in-interviews are held by the same procedure as regular interviews and he has presided over so many such interviews.

Continuing, Professor Chaman Lal said that why people get so agitated. It seems that if a person has an area of influence, which many other people do not have, they suffer and one privileged person gets because of influence.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no case of this kind has been presented to him.

Continuing, Professor Chaman Lal said that he is not talking about frivolous but real things. It should give an impression that it is completely impartial and gives the right to all the deserving people and for that it is necessary that when they approve this, if all agree, they could move further resolution that all other cases which are genuine and follow the UGC regulations, should be given this benefit without any other formality and there should be a Committee including President, PUTA and senior most Professors must be part of the Committee to examine all such cases. The Committee should observe all cases and whichever cases are clear, those should not be taken to the Board of Finance. If one case is taken, then all other cases should be equally taken and that should be passed through the Syndicate and the Senate as per procedure. If they do it in impartial manner, then there should be no problem.

Dr. Parveen Goyal enquired whether there is same Selection Committee for interviewing the candidates for private Colleges and for the University service and they are counting past service. Is the level of the Selection Committees the same?

Professor Mukesh Arora and other members belonging to the Colleges objected to it vehemently and requested Dr. Parveen Goyal to withdraw this statement, Dr. Parveen Goyal regretted and withdrew his statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Colleges do not have the authority to make the appointment on their own. When a College wants to appoint a teacher, the Vice-Chancellor's nominee and the subject expert are put on the Selection Committee by the University.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that when Professor Yog Raj, Professor Dinesh Gupta, Professor Karamjeet Singh and other teachers from the Colleges were appointed in the University, why no such objection was raised at that time.

Due to commotion, the Vice-Chancellor adjourned the meeting for five minutes.

When the meeting resumed, the Vice-Chancellor said how the teachers' career profile has evolved in the Indian system. He has been a little bit more in the Indian academics. He has served on national institution as also this University as a Professor. He has been involved in evolving the career profile for the academics in India in different places and in different roles. Even, this year, the preamble for the 7th Pay Commission was also obtained from him by the MHRD. A comprehension of what a College teacher is and what a University teacher is and how this difference has been bridged and brought to zero by none other than the two iconic alumni of this University, namely Professor Yash Pal when he was the Chairman of the UGC and when the recommendations of the 4th Pay Commission for the teachers came and later on Professor G.K. Chadha when the recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission came for the entire academics. Till then, there used to be a difference between the College and University teachers. As the UGC came up, the College teachers had a different scale and the University teachers had a different scale. This is a legacy that they had in pre-independent India. Even if they look at the Panjab University Calendar of the year 1946, there is a difference. Professor Kothari was the first one who brought in this thing and said that the qualifications for getting appointed in the Universities and the Colleges would be the same and there would be the same salary grade. At that time, there was no career profile and no flexible complementing scheme either for the Universities or for the Colleges. Such complementing schemes were also not there in the IITs. It is only when Dr. Homi Bhabha started to assemble India's atomic energy programme and for the scientists he brought in

the flexible complementing scheme which today is called career advancement scheme. He wanted it for the scientific officers attached to the atomic energy programme and concurrently he wanted to introduce it in the academic institutions attached to the Department of Atomic Energy. Professor Yash Pal was the beneficiary of that flexible complementing scheme but long before Professor Yash Pal became the Chairman of the UGC, even in the scheme of the 3rd Pay Commission, the notion of promotion on the basis of experience was introduced both for the College and University teachers. Since, typically in the Colleges, the teachers joined after a postgraduate degree, so lesser number of teachers were there with the Ph.D. So, a distinction was made when one could move from the position of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer or from a Lecturer to Reader. It was 16 years for a postgraduate and it was 13 years for a person with Ph.D. This was the situation but the nomenclature was different. One was called as Reader while the other one as Senior Lecturer. But as the 4th Pay Commission recommendations came in, similar nomenclatures were introduced. But still there was a lot of confusion as there were the nomenclatures of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Principals equivalent to Professor or Reader. The unfinished agenda of Professor Yash Pal was completed by Professor G.K. Chadha who categorically stated that the career profile of the University teachers and the College teachers would be similar. So, all these UGC regulations of the year 2008, 2009 and 2010 are in that background. Now, the University teachers and the College teachers have the same career profile. The UGC desires that the teachers should move from one University to the other otherwise there is inequality. So, in order to encourage movement, the experience at one place should be counted at the other place and the experience should be given the value. Most of the Colleges in India are not in grant-in-aid. When the College education was promoted by the UGC in 50s and 60s, most of the Colleges were grant-in-aid Colleges. But as the Government ran out of the scheme to support the College education, the Colleges started to have non grant-in-aid positions. The non grant-in-aid positions were also enjoined to follow the same selection criteria like having the Vice-Chancellor's nominee and subject expert. At one point of time, all the subject experts used to be sent by a given Vice-Chancellor. But now the Colleges have been given a freedom to choose from the list of experts. But there is no distinction between a College and a University faculty member. They ought not to make a distinction between faculty member who is directly recruited or has come via the career advancement scheme. India is evolved and equality is there, a progression is there. Right now in the (Punjab) sUniversity only the Professors have been appointed in the governmental system and the DPIs have not become alive to the fact that the teachers in the affiliated Colleges also need a promotion to the level of Professor. In many a cases, the teachers in the affiliated Colleges are perhaps more experienced because in the Government Colleges, the teachers typically get appointed after a very-very long time. By the time, the Government appoints the teachers in the Colleges via UPSC, etc., most of the candidates find places in the affiliated Colleges and then the people do not change. The history tells that the teachers in grant-in-aid position in affiliated Colleges are no less than the teachers in the Government Colleges in the governmental system. So, they should be little sensitive about making distinction between College and University teachers. They are all the same and belong to the same continuum as today everybody must do research. If the teachers do not do research, the College teachers would not have an opportunity to career progression and that would unnecessarily accentuate the differences between the College and University teachers and that is not good for the academia in the country.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there is a tendency that if a person is known and even if does not deserve the benefit, but they say that the benefit should be given whereas in the case of unknown it is the reverse. If they take up all the cases together, could all cases would become in accordance with the UGC rules. He requested that the present case should be cleared and a Committee be formed for the other cases.

He also suggested that once Dr. Parveen Goyal be sent as an expert in the Selection Panel who could know the difference between the College and the University teachers.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the past service should be counted only through a proper system.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if she (Dr. Namita Gupta) is going to be given ante-dated seniority, it is not mentioned in the item as to how many people are going to be affected due to the seniority. If nobody is to be affected, then it is fine. If the seniority of people is going to be affected, then all those persons should be given a notice as they have a right to express their viewpoint on it. Secondly, if there are large number of such cases, then a Committee be formed to consider all cases of similar nature and give a recommendation to the Syndicate. Unless they have been doing it in the past, he understands that they have not been doing it in the past, this is the first case, then let it go through a Committee rather than in an ad hoc manner.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that most of the teachers have said that the benefit could be granted either to all or to none. They should not adopt the pick and choose policy. For future, they could prepare a manual so that it could be implemented for all as per the rules and regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not done any pick and choose. This is a case which is in progress. He suggested to bring all such more cases which would also be done but this one should not be withheld.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to what was the decision of the Committee earlier constituted in this case.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that the present case should be approved. Since the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate is going to be held on 23rd and 24th September, a Committee of some members be constituted to examine all such cases and the same could be approved in the ensuing meetings.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine, he would form a Committee. The Vice-Chancellor said that let them now conclude.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how it could be concluded. Has everyone been given a chance to speak? He said that he is raising his hand and if he speaks on his own, then it is said that the permission has not been taken. To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that when the matter has already been passed, then he (Shri Ashok Goyal) raises his hand and requested Shri Ashok Goyal to speak. Shri Ashok Goyal said that a proposal has been given that it should be passed and another proposal is also there to which the Vice-Chancellor had said nothing.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposal is that should they pass it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "no", he wanted to speak on the item. He said that first of all let nobody take an impression as if anybody is against the teachers. They should have all positive approach and whatever best could be given to the teachers keeping in view the spirit of the regulation of the University and the UGC, they should do it. The Vice-Chancellor has said it and he did not know how far it is correct because he is not sure, during his (Vice-Chancellor) 5 year tenure whether any such case has come or not. But if the Vice-Chancellor says that no such case has come before him and no such case has been rejected, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) took it to be correct.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not rejected.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that may be during the last 5 years no such case has been rejected. But he has been here for more than 5 years. In the past, they have rejected such cases. What was wrong with them when they rejected those cases and what is the reply with them today to those people that their cases were rejected and the person who is similarly placed, after 5 years, his/her case is being approved. In view of the opinion given by some of the learned members that they are not against this case, but let them not send a signal that while doing this case, they say that let it become a precedent and thereafter whosoever wanted to apply, the case would be considered. He proposed that a circular be issued that all such cases where there is a break in service and who meet the UGC regulations because now it is only the question of the interpretation of the UGC regulations as Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa has interpreted that this candidate fulfils the requirement. The Vice-Chancellor has made a statement that in this University that even the walk-in-interview is conducted by the same Selection Committee constituted under the same rule as in the case of regular appointment. He is sure that if the Vice-Chancellor has given a statement, it must be right. But before the Vice-Chancellor came, this was not the case because the constitution of the Selection Committee in case of walk-in-interview was not a duly constituted Committee in terms of the UGC regulations. But still, if they have to consider this case to be fulfilling all the UGC qualifications, they are not against it. Let all such cases be called including those which have been rejected in the past including those who did not even apply for such a benefit. Assuming and believing that they are entitled for it. If some other cases are also pending which have neither been rejected nor been approved, let a circular be issued and the cases be processed in the same manner as this is supposed to be processed. Why to say that this case be approved and thereafter they will look into all the cases. What is the reply with them to others that why this case is approved and why the earlier one's not, specially those who have been rejected prior to this case. Secondly, he does not know who has said that no one is affected by the seniority. Is it possible that nobody will be affected by the seniority? It may be possible. May be in that department, it could be none, but in the University hierarchy there could be so many. So that also have to be kept in mind. He has also been given to understand that when they are saying that all such cases should be brought in, when in Syndicate a member pointed out that there was a case earlier also which is similarly placed, which has been sent to University Grants Commission and advices from the UGC are still awaited. That case is also done. He has been given to understand, and he is sure that the information which has come to him should be correct, that in this case also, the letter has already been issued in anticipation of the approval of the Senate. So, if the letter has already been issued, in anticipation and subject to the approval of the Senate, the heavens are not going to fall if they do not approve it today and bring all the cases together so that they know what are the implications. He said that it should be approved, but only along with the other cases so that the message does not go that they work in piecemeal and they work on the basis of pick and choose.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not the only one who do it. It is routinely done at least in Maharashtra Universities. A regular teacher of Kurukshetra University has a gap of 12 years before she got the same Lecturer's position via one year walk-in-interview. She gave that interview five times and every time there used to be one day break. Then she got a Reader's position, but her fifteen years' back there years' experience, in a University as remote as Kurukshetra from Bombay, the Maharashtra University has accepted it. She got a Reader's position temporarily, then two years later she got a Reader's position permanently. When it came to her retirement in February, 2017, the Maharashtra Government agreed to join her entire service from 20th June 1995 which was temporary service of Five years. One year of temporary service as a Lecturer and one year of Readers position as a temporary service plus the Reader's position and the Professor's position, including the three years she served on deputation at this

University. She had paid whatever the pensionary benefit are to be transferred and 20 years period was counted to give the teacher full pension. They are giving PU teachers and staff pension after 33 years and not after 20/25 years (as in Central Government or Punjab Government). This is how the other States are protecting the interests of their teachers in the colleges and universities.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to bring only two cases to your knowledge. If somebody is coming from a college or any other University, they have been counting his past service, but if a teacher has come from Oxford University, they do not give him any benefit because U.G.C. says so. He does not know why they have made mockery of the rules. Another case that he would like to bring to his notice, without counting any other case that a former Registrar of this University, the former D.U.I. of this University, Professor A.K. Bhandari even has not been given this benefit. What they are trying to do. So, he said, let this benefit be given to all, they should follow Maharashtra. They should follow all those progressive Universities who are expert in protecting the rights of the Community. He said they are with them. They not only want to follow them, rather they want to go a step further, but not in piecemeal. Bring all the cases together.

Professor Ronki Ram appreciated the Vice Chancellor for giving time to discuss this important issue. He said that in whole of the country, the teachers interest should be taken into account. At the moment, they have luminaries of law and many times the decisions taken by the lower Courts are revised by the higher Courts and many times the decisions taken by the High Court are revised by the Supreme Court. At that time the Judges do not say that first call all the back issues and clear it and only then my judgement would apply. If they are really for the interest of teachers, this item should be cleared immediately. Others should also be given the benefit. They have a system, why they want to delay. If it is right, it should be cleared. Other cases should be taken into consideration. Why they want to pin this case with others. There are cases where the Courts have revised the decisions. What is this they are doing. The judge never says before hanging a person, hang all other first.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two options, one, clear this case and bring the remaining cases to the Senate via the Syndicate in its meeting to be held on 23rd September and to the Senate on 24th September Option two, they should keep it pending till 23rd September. The Vice Chancellor said that he want option one which says that they should clear it and bring all the similar cases via the Syndicate meeting to the Senate meeting to be held on 24th of September, 2017. Option two is that they should keep it pending.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members if they clear option one.

Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Naresh Gaur, Shri H.S.Dua, Professor Rajesh Gill raised their hands in favour of option two.

However, majority of the members raised their hands in favour of option one.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the teachers say that they teach objectivity to the students, why can they be objective in their approach. Earlier he has not allowed discussion on it.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage.

The Vice Chancellor said where they are objective. They are not allowing a decision to be taken. In what way they are objective. Some members said that they have some interest in it and also that he has not allowed them discussion on this, the Vice Chancellor said that they cannot make accusations left, right and centre.

Shri H.S. Dua said the way they doing this in so hurry, there seems to some problem in it. However, the Vice Chancellor said that there is no problem in it.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members to raise their hands for option one.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, he is giving option. that there should be no question of option, there should be one right answer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, let him tell the House that the Vice Chancellor shared with the Board of Finance where there were nominees of MHRD and UGC also, they said it if there are similar cases, those should be cleared. He has gone through the minutes, they have not said anything except that, the nominee of the MHRD said that a clarification be sought from the UGC in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that the UGC Director of Finance was there, he approved it and the minutes have been sent to him.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, let they write to him giving all the facts.

In between the pandemonium prevailing this moment, the Vice Chancellor said that he respects Professor Bambah who says that option two should be accepted.

Professor Chaman Lal while addressing the Vice Chancellor said that he made a mention that their University pays pension after 33 years. He is shocked to know that after Chadha Committee Report, in all Universities pension is given after 25 years of service to which the Vice Chancellor said that the regulation is lying with the MHRD, it has not been passed.

The Vice Chancellor said that this item will come on 24th September again. All those cases which can be cleared by that time will be brought. All those cases which require more scrutiny will come later. They will not wait for cases which need more scrutiny later. Next time they will clear all similar cases and those which require little bit more scrutiny, they can wait and it will come in the December meeting of the Senate.

On being asked by Professor Ronki Ram, the Vice Chancellor said that it is principally passed as said by Shri Ashok Goyal ji. But all similar cases brought in via the Syndicate to the Senate on 24th September.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to issue a circular for calling the application to which the Vice Chancellor said that the Registrar will issue a circular tomorrow. He will form a Committee as soon as the Senate meeting gets over.

Some members raised objections of the item being passed, the Vice Chancellor said that their objection has no validity. Seniority is not counted. Nobody promotes people by thinking where one will be put in seniority. These things are by merit. This is not in administration and this is not a civil service. This is an academic activity station and keep their things with themselves.

At this stage pandemonium again prevailed.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she has one query on this issue because the position prior to regulation 16.3 of 2010 and after 16.3 of 2010 regulation is different. Now they are talking that it will counted towards seniority. She is talking as a legal person that because here is a question where they are asking and trying to give the benefit of temporary service and for future if they see 16.3, it is to be counted for seniority also. So, tomorrow, the university will be in a number of litigations. They will be facing in the High Court that they are giving benefit of temporary service and service rendered in the colleges towards seniority in the University. So there will be a lot of litigation in the Court. So, she requested that legal position should also be examined.

The Vice Chancellor said that seniority business does not come into picture at the moment. The UGC is not worried about seniority etc.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it can be counted towards experience and pension benefits, it cannot be counted towards seniority.

The Vice Chancellor said that she could handle those seniority cases (in Court) if she wants to do.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the recommendations of the Board of Finance **(Item C-2 on the agenda)** contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 01.08.2017 **(Items 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15)** as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 (Para 2), be approved;
- (ii) the recommendations of the Board of Finance **(Item C-2 on the agenda)** contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 01.08.2017 **(Item 1)** as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 (Para 2), be approved with the addition of a detailed note to be prepared by the Finance and Development Officer clarifying zero deficit budget;
- (iii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee on **Item 5** with Dr. Gurmeet Singh as one of the members to re-look into the proposal relating to non-recurring provision;
- (iv) **sub-item 7** be referred back to the Syndicate and Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal be requested to prepare a note to be placed before the Syndicate;
- (v) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee on **Item 8** with Dr. Ajay Ranga as one of the members to examine all similar cases;
- (vi) the recommendations of the Board of Finance **(Item C-2 on the agenda)** contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 01.08.2017 **(Item 20)** as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 (Para 2), be approved in principle. However, the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee to examine all such similar pending cases or cases which were not accepted earlier of those who are still in service which are covered under UGC guidelines for counting their past service towards total service period for promotion(s) and/or retirement benefits and place the recommendations before the Syndicate meeting scheduled on 23rd September 2017, and the adjourned meeting of Senate on 24th September, 2017. A circular be issued for information of the faculty members for claiming the benefit of previous service.

Shri Raghbir Dyal recorded his dissent on **sub-item 1** as he was not allowed to speak on the financial matters.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the issue of fee concession to the transgender students be taken care of by the Dean Student Welfare.

On the request of most of the members the Vice Chancellor permitted to hold the General Discussion.

General Discussion

1. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that Panjab University does not take seriously the things discussed during the zero hour of the senate meetings. He said that the issues that were raised in the last two meetings of the Senate, then came to Syndicate, it is only after that the Controller of Examination and the DCDC issued the letter. He said that they appreciate it but it does not mean that the issue which is raised in the Senate in Zero hour, is not taken care of. He further said that in Punjab 1925 posts were being filled in Grant-in-aid colleges. The teachers who have applied till date, they have a submission that the Senate of the Panjab University which is the highest supreme body of the Panjab University should pass a one-time resolution and have it sent to the Punjab Government that these teachers be kept on probation for two years and then be regularised and they be given U.G.C. Pay Scales. He said that in that reference, his colleague Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu in the Syndicate meetings of 3rd March and 26th April 2017 had narrated some lines that Punjab Govt. has changed their nomenclature. He wanted that whatever was told by Principal Sandhu, he wished that they might turn right. Punjab University should pass a resolution and send it to the Chief Minister.

The Vice-Chancellor told that he had already brought this to the notice of Education Secretary, Finance Secretary as well as the Minister. He will not hesitate to write a letter on behalf of the Panjab University to the Education Minister. Chief Minister is the ex-officio Member of the Senate, he will write a letter to him.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar stated that Panjab University should write to the Chief Minister in this regard.

2. It was pointed out that evaluation work has been completed since four months. But no payments have been made to the teachers. Government digitisation has failed. This system be stopped and old system of spot payment be started again. In future the teachers will not work for the evaluation work till a regular system for the payment of evaluation work is made.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that payment regarding on the spot evaluation to the teachers cannot be made on the spot. It is not possible. They are bound by the GFR. The answer is that they have to make their system more efficient and responsible. Defiance of the Central Government to implement GFR is not the answer to such thing. It is better that they put their house in order instead of blaming the Central Govt. Those teachers who are invited for evaluation work should attach with their acceptance letter their bank details and a verification should go from here that these things have been received. We should get in practice that these are the acknowledgments. He said that they have to make it sure that the house is in order, he advocates that the house is in order instead of promoting unnecessary confrontation with the Central Government.

3. Dr. Surinder Kaur raised the issue of appointment of teachers in Colleges under grant-in-aid. She said that even after rendering three years of services they are not sure whether their services will be regularised or not. This may please be looked into.

The Vice-Chancellor told that he will take up the issue.

At this stage a pandemonium prevailed as several members got up and started to speak simultaneously without permission from the Chair.

4. Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the U.T. administration follows the Punjab pay scales and the problem is that particularly the approval of all the U.T. colleges has been withheld and

reason of this withholding is that the U.T. administration has followed and sent the circulars to the U.T. colleges that their scale is that of 15600/- and the colleges which are conducting the interviews on the aided as well as on the unaided posts, they are sending after making the selections, as per UGC, the advertisement is also as per UGC, as per Panjab University, or State Government. Here the State Government is U.T. The U.T. Administration has been saying that 15600/- will be given and the University has been directing for full scale and the UGC is also insisting for full scale. He further said that the U.T. Administration has approved 15600/- and the panel of selection committee of the University and the U.T. Administration has made all the selections and when the selection case of a teacher comes to the University, there is a proforma requiring mentioning of the pay scale, and when the pay scale is not mentioned or when they mention, the University does not give that, it creates a conflict. He said that for the last one year, no post of lecturer in U.T. colleges has been approved. He urged the Vice Chancellor to resolve the problem. He stated that when there is no problem to the teacher and when there is no problem to the College Management and if the University wants to get the things done, then after cooperating with the U.T. administration, this issue should be resolved so that the sword hanging on the teacher that the management might not harm them. The teacher should not feel insecure who is on probation, until he/she gets approval. He said that this is a serious problem and needs to be resolved.

The Vice-Chancellor addressing to Dr. Dalip told that they have a State Higher Education Council Meeting. He requested to make sure that the Director, Higher Education, U.T. attends the meeting, invite the Director, Higher Education, Punjab on that day also. Let this matter be taken up during the SHEC meeting either just before the SHEC meeting or during the SHEC meeting. This is just too important a matter that the approvals must be sent. Approval cannot be withheld and these governments must pay properly to the teachers. There cannot be any compromise on this. He has spoken repeatedly to the Punjab representatives and he will speak to the DHE, U.T. immediately. He asked as to what they want to be done by him.

Shri Naresh Gaur intervened to state that five minutes are going to be wasted on this issue.

He (Vice Chancellor) said that he is doing all that (Zero Hour) for them.

On the further statement of Sh. Ashok Goyal, he (VC) said that there is no compulsion for him to conduct zero hour. He further said that as to why he is being prevented to run the meeting. He added that the assertion that he does not attend to their concerns, is not acceptable to him.

5. Dr. K.K. Sharma said that he want to seek one clarification. He said that a circular of one of the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 11th of July has been circulated to the colleges regarding the recognition of degree awarded by CMJ University during the session 2015-16. He said that he wanted a clarification that as to whether that letter is okay because some of the colleges are still hesitating to implement it on the pretext that it is to be approved by the Senate. He wanted the Vice-Chancellor to clarify if that letter is sufficient and make it a part of the proceedings, otherwise impose it through the Senate also so that there is no confusion on it.

The Vice-Chancellor asked what is the law of the land. The members wanted that the letter should be endorsed by the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor said that the letter cannot endorse by the Senate unless the Item does not come in the Senate for consideration. He further said that he is not proposing to pass it in the Senate in an adhoc way.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his suggestion is that it is a very sensitive matter and the Vice-Chancellor has asked a very relevant point as to what is the law of the land. He further said that he is surprised that the letter has been issued clearly, may be the Syndicate has

decided and the Senate was very much aware of the fact and has taken a conscious decision that these degrees are not valid.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are nobody to say that these degrees are not valid. They could say that these degrees are valid so far as the law of the land is concerned, so far as the UGC is concerned and they cannot become an authority over and above them.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that so far as his suggestion is that they should bring this as a regular item for consideration and take a decision in view of what the UGC says, what Supreme Court says.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is the law of the land.

Shri Ashok Goyal continued saying that the letter has been issued, and it needs to be looked into under what circumstances the letter has been issued because it is a clear violation of the directions of the Supreme Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter could/would be taken in the meeting of the Syndicate on 23rd of September. He further stated that the point is that, prima facie, the letter has been issued and when the letter is issued, it is assumed that it is as per the law of the land. University is not supposed to issue a letter against the law of the land.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what has been done to this discussion. The Vice Chancellor replied that he will examine if it is as per the law of the land or not and the letter issued by the University has to be as per the law of the land. Shri Ashok Goyal enquired if it is no so. The Vice Chancellor said that then the letter shall have to be withdrawn. On Shri Ashok Goyal's query at what time he should come to meet the Vice Chancellor, tomorrow or so because it is a very sensitive matter, the Vice Chancellor said that he would not be available tomorrow. He would be here the day after tomorrow and he will send an SMS to Shri Ashok Goyal. He further said that so long it is not withdrawn, it is valid and he has not withdrawn it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it is against the law, then it can be withdrawn.

6. Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that his humble request is that in the Zero Hour of the previous Syndicate, a question has been raised regarding the stay obtained by the private self financing colleges for appointment of regular teachers without NET. Now the latest regulation of the NCTE has come in which the NET has been made compulsory, he asked as to whether the stay has been got vacated or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has instructed the University lawyer to get the stay vacated. It was explained that the next date is that in the month of November. The Vice Chancellor said that efforts are being to get the stay vacated.

7. Continuing Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that his another request is about the problem of B.A. B.Ed. Students of self-financing colleges and others, if anything could be done for it, that should be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will look into it.

8. Shri Sandeep Kumar said his point is relating to the evaluation results. He said that the results of revaluation are declared late, and the future of the students is spoiled on that count. He cited an example one student whose 16 marks were increased in the Final year but his revaluation result was declared after the admission. He urged the Vice Chancellor that in future he makes sure that the results of the revaluations are declared well in time.

- 9.** Dr. Neeru Malik said that she wants to bring it of the notice of the Vice Chancellor that she is the member of the Scrutiny Team of admissions since 2006. This Committee does a lot of work for M.Ed. before counselling and scrutinising the forms before admissions. Rs.300/- per day were paid to the teachers for the admission work up since 2006-07, and then Rs. 500/- per day up to 2011. After that the entry of the forms have been started to be done in the Computers and the rules for charges of Rs. 5/- per form has been approved. With new rules Rs.5/- has been approved for a form, i.e., Rs. 2.50 to teachers and Rs.2.50 to non-teaching staff, whereas teaching staff were paid Rs.500/- before the said new rules. She requested that a committee be constituted to revise the rates whatever are prevalent on per day basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that someone has said that this has been made Rs. 30/- . He further stated that this is not a Senate matter. This can be solved by sending him a note and he will resolve it. He again said that these are not Senate matters. The Senate matters should be related to relating to some policy, some major things on this or that or so and she also endorsed the view point expressed by Shri Jagdeep Kumar on the issue of 1925 posts of teachers.

- 10.** Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that his point is relating to the general observation of the efficiency of the University. He said that Board of Studies elections have taken place since long but the letters have not been issued to the members. He said that he had met the D.R. General. After three or four months, the meetings of the Board of Studies have been held but the letters are still awaited.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Mehta should have written to him and it could have been handled.

- 11.** Dr. Mehta said that due to discrepancy, the people are unable to know what part of evaluation payments have come to them and what is left to be paid.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not a Senate matter. The time of the Senate is more precious. This is not meant for these matters.

Dr. Mehta said that they are not listened to and that is why they are forced to raise these issues in the Senate.

- 12.** Professor Ajay Ranga said that the Vice Chancellor had said two three minutes earlier that there should be a transparent, accountable and responsible system. To make the system accountable, they have started two things. He said that in 2016 Syndicate, we started the system that all the complaints will be filed online and a website was created. The Vice Chancellor said that this again is not a Senate matter and said that they can raise their matter in the Chairperson's meeting.

- 13.** Dr. Ajay Ranga further pointed out that file tracing system which was implemented in the University to bring the transparency in the system but that system is there, that is in existence, but that is not operative.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what was not operative.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is talking about the file tracking system that where is your file and who is taking how much time, why they are delaying unnecessarily. He further said that at that system, a slip is issued and if someone makes a telephone, then the work is done, otherwise teacher's work is not done.

- 14.** Dr. Raghbir Dyal said that he wants to enquire about the status of the new buildings of the Panjab University Regional Centres. He asked as to if he should write or email to the Vice Chancellor to have this information.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter is progressing and he will give it to Dr. Dayal and his name will be put on the list and this was not an issue at all.

- 15.** Shri Varinder Singh said that the Ph.D. registration of a girl who alleged sexual harassment, has been cancelled. He requested that they should make efforts to get the matter compromised between both the parties. He further said that both the children are young and their parents are worrying about their careers. He added that he knows that the girl (Ms. Jaidka) had put wrong allegation of sexual harassment. Whenever quarrel happen in any family, wrong allegations get put from both the quarrelling parties. However, in this case, the careers young persons are at stake, therefore, he suggested that a committee should be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not recommend any discussion on this issue because this matter has already been considered.

- 16.** Principal H.S.Gosal said that in 1897, 21 Punjabi Sikhs had fought a battle with 12000 sainiks in Saragarhi and the Punjab government has declared holiday of that event. It would not make any difference if the Panjab University also declares holiday on that account.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they wanted to have a holiday in affiliated colleges in Punjab, he is not objecting to it. He said that so far as the holiday in Panjab University is concerned, if the U.T. declares holiday, then it is fine. In case, the U.T. does not declare holiday and it compromises the number of teaching days. If the U.T. declares a holiday, then the blame would not be upon him.

- 17.** Principal H.S. Gosal said that the Panjab University had given chance to undergraduate courses. He said that there are other certain categories as LLB, BALLB and professional courses. He suggested that it would be better if the facility is extended to those students also. Dr. Mukesh Arora seconded the proposal of Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

The Vice Chancellor said that it applies to the annual system only and it is not meant for semester system courses. He further said that they should not unnecessarily raise the demands. Allow the University also to run as per some norms, as per some standards, just do not make the whole thing so porous that anything is possible in the system. Again on the raised issue of holiday, the Vice Chancellor said that Punjab is okay, if there is a holiday in their district in Punjab, they could do so, he is not recommending for the Campus until the UT declares for it.

- 18.** Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal continued saying that a circular from the University was sent to the colleges, five six years back, that the students who have been admitted of CMJ, University, their fee be refunded and EIILM University students are not admitted. He said that if that is to be implemented, then an item should be brought in the Senate for consideration and discussion.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter be brought in the meeting of 23rd of September, 2017.

- 19.** Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that for the of B.Ed. entrance, the colleges have to send the lists up to 14th of September, some students are of the category whose test is clear but their results of revaluation of December examination, have not been declared as yet. He said that as the 10 days are given for graduation and MA admissions

after the declaration of the revaluation results, he asked as to whether they would be given 10 days relaxation. He said that the matter is of utmost importance, the necessary orders may be issued on this vary day.

The Vice Chancellor said that their admission be made provisionally and instructed the officials to note it.

- 20.** Shri Naresh Gaur said that his issue relates to the Senate of 2012, 13 or 14, wherein an issue had come of charging of Rs. 1500/- from the students for retirement fund for colleges when the fee were increased. At that time an issue was raised that the return be sought from the colleges. He said that to his knowledge till date no audit has been made nor any check has been applied.

The Vice Chancellor said that that the letter has gone and he is following up. He further said that as to what is in the letter, he read out the letter. He said that the letter of 24.6.2010 which has been sent to all the colleges by the University, wherein it had been written in details that leave encashment, retirement, gratuity, PF, ADA, HRA will be given. He said that in the colleges of which the Principals are sitting here and they are the Senators, in their colleges, the full PF is not given to the teachers. Basically, the PF is to be given on basic pay plus DA. It has been given merely on the basic pay and most of the colleges do not give the PF at all. He further said that this time the letter which has been issued and the copy of that letter is with him. He said that it is not known as to if someone has got it done intentionally or it is a general mistake, the gratuity and retirement benefit has been mentioned and the mention of the PF has completely been deleted. He said that on the pretext of that letter, the people are likely to deny the full PF to the teachers. So he said that the letter be amended and it be re-issued properly to the colleges in reference to the letter of 24.6.2010 and the information from the Colleges on this issue be called for. He has noted it and further added that he has not got the mention of the PF cut it up.

- 21.** Professor Chaman Lal said that he wanted to remind the Vice Chancellor before all the members about one thing that in the Senate of December, 2016, he had stated that the Registrar of our University, Dr. Madan Gopal Singh and Professor Brij Narayan sacrificed their lives while serving the University during the partition of 1947. They were murdered in Lahore while they were on duty in the University. It was decided that in their memory, the University will certainly do something. He said that the lecture started in the memory of Prof. Brij Narayan in Economics Department has not continuously been held and a Chair in his name should also have been started in the Department and his nameplate be also put up on the wall. He said that he had also told that the colleague of Shaheed Bhagat Singh who had spent five years in Jail with Bhagat Singh, his name plate should have been there in the department and memorial lecture should also have been started, that also has not been started. He further said that there are so many luminaries of our University, although they formally cannot do more in their memory, he had suggested that a Gallery of the University luminaries should be created. He said that influential members of the Parliament who come after becoming the Senator of Panjab University come here and they are very keen to work for making memories of their gurus, such as Balwant Gargi, Mulkh Raj Anand, Professor Yash Pal, Dr. Hargobind Khurana. He said that these icons are more important for us instead of the contemporary people who by power they hold, want to get some little things done. He said that a gallery of Mulkh Raj Anand, Dr. Dawedi and Dr. Yash Pal should be there and the Photo of the Vice Chancellors of the era of Lahore if not possible to be placed here, it should be placed in that Gallery. He said that since the year 1882, whosoever holds the office of the Vice Chancellor, the photo of all those should be placed. If we claim that we are the continuation of Lahore University, and we are the heritage of Lahore University, then the

portraits of those Vice Chancellor should be arranged to be placed. He further enumerated the names of Abdul Salam, Hargobind Khurana, Balraj Sahni, Bhisham Sahni and other great writers who deserve due regard on the same pattern as is being given to the contemporary writers. He further said the great scholars of the past should not be ignored. He said that he strongly suggests that a resolution should be passed today and he had reminded the Syndicate through email that such a decision had been taken and they have taken no stock of the things. He said that he is reiterating that in the next Syndicate, carry the agenda that for all these contributors of the University, whatever could be done irrespective of the quantum of time involved, but the planning should be made.

The Vice Chancellor said that about the Vice Chancellor before 1947, there was only one full time Vice Chancellor. Rest of the Vice Chancellors were in their official capacity. Sometimes, it was the Governor, sometimes, it was the Lieutenant Governor, sometimes it was acting and so on. He said that it would be meaningful only to have one more photograph which was of, who was the full time Vice Chancellor. He said that there was only one full time Vice Chancellor. Now, whether to start with that or they just stick to the Vice Chancellors of independent India. He said that this is a very moot point. It makes sense to have a photograph of Dr. M.G. Singh somewhere in the Dewan Anand Kumar Hall. So, he will find a suitable place that Dr. M.G. Singh, our Registrar who lost his life while working for the University, it should be there along with the photograph of Professor Brij Narayan, it is no issue at all. He said that these two are okay and as far as the Gallery is concerned, he would talk to them later. He said that the gallery would be there as and when the auditorium comes up. It will be done but it cannot be done very quickly.

- 22.** Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he is thankful to the Vice Chancellor on behalf of the house that the Vice Chancellor had issued the letter concerning leave for the candidates working grant in aid posts. He said that in large managements, especially, the posts of grant in aid, which should have been the regular posts, when the posts were advertised, he said that he had also stated in the Syndicate, that only on contract basis this should be allowed, otherwise they had excuses not to fill the posts. It was allowed keeping in view that the posts are filled in. These posts are likely to be regular posts. All the benefits such as, different types of leave, should be given to them. The facility of leave have not been given to them. He said that even in the bigger managements, like DAV, he has come to know that in their College of Jagraon, such teachers have not been given the leave. He further said that especially the two big managements, that is DAV and SGPC, the problem continues to exist. The letter should be issued to them by the University that all the benefits of the teachers should be given to those appointed against grant-in-aid posts. For example, he can tell about the SGPC, the teachers who are completing the probation period of two years, they are being paid just basic pay for the last 8-10 years and they are prolonging the probation period up to 4 years. He further said that there are so many candidates with M.Phil., Ph.D. and there may be over 50 teachers in Panjab University who have not been given the benefits of Ph.D., M.Phil. He said that his request is that the SGPC should be issued a letter. Even they do not issue appointment letter(s) on our format. Although, by making attempts, they have got it done and this should also be got done that the due benefits of the teachers should be given to them. It is understandable that they do not give the benefits during the 2 years probation period, but after that whatever the benefits are due, these should be provided to them and the increments of Ph.D., M.Phil should also be given to them.

- 23.** Shri Deepak Kaushik, President, PUSA said that he had to make a request that the incident of fire that took place in Panjab University and there are employees some of whom are the retired and working too, they are fighting with such a dreadful disease that

they are on the death bed. The medical reimbursement bills of those employees, even of those who have not opted for Pension, and they are dependent on medical reimbursement for the treatment of their disease. The medical bills after clearance from the Health Centre had come here and some of the bills which were lying in the accounts branch and some lying in the Audit branch have burnt. The accounts branch is taking necessary action and the audit branch and the health centre have been asked to provide the list. The Health centre is having the names of the employees along with the admissible payment amount. He said that his request is that to speed up the reimbursement claims, a time bound committee should be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already taken it up with the FDO and the FDO will give them an answer.

24.

Dr. Amar Singh thanked the Vice Chancellor. He said that he is a retired bureaucrat, now he is an advisor in the Punjab government and unfortunately he could not attend the previous meetings, he is sorry for it. He said that he has gained a lot and heard so many members raising various issues. He said the today he wanted to raise a very general issue not connected with the agenda, one, he said that he is really shocked to see these two three volumes of the agenda. He said that in today's era, in 21st century, if we are carrying so much of paper and wasting so much of paper, in this University which is one of the pioneer University of our country, it is pure wastage of paper. He said that if they cannot eliminate it, it could be reduced. Secondly a very small experience in the University is that there was somebody known to him working as Secretary in Govt. of India. Somebody was known to him and their daughter did some degree in Panjab University, even Col. Sandhu knows about it, that the girl has not been able to get her degree for the last three years from this University. He has been told various times to get this one. He said that he thinks that they need the digitalization of the students services, they can well imagine the girl is already serving somewhere and for getting a degree or certificate, she is roaming about in the University for the last three years. He knows that the University has adopted digitalization but it needs to be higher level as far as the services of the students are concerned. Raising the third point he said that he did his medical degree from Medical College Amritsar and he became an IAS officer. He further informed that he did his Matriculation from this University because this University used to conduct the Matriculation examination. This is one of the best Universities in the country, he has ever seen. So this University must take certain pioneer steps. He thinks that today the degrees like B.A., M.A., B.Sc. are not much important. Now it is a question of skill sets, which skill sets one has because today most of the jobs are in private sector and they are not looking for B.A., M.A. or MCA they are looking at something more than that. He has worked with them, he was the Chairman of the Government of India Skill Development and he was pioneer of this National Skill Development Mission Project. He was ready to work with the University on that project. So they have to start working on that because today mere degrees would not work. He suggested that we break the tradition of doing Arts with Science it could be modified in such a way that the students could get knowledge of upcoming subjects because today very new subjects are coming like artificial intelligence and coding so that the students could get opportunities for working globally. Lastly, he said that the University is situated at a place where one of the largest High Court and two Vidhaan Sabha and two Governments are situated. The Panjab University's students should interact with these institutions and he is ready to help being an Advisor to the Punjab Government. The students could get the opportunities for internship, training in the department where he is working. He further suggested that the Government governance suffers from innovative ideas and being a bureaucrat he knows. In the Panjab University so many departments are there like Sociology, Political Science so many other departments could contribute that how they could improve their Police Administration and how to improve their Municipalities and

how they could attract the tourists to Punjab and how could they improve the economy of Punjab and there are so many other things also.

- 25.** Dr. Mukesh Arora said that during the last two meetings he told teaching and non-teaching employees who have retired from the university; their dues may be paid to them after deducting 10% of amount from their dues.

The Vice-Chancellor said that has been done. To which Dr. Mukesh Arora replied nothing has been done. The Vice-Chancellor said what else he can do his request has been passed out. He had tried to motivate them. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it is time bound. The Vice-Chancellor said that all that has to be done by the FDO and University employees and he cannot penalise anybody.

- 26.** Dr. Mukesh Kumar Arora raised the issue of regularisation of employees who are working on contract basis for the last three years. The Vice-Chancellor should meet the Chief Minister of Punjab. The Vice-Chancellor replied that they cannot be regularised as per orders of the Chief Minister. The approval of both Government, i.e., Central Government and Punjab Government must for regularisation of these employees. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he is talking about the employees of Punjab. Central Government have no role in their regularisation. They are employees of Punjab Government, he is afraid that if Govt. changes, then nobody will take their responsibility.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that he will take up the issue.

- 27.** Professor Ronki Ram said that some prominent Colleges are situated in Punjab which were earlier affiliated with Panjab University but with the opening of other universities, these Colleges have been affiliated with those universities. Such Colleges at Sidhwan, Mahilpur and Amritsar have contributed a lot to eradicate the social evils and in the freedom movement. Since the University honours its alumni, he suggested that could it be possible if they honour the Management of the Colleges which have contributed a lot to the society and which have been created by the society on the occasion of Convocation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be done on the occasion of Convocation but can be done on the Panjab University Foundation Day.

- 28.** Professor Ronki Ram suggested that the security staff of the University should be converted into 'B' class from 'C' class.

- 29.** Prof. Pam Rajput said that Vice-Chancellor has started a very good initiative of Governance Reforms. He has constituted a committee for the same for the last one year. She requested the Vice-Chancellor to ask the chairperson to submit its details as soon as possible, so that its next procedure regarding changes be completed in Vice-Chancellor's tenure.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will try.

- 30.** Dr. Inderjit Kaur said that she has requested the Vice-Chancellor to look into the cases of those college teachers who are on contract for the last three years.

- 31.** Shri Prabhjit Singh raised the issue for regularisation of non-teaching employees. He said that a committee has been constituted. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to form a sub-committee for the purpose and issue directions to take steps so that they be regularised in the month of November, before the festival of Diwali.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not possible. They have to seek concurrence/approval from State Govt., Central Govt. and Board of Finance.

Then Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the committee be asked to expedite the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that he will try but cannot give any assurance.

- 32.** Dr. Surinder Kaur said that she has one more request that payment on account of paper setting has not been received by teachers. Teachers do not know about the details of receipt of payment i.e. for paper marking or paper setting.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he will ask the Controller of Examinations and Finance & Development Officer to prepare a report and send it to all chairpersons/principals giving all information needed and that this information will be acknowledged so that this matter can be expedited.

- 33.** Prof. Shelly Walia said there are three different types of Committees in the teaching departments of the University, (i.e. Administrative, Academic and Board of Control). He stated that Vice-Chancellor will agree with him that these in fact safeguard the academic promotional quality work. There is lackadaisical attitude in the teachers to attend these committee meetings. Attending these meeting is as important as that of evaluating the viva-voce or attending an interview etc. Many teachers do not attend the meeting and he thought that he should bring it to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor that he may please issue a circular to all the chairpersons of the teaching departments that attending these meetings is very compulsory and important, so that teachers do not stay away.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra stated that she agrees with Professor Shelly Walia. Attending these meetings are extremely important and they add value to the whole system. She will definitely write to all the department's chairpersons that they should communicate to their teachers that these meetings are important and these must be attended to.

- 34.** Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma stated that lot of committees are constituted for different issues i.e. some on college visit or some on local university issues. But many times it is seen that a committee becomes so large that its purpose is defeated and importance is diluted. He said that some members are kept in each and every meeting, but they have no time to attend the meeting or to go to outstation. He suggested that only those persons be kept in the committees who have sufficient time to attend these meetings. He asked for rationalisation of the same.

- 35.** Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that committee's related material must be provided with the notice of the committee. To get material is a hard task, and they have to put in great efforts. He has to say that whenever any committees are formed, they must give their reports as soon as possible so that the purpose of constituting the committees is fulfilled. He also requested to the Vice-Chancellor to look into the case of private college principals who are getting fixed salary of Rs.37, 400/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already taken up the issue.

- 36.** Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that he wants a case of Physics Department of the University in the Vice-Chancellor's knowledge. This case is already in the knowledge of Chairperson, Deptt. of Physics and Controller of Examinations. This case is of Niphya Chaudhri, she has applied under Single Girl Child Quota. The Vice-Chancellor said that this is a particular case, this is not a senate matter. Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa replied that

this is a matter pertaining to the policy. In this case normally first to four semesters were of 350 marks and then in fifth semester it was reduced to 275 marks, in sixth semester it was again raised to 325 marks. So in this case student got grace marks on the basis of 2.46 in spite of 2.71. on the basis of 2.46, the student was considered less than 3 if she got 2.71 then she will be awarded three grace marks.

37. Dr. D.P.S Randhawa said, secondly, there is one more case. Mr.Gaurav Marton, SC candidate, has applied for admission. He is late applicant. Other students who have less marks got admission. One seat is lying vacant and admission date is still due. His request is that he may please be considered for the admission. In the case of Ms. Niphya Chaudhri, Controller of Examinations has told that he cannot do anything in the matter, the matter should be bring in the Senate.

38. Dr. D.P.S Randhawa said that in the Department of Public Administration, seven students have been forced to attend 3rd semester classes when they have already passed the degree so he needs his attention on this case. They were students of 2014-16 batch. In 3rd semester these seven students were allowed to give their examination. But their attendance was short and now when they have passed the degree, they have been forced to attend the classes of 3rd semester. They have already passed the 4th semester.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he cannot take these things in an adhoc manner bring it to him in writing and he will look into it.

39. Shri H.S. Dua said that as the Vice-Chancellor already knew that there was downtrend in admission in the colleges of Punjab. Some colleges have applied for seat enhancement. There are many reasons for this. Some applied for abroad and some candidates, who did not get admission in their choice of college, took admission in private universities. Admission date has been extended till 15th of September, 2017 and the college has applied for additional seats, then as per past practice additional seats may be sanctioned. The Vice-Chancellor said he has no such cases with him. The related case may be with the Dean College Development Council to which Shri Dua replied that the case has already been sent to DCDC for the last one and half month.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is no use of additional seats. Some colleges apply for additional seats and in some colleges, the seats remain vacant. To keep uniformity in seats, this decision was taken. The Vice-Chancellor said that without examining the case he cannot take adhoc decision.

40. Shri H.S. Dua further said in the city Ludhiana no candidate for Principalship is available. He said that he does not want to use some words for such a situation, but in reality, this is happening. It may be seen that how committees are being formed, who are members of these committee and to whom they are visiting, at least some uniformity should be there. He said that he asked for these points, to which he received a reply from Vice Chancellor office that College Branch be contacted for the purpose.

The Vice Chancellor said that the office cannot supply at his home.

Shri Dua said that he had asked for supply to the House.

Then Shri Dua asked for making available a soft copy to him.

On Shri Dua's seeking the soft copy, the Vice Chancellor said that they are not available in the form of soft copy. They are all lying in the files. When the process was started, there was no procedure in place as to how the information has to be compiled.

However, it could be managed in excel sheets from now onwards. He said that he cannot do it, he can ask the office to do it and they will take their own time and as and when they are able to do it, they will do it. He said that if Shri Dua wants it quickly, he has to himself go to the College Branch. The Vice-Chancellor added that he had himself gone to the College Branch and told them to collate all these files at one place. He asked Shri Dua to go there and extract whatever he wants out of that.

41. Shri H.S.Dua said that his issue is regarding Provident Fund Committees in colleges, which were formed by the Syndicate on Punjab and District level, he suggested that these committees be notified. He said that he asked about this to the Registrar in the last meeting. If some teacher has any problem of representation, about periodic inspection, then he can check with the committee.

42. Shri H.S. Dua further said that for the last three years, cases of affiliation committees for colleges come for information in the Senate whereas it should be for consideration. Every Fellow has the right to access the case to see about the infrastructure, staff, courses and facilities in the college. He further said that even a little thing about university teachers is decided here, seniority is decided here, but in the case of colleges, it is left unnoticed whatever happens there. He said that he is trying for the last three years that this item should be brought as consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he cannot give reply to this. During the last 60-65 years, since the inception of the Panjab University, this practice of “for information” is being followed. Shri H.S. Dua said that procedure is that the items were always there for consideration and for the last two three years, these are knowingly brought as “information” of the selection committee’s reports. He said that in today’s meeting, they have the cases of affiliations. The Vice Chancellor tells that to such and such colleges, affiliation has been given, he asked the colleges in which the admission has taken place two months back, why this has been brought as an information. What is the purpose of it. On the point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not only practice.

The Vice Chancellor said that the time is not allowing to discuss it more, the matter could be discussed in the next meeting of Senate on 24th of September, 2017. Shri Dua said that every time they are told that the matter would be discussed in next meeting. He said that if it is happening as usual, then it is okay and if the teacher of the Punjab is being targeted knowingly, then it is not good. He said that every member sitting over here should have the information as to in which college what course is being run, what we can add to it and with what we can develop it.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever Shri Dua wanted to be considered by the Syndicate, that could be given to the Syndicate members in writing.

Shri Dua said that he would not give any suggestion to any Syndicate member because he has been the member of the Syndicate for three years. He said that nobody even has the right to ask for my suggestions; it is his right to seek in this House what are the agenda papers in this bundle. To whom the Vice Chancellor is giving affiliation, what was the committee, who has formed the committee, what was the constitution of the Committee. This information should be supplied to all the Fellows. They should know what is going on.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that actually what happened regarding Shri Dua had said is that the committees were formed under the Chairmanship of this or that. Shri Ashok Goyal was the Chairman of the Affiliation Committee for 2-3 years. It was just to facilitate the colleges so that they can make admissions well in time. Thereafter the

matter goes to the Syndicate. The matter does not come to the Senate as the colleges where admissions have been made, only because of the fact that Senate is held after 3 four months period. He said that Professor Navdeep Goyal is the Chairman of the Affiliation Committee and he could provide the better data regarding affiliation of colleges. Whatever Shri Dua has said regarding consideration of item of affiliated colleges is absolutely wrong.

Shri Dua said that he was also a member of this committee last year. In the meeting of Affiliation Committee it was recorded that such affiliation cases must be brought in the Senate before 31st March.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that whatever Shri Harpreet Singh Dua is saying, so many thing are right and we have some limitations of our own. He said that he himself was the member of the affiliation committee last year and Shri Dua was also the member. Earlier Shri Ashok Goyal was the Chairman of the affiliation committee and this time, Professor Navdeep Goyal is the Chairman of that Committee. He said that till date no employee is there in the colleges branch which deals with the affiliation cases of Ludhiana district. He said that only one employee has been dealing fifty to sixty colleges alone, and they have their own limitations. Because of the lack of manpower, the meeting that took place on 31st of March and the cases of 35-40 Colleges were dealt with and because of the lack of manpower in the office, the cases which were prepared, have been coming late. The problems are coming to fore because of delayed processes. He said that whatever cases are coming, that will be coming in "For Information". The process that has not been completed and for that one meeting or so, would be there. He said that even yet all the cases of affiliation committee are not in complete form. These are the mixed problems. He said that when Shri Ashok Goyal was the Chairman of the affiliation Committee, the problem had surfaced even then. They tried to do it quickly but things could not be made such. He said that for fifty to sixty colleges, there was enough staff and for 192 colleges, there was only 50% staff in the college branch. He said that whatever flaws are talked of, these are due to the genuine problems.

Principal H.S.Gosal said that the incumbent who was dealing with the affiliation cases, have not been in office for the last two months and now the employee to whom the work has been assigned, does not do his work carefully.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that for the time to come, let it be resolved that whatever the Affiliation Committee would go, it would go in between the January or February and if the affiliation is to be given to the College or not, as has been prescribed in the Calendar, it would be decided before 31st of March and the information would come before on the table of the Senate Members with regard to that the college had applied for this or that, this is the infrastructure, this is the teaching staff, the affiliation is being given or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that every Inspection Committee when visit the college, some conditions are imposed, mainly the condition regarding the teachers, the appointment of teachers. Because, for appointment of teachers, they are required to advertise it every time, after advertisement, a period of one month or so is needed, then a panel is to be taken and the panel cannot be given before that time, that takes about a month and thereafter interview is to be conducted. He said that after inspection also one has to be given about three months. He said that whatever Shri Dua is saying, there is nothing wrong. But to do that process before December. He said that all should be finished before December, so that whole of the inspection ended before December.

- 43.** Principal Gosal raised the issue of one of the commerce college of Ludhiana district which has applied for the panel. The college calls them and they ask the DCDC further. If the panel is not given, then the teachers would not be appointed and in such

situation, the colleges would not be able to run the course. He requested the Vice Chancellor to give the Panel to the college.

- 44.** Shri H.S.Dua said that the last date for applying is 30th September and from 30th September to till 31st of December, they have three months just to form a selection committee. He suggested that it should be done from 31st October. He said that before 31st of March, the process should be completed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the previous affiliation Committee and the current affiliation committee should have a joint meeting and give an algorithm how they would attend to this task of governance and this is the way to do it.

- 45.** Shri Ashok Goyal said that this University Senate had decided that let they resolve that the affiliation be granted in terms of the regulations and it is only in that spirit that they wanted the things to be expedited so that they come to the stage of 31 March as per the regulation but instead of going into that direction, they are going even in the reverse direction. He stated that he is surprised that even now, it is coming only for Information but while the prerogative of our Senate, it is the Senate, which is the authority and this is for information.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not know whether there is some document 4.9 which a Syndicate/Executive Council of University shall be the ultimate to decide granting or not granting affiliation.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what is the regulation.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is UGC's regulation 29.9.2013.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this means that our regulations are insignificant. He said that Panjab University regulations say that it is the government of India who is to grant and not to grant and we are governed by our own Act.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can have a meeting and tell him everything. He said that they are government of the University and they are ought to be willing to do the work. He said that who was he?. He was just to preside over the meeting. It is their duty, find an algorithm to do the duty. The Vice Chancellor said that please do your duty and whatever they need from him, it be taken from him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the suggestion of the Vice Chancellor is right. He further said that let the meeting be held and the purpose should be such that as to how to improve the system.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is right. They are responsible to the colleges of the Panjab University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that these are not the Inspection Committee, but these are the Advisory Committees. They are not there to advise.

The Vice Chancellor said that work together and attend to your responsibility.

- 46.** Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is strong resentment among the teachers of the University that there are handful of people, who are deputed in selection committee. She said that she had raised it earlier also and requested to make a roster.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no such directive and he does not want to give any promise on that. He further said that it is prerogative of the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Gill termed it as a favouritism and further said that he admits that he would send a few people.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will not be doing such. He further said that they can do whatever they want. He has not done anything which is violative of the responsibilities which have been given to him.

Professor Shelley Walia said that when he was the member of the Syndicate, he remembered that the directive was given and the Dean, College Development Council is also sitting there and he was asked, if he remembers, that he will make a roster and the roster would be according to the seniority and people would get chance to be in the Committees. He said that as a senior member of the department and he wanted every member of the House to know that he has not been deputed in any committee for the colleges in the city, for the last five years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has the history of such cases and he could show it.

- 47.** Principal H.S. Gosal raised that issue that on the one hand, people are motivated to do Ph.D. but there is a girl JRF student of his college, and she wants to do Ph.D. from the Panjab University, but she is being discouraged. He urged the Vice Chancellor to do something in the matter.

On the request of some members, the item No. C-70 of the agenda was taken up first for consideration.

IV The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-70 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

- C-70.** That the following resolution dated 28.08.2017 proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Syndics (through e-mail), regarding status of Panjab University, be considered, pursuant to the Syndicate decision 20.08.2017 (Para 23):

“Panjab University be declared an Institution of National Importance without any change in Governing and Academic structure of the University” (Funded by Central Govt.)

- All the affiliated College situated in the State of Panjab and Chandigarh will remain with the University.
- The service conditions of non-teaching staff and other benefits being provided to them at present will be not be changed and these will be given as per Punjab Government rules.
- The service conditions of the teaching faculty will be as per UGC/Central Govt.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (Para 23) considered the resolution proposed by Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Fellow for grant of Central University Status and decided that Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Jarnail Singh be requested to prepare a fresh draft resolution on the issue of grant of status

of National Importance/Centrally funded institution to Panjab University.

2. The above said resolution proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal has been circulated through e-mail on 28.08.2017 to the members of the Syndicate for perusal and consideration.
3. As decided by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 23.07.2017(Para 12), the data of other Universities which have been converted to the Central Universities was not received upto 20.08.2017. The F.D.O. has now provided the said data (copy enclosed).

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he will start from the minutes of the Syndicate meeting held on 23rd July, 2017. Though this resolution has come after nine months, there are some papers attached to it on which they have been working. When the meeting of Syndicate of 23rd July was held, this new resolution had not come at that time. Regarding this resolution the Vice Chancellor has stated that it is a good resolution the way they have put it, but he does not know how to make the Government of India respond to what they are stating. This has come from all of them put together, so let it be passed by the Senate. The Vice Chancellor very well knew the background of this as to how he has formed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Jarnail Singh where they had enough discussion and prepared a Concept Note. They addressed the apprehensions of their colleagues, especially those in the colleges. The three main apprehensions addressed by them include, (i) that the colleges will remain affiliated and apprised them about the Universities which have become Central University and whose college remained affiliated to them, (ii) they have apprehensions that the present structure of the Governing Bodies may abolish and (iii) the apprehension of the non-teaching which was raised by Shri Deepak Kaushik, President, PUSA regarding the service conditions of the Non-teaching employees was also addressed. All these three conditions have been included in the resolution now proposed by Professor. Navdeep Goyal. They have no objection to it. He said that the Vice Chancellor has said that he will be meeting the Chancellor again. To his mind, if this resolution is passed in the present form it will make his position strong as well as the position of the Chancellor for grant of Central status to the University. They have talked about it in the morning session about the budget, Shri Shaminder Ji and some colleagues had gone to Delhi in connection with the 7th Pay Commission. At the time of the last Pay Commission, the Central Government has decided that for 5 years 80% of the burden owing to the recommendations of the Pay Commission will be borne by the Central Government. This time when about month ago when the Cabinet note was prepared and there was a news also that the a benefit will be given and the announcement is going to be made. In that note the MHRD has given a proposal that they will bear the 50% expenditure for a period of 3 years. In spite of that the MHRD has stopped it and perhaps they have now said that it will be given to the Central Universities only. Though they are getting salary of teaching staff from them and a proportion of the salary of non-teaching, but they are not getting a plan budget. He said that the Vice Chancellor has stated that that along with Haryana, they should also include Himachal Pradesh for sharing the expenditure which is a very good proposal. But he said if they take some money from the Haryana Government, some of their colleagues in Punjab may object to it as to why they are involving Haryana again in this issue. But if the status of the University becomes Central, what is the problem in it. However, he further said that if there is problem with the Central University, it could given a Central Status, he has no objection to it. If they would like to pass the resolution given by Professor Navdeep Goyal,

they could do so. He has talked to Professor Navdeep Goyal about it. They could make one or two very minor changes in it. With the addition of one or two words, the things would be clear as to on what pattern they are asking for the Central status whether it is on the pattern of Allahabad University on some other University. They have to understand that there should be some permanent solution of this problem. He has been saying this since 2008. As the Vice Chancellor said that a decision was taken in 2011, but it was changed by the Government of India, it could be changed at any time. So there is no permanent solution. They went to the Court for release of grant to pay salary to which the Vice Chancellor said that they did not go to the Court or the Supreme Court. Dr. Gurmeet Singh said ok, but ultimately the solution is that they need to pass the resolution with all the three conditions as enshrined in the resolution. It will be very good if the resolution is passed for the grant of Central University status. This issue was at the top of the agenda of PUTA. The PUTA President is sitting here. The PUTA Executive has already passed a resolution in this regard. If the House likes to pass the resolution given by Professor Navdeep Goyal, he has no objection to it even. He is with him (Professor Navdeep Goyal) and he would like to add one or two words with his permission. It would be good if they pass it today itself with consensus. He suggested that they can seek help in this connection from the persons like Shri Amar Singh Ji, who has been Advisor in Punjab Government, Professor R.P. Bambah, Shri Pramod Ji of IDC and there also many other colleagues who have good connections with top leaders of Political Parties. He has no objection if it is Central University or a University with Central Status. If they do not do it now, the coming generations would not forgive them. He said that they pass this resolution whole heartedly and he assured that nobody in this House is against it because this is democratic House and nobody wants to harm this University. Nobody wants that the colleges should disaffiliate from this University. The University has dignity, it is because the colleges are affiliated to Panjab University. They want that more colleges should affiliate to this University. He said that they are talking about Haryana, but if it becomes a Central Status University, there is no problem if affiliation is given to Parwanoo College. He, therefore, suggested that a consensus should be formed and a Committee should be constituted and it should passed today itself as it has already taken nine months. He appealed the House, especially to the campus teachers and also to the colleges colleagues pass it, as they do not have personal grudge against each other. They should not think that the University teachers are asking for Central University Status for enhancement in the age of their retirement. Rather he is an opponent of retirement at the age of 65 years. They are not fighting on this issue for increasing the age of retirement, but they fighting for the dignity of this University. Therefore, it is utmost necessary and there is no way out except this. Perhaps they may be aware that they have not been given grant from RUSA. There are so many such schemes but they are deprived of them. The young generation is thinking about it. If they did not come in a national perspective, they will not be able meet out requirements. The sentiments which have been expressed by Professor Chaman Lal ji and Professor Shelley Walia ji that the UGC and the MHRD should dictate them, is not correct, but should have some introspection of ourselves. Why they are doing so. They may have done something. So they should not go on the path of confrontation. If some officer is in MHRD and UGC, they should not think that he is sitting in some enemy country. They are our people. There may a question of communication gap. This University has a very big base and a great heritage. They are already getting 90% grant from the Centre Government. This would not put much financial burden on them. He appealed to the whole House to pass this resolution unanimously as this is the first step in this direction. What would happen afterward, nobody knows. If they consider it a dream, even then they have to pass it today.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they are fully against it what Dr. Gurmeet Singh has said.

Dr. Amar Singh said that this is a very sensitive issue and he was not aware whether this resolution is coming. He suggested that they should must give a chance to the Punjab Government to give their opinion. They are here in Chandigarh. It would not be proper if they do not talk to the Punjab Government and pass such a big resolution. He, therefore, suggested to first talk to the Punjab government before taking any decision to which most of the members consented to it. Let a situation be not created where if they pass a resolution, the Punjab Government may not agree to it. They should first ask the Punjab Government.

At this moment a pandemonium prevailed and nothing could be heard properly.

Shri Deepak Kaushik, President PUSA said that they should ask the Punjab Government later on. First they should make a consensus here in the House. He said that he represents the non teaching staff. He has held a meeting with the PUTA office bearers. Non-teaching staff never says that they would not allow the Panjab University to become a Central University. They have neither said this in the past nor they will say it in future, but they will first see the rules of Allahabad University relating to non-teaching staff. First bring the rules of Allahabad University and then they will sit together and make a consensus on it. But how it could happen that only seven hundred people should say that this has to be done. He is not against it, but he would only like to say that 4200 non-teaching employees of Panjab University, who are part and parcel of Panjab University, they should not be ignored. Nothing should be done in haste. All the teaching and non-teaching employees of the want welfare of the University. Nobody wants that grant should not be given to the University. They only want an assurance to the effect that after becoming a Central University, the rules of Punjab Government as applicable to Panjab University non-teaching employees would remain the same. He further asked if this University becomes a Central University, how they would be able to give the scale of Punjab Government to the non-teaching employees. He also pointed out that an issue of Secretariat pay had come to the Board of Finance due to which the salary of an employee could decrease 4-5 thousand per month, the University could not make any consensus on it, then how they can give them the Panjab Government scales. He, therefore, suggested that before doing anything they should first make a detailed consensus on the issue. After that they may send it ahead.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the University is running very well, then what is the problem. However, the Vice Chancellor requested him to sit and said that he will give time to him later.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he would just like to give an information. When Giani Zail Singh was Chief Minister and Shri Gurdarshan was Minister of Education. It was agreed that Panjab University should become a Central University. At the last moment when Dr. Manmohan Singh was in Chandigarh, people connected with the University went to Shri Giani Ji and Giani Ji refused his consent. He said they do not want to give Panjab University to the Centre. Dr. Manmohan Singh was Prime Minister and Shri Pawan Bansal was very important Minister, requested many people. They took up the matter with Shri Parkash Singh Badal, who wrote a letter agreeing that the Panjab University should become a Central University. After that, he would not like to go into the details, there was some political consequences as a result of which Shri Badal Sahib refused it. He wrote to the Prime Minister that the consent given be considered as withdrawn. Therefore, Shri Amar Singh has suggested that they should consult the Punjab Government. This is important. The University had almost become a Central University if the consent has not been withdrawn. If they do not have understanding with Captain Amarinder Singh, then it might again meet the same fate. Therefore, there should be consultation with Captain Sahib which is very important.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the issue is very sensitive and thus they should first talk to the Punjab Government where all the political parties would involve. Secondly, when the University is running very well for the last so many years, what problem has cropped into now to make it a Central University. He further said that when they have to take money from the Central Government, how they can impose their own terms and conditions. All the things that their colleges would remain affiliated to this university or their Senate would remain the same and so on, will have no logic when they would take grant from the Centre. They will impose their own terms and conditions. A financial crises which has come has now been solved. They, especially the Vice Chancellor, has worked very hard to come out of this situation. He held a number of meetings with the government functionaries to get out of this situation to which they have now succeeded. So, when the University is running smoothly now, what is the problem that they want Central University Status. Are the employees are not getting salary. He has read in the newspapers where it is written that they should affiliate the Haryana Colleges or Himachal to get grant from Haryana Government. He does not know in spite of getting everything, why they demand Central Status. There should be some reason for it. Would they like to get the retirement age enhanced to 65 years. He and his colleagues are totally against it as the University is running very smoothly. The Vice Chancellor has done a lot of efforts for this and there is no need to change the status of the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is a man of that school of thought who feels that this University, established in the year 1882, has a glorious past. The Vice Chancellor has a lot of study and knowledge about the history of this University. He said the democratic content of this University, due to which all these people are sitting here, is not negotiable. He has also said this in the meeting of the Syndicate that in Pakistan where usually military regime prevails, even in that country the Act of they have preserved the democratic content in accordance with the Act of 1882. If that could be preserved there, why not they would like to change it just for the sake petty gains. It will be a disservice for all of them if they change its democratic content by make it a Central University. It is immaterial to ask or not to ask the Punjab Government about it. He is a man of this school of thought that the present democratic content of this University should remain intact. He appreciated the efforts made by the Vice Chancellor to get this University out of the financial crises. Everybody has appreciated this endeavour of the Vice Chancellor. Agreeing to Shri Varinder Singh that when everything is going well, he said why just to increase the age of retirement and to get some petty financial gains, why they should demoralize the University. This would be a great disrespect for them. When they pass a resolution in any form and send it the Central Government, it would then become the prerogative of Centre Government to run this university in the way they like. Therefore, he would like to say that this discussion should be stopped and the status quo should be maintained. However, if some improvement is needed in consonance with the present requirements, that should be done, but to change its democratic content or to change its status is quite demoralizing. The people who have contributed for the upliftment of the University would end up. He, therefore, appealed that this chapter should be closed and the present status quo should remain intact.

Professor Rajesh Gill, President PUTA said that since the resolution has been moved by Professor Navdeep Goyal and earlier Dr. Gurmeet Singh and Professor Akshaya Kumar had prepared a Concept Note on it. Since the resolution now has been introduced by Professor Navdeep Goyal, she requested Prof Goyal to enlighten the House about what concept he has in his mind and then she would like to react.

Briefing about the Concept Note as desired by Professor Rajesh Gill, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when Dr. Gurmeet Singh's resolution for the Central University was first discussed in the Syndicate, at that time a Committee was formed by the

Syndicate which consisted of previous PUTA President including Professor Akashya Kumar, Dr. Devinder Singh, few Syndicate members and Dr. Gurmeet Singh, the proposer of the resolution. Jointly a Concept Note was prepared and as per that Concept Note, what they could notice was, when some talks about Allahabad University or some other University, those were not declared as Central Universities. The Allahabad University is an Institute of National Importance. Once they were declared as Institute of National Importance, their governing structure and other structures was not kept as such but 100% grant started coming from the Central Government. When they proposed this, the main problem was that they were facing a great financial difficulty and also they were keeping in mind one major problem, they may face in the immediate future that when 7th Pay Commission is there that they will be giving grant only to the Central Universities for implementing the 7th Pay Commission and that they may not be giving grant to other Universities. As well as Panjab University is concerned, it is being considered as Interstate Body Corporate and registered as a State University in the UGC. So, if they are able to get the status which is similar to Allahabad University, that will be a better thing for Panjab University. Based upon that and after a lot of discussion in the Committee which was formed, the issue was discussed in the Syndicate again and then on certain points, there was an agreement and based upon that he was given the responsibility of making a resolution. Based upon whatever was discussed in the Syndicate, the resolution was made and that was circulated to all members of Syndicate and after their consent, it has come over here for discussion. He further said that he believes that when they look at the Allahabad University model that seems to be the one which can work for their University and they should accept that.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she endorses whatever Professor Navdeep Goyal has said because it is not only the question of finances that there is financial crunch and they will get money or not, it is much more than that. They should take in a very broad context. The University categorises the Universities in two categories i.e. either they may be a Central University or a State University whereas they are an Interstate Body Corporate because of which there are huge problems. The Vice Chancellor would understand best. They have different stakeholders in the University which consists of teachers, students and non-teachers, affiliated colleges and so on. She said that this is the time when they have to sit and objectively look at the pros and cons, objectively look at the situation, rise above any parochial settings or mindsets and try to objectively weigh the situation as to where do they stand and what options do they have. The University teachers already have the 65 age to work here, so they do not bother about that. As far as the finances are concerned, they are relatively in a comfortable position at the moment. But then if they look at the Central Schemes floated by the Central Government, most of these schemes are granted to the Central Universities. State Universities do not figure anywhere and they are Interstate Body Corporate, they suffer from so many hiccups. It becomes so difficult to grab any of the scheme or monetary schemes. Even RUSA grant was not given to them. Therefore, let them be not emotionally charged on it. If this governance system is there, it suits them, it is a democratic body and it is very valuable to them also. The contribution made by the colleges has been anonymous, they do not deny that. If the University is running, if the University system is going on, they give full credit to the colleges also. They are a part of them and they cannot think of the Senate without the colleges people. Let it not be taken as college versus University or teaching versus non-teaching issue. Let all of them sit together. Passing a resolution does not mean that they have become a Central University. It is a very-very difficult task. The Central Government does not say that they are ready to make them a Central University immediately. It is not that simple. They should understand that the Punjab Government has a stake and they have to approach the Punjab Government very respectfully. She said that she would also like to suggest that, as commented by Shri Amar Singh ji, they should form a Committee which may consist of Shri Amar Singh Ji, Professor R.P.

Bambah, Dr. Pramod Kumar, Dr. Rashpal Malhotra and some of the members from the Senate also so that they can negotiate. They should not react. She said in her subject they always distinguish between reacting and responding. They say that animals react, but human beings respond. They should not react, they should respond. Using their mind, using their discretion, using their wisdom and using their rationality and objectivity, weigh the situation. When everything is running smoothly. She said that she is surprised that many of her colleagues, especially from the University campus, when the PUTA Executive members were giving them resolution some of them said, "including you Sir" (she pointed her finger toward Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma), that he is all in all for Central University, but now their statements are different.

At this Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said, Not at all, he has never said this. It is totally wrong. They can see the minutes of last year meetings of the Senate. He has always opposed it. Professor Rajesh Gill said that he has said it in the Senate also to which Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that question does not arise.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh intervened and said that he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) has supported in the Senate for making it a Central University. He said that he challenge him on this issue. He could get the minutes of the Senate to see his version.

At this stage a pandemonium prevailed where nothing could be heard properly.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she thought that she is speaking to intellectuals and they will appreciate the language of a social scientist. If this is situation, if someone says that he has abused her, she said he can abuse her, it will give her more dignity. She further said that as a teacher of Panjab University, as President of PUTA, this is the proposal which has come from the teachers. This has not come from her, this has come from Professor Navdeep Goyal. They make this House, a democratic Body, they are a part of it and she is just requesting them that rather than being irrational or emotional, she is not saying this to anybody in particular, do not take it personally, let it be taken as rational, let it be objective. When they take a decision in their home, they think about the pros and cons of something which they want to do. They also see the positives and negatives. They should do that exercise for the University also. She has been requesting it all the times. They are not uneducated persons. Even, the uneducated person talk in a very sophisticated manner. They could at least form a Committee and think about it. This resolution/proposal should not be discarded because this will be in their favour.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is talking, keeping in view the sentiments of all those who have spoken on this issue. He informed that his first term in the Senate was from 2004-2008. This resolution was passed in the Senate for the first time. A Committee of Senators was also formed to meet the politicians of Punjab. When Professor Ronki Ram was PUTA President he went along with Professor Ronki Ram, some Senate members and some PUTA members met the politicians of Punjab. At that time Akali Government was in power and Congress Party was in opposition. They had started from the opposition and explained them about the issue such as financial problems, enhancement of age etc. But they have clearly told us that it is a political issue and that they cannot do it. After doing the whole exercise, they have now come back to zero. Since this is a political issue, they should take the help of Shri Amar Singh. Shri Amar Singh ji should talk to the Punjab Government along with anyone he wants to take with him. He said that until and unless, the Panjab Government does not give its consent, nothing would happen, there may be the government of any party, may be Congress, Akali or Aap. There is no need to waste time. They may pass anything here, it will not serve any purpose. He suggested that first of all they should have the consent of the Punjab Government, then they should do whatever they like. He further said that there is no need of wasting time. Let Shri Amar Singh ji, who is Advisor in Punjab Government, talk

to the Punjab Government. Prof. Rajesh Gill, PUTA President, Professor Ronki Ram ji, a Former PUTA President may accompany him. They had already done this exercise, but the result of that even after ten years is zero.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Professor R.P. Bambah has very well explained about it. In 2008, when he was President, PUTA they sat on a Dharna for 148 days in connection with this issue. All their colleagues had supported them and they all want that the financial problem of Panjab University should be solved. The issues like burden on Punjab Government and amount which has to be given by the Centre should be solved. In this connection he met Professor Bambah, Captain Amarinder Singh and Shri Badal ji. The employees of all categories were with them and all of them had the belief that they have successfully won the battle for pension. With the hope that as they had won the pension battle successfully, in the same way they were sure that they will win this battle also. With this thing in mind they brought him back as PUTA President. At that time there was Congress Government in Centre and Akali-BJP Government in Punjab and Dr. Manmohan Singh was Prime Minister. They also met Dr. Manmohan Singh. Dr. Manmohan Singh has also come here. Dr. Harkishan Singh Surjit ji also helped them for their pension, he had requested Dr. Manmohan Singh time and again for the approval of pension scheme. As regards the Central Status, neither Dr. Manmohan Singh nor Shri Harkishan Singh Surjit had asked about Central Status. They (University people) started it of their own. They first went to the Punjab Government. It took a lot of time to get NOC from them, which is available with him even now. They explained to the Punjab Government that whatever grant they are paying us, it will start coming from the Central Government and the financial problem of Panjab University will end up. Then Badal Sahib asked them if they have talked to the other opposition parties. They said that their government is in Delhi and his government is in Punjab and if both the government give their consent, the issue should be solved. But it could not be ascertained whether Shri Badal Ji asked the opposition or whether they have passed it in the Vidhan Sabha, but he has said that this is okay. They told to all the persons in the University that Shri Badal Sahib has agreed and the Centre is already ready to do it. They always address Dr. Manmohan Singh as Professor Sahib and not as Prime Minister. They were very much joyous with the idea in their mind that now they will go to the Centre Government and the University will become a Central University. It was perhaps on 5 September, 2008 when they were to go to Delhi. But on the previous night one of their Senators, Shri Viridi ji informed them that this issue has spread in whole of Punjab and some indifferent voices with regard to this issue are being heard and that this issue may not go to its final conclusion. When this issue was being hotly discussed in Punjab, at that time the letter given by the Punjab Government was withdrawn. When they asked some of the officers of Punjab, at that time 21 Congress MLAs told them that they have given in writing that they will not allow Panjab University to become a Central University because the Universities of Punjab are part and parcel of them. Until and unless, some decision is not taken on (the future of) Chandigarh city, no decision could be taken on Panjab University. They told them that a Central University is already coming up at Bhatinda, but they said that Bhatinda is not a disputed territory, but Chandigarh was created for Punjab in lieu of Capital of Punjab which was (left) at Lahore. In Punjab it is said that the issue is not that there is a problem of salaries. The issue is that the Centre in the garb of these things would like to keep Chandigarh under their control. Professor Ronki Ram said that they could not clear this issue from the minds of the people. When they again requested, the Punjab Government said that the Centre may make Punjabi University Patiala or G.N.D.U. Amritsar as Central Universities. But since it is a disputed territory, it cannot be made a Central University. For them this issue cannot be emotional rather it is rational, but for the people in Punjab, this issue is emotional. Then many people said that since Badal ji has withdrawn the letter, Professor Ronki Ram has also taken a U-turn because he has to contest the election for a M.P. People started saying that only Professor Ronki Ram is an

obstacle in this issue, but he told them that this is wrong. He told them that day before yesterday, a news in the Ajit Newspapers has been published where Dr. Dharamvir Gandhi has said to the press that inferences are being drawn to sell Punjab University or to compromise on it. They strongly asked the Punjab Government that there may be the government of any party, but they would not tolerate it in any cost. They have still not passed a resolution, but the news about it has started appearing the newspapers. They have to go through a system on this issue. With a great difficulty they have arrived at a consensus to have Rs. 20 crores from Punjab Government. Therefore, keeping in view of the interests of the University and emotions of the public, they should consider the issue. However, it is for the House to take a decision which would be acceptable to him.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said after listening to Professor Ronki Ram, everybody must have now assessed it that the emotional issue which was there at that time, it is still there. Shri Badal Sahib has been a very intelligent person. He first gave the N.O.C. and next day through his own people, they withdrew the letter. He said they have also sat on Dharnas in 2007 along with Shri Satya Pal Jain when Professor R.C. Sobti was Vice Chancellor. At the time there was a feeling that the University would become a Central University, but the next day, a news came in the newspapers. As said in Punjabi, if a Donkey is decorated like a Dear, it cannot become a Dear. This University is like a Dear, it should not be made a Donkey. If they write it a Central University, it will remain in India, it will not go to Pakistan. The grant will come from this government which the University has taken and they can take more money from them. Ultimately, the University will remain in India and not going abroad. There will be either BJP Government or Congress Government. HRD Ministry will also remain there and it will give grant to the University, if they can give grant now, why not later on. If they go to take a loan from Reserve Bank or HDFC or any other bank, they impose their own terms and conditions. They would not accept their conditions. If they say, after becoming the Central University, the Senate will remain as it is today and their Colleges will remain affiliated to this University, it cannot be so. In Central University, Bhatinda and in Himachal University, are there any colleges affiliated to it. He said that they should be first shown the Act. Continuing he said that only their Act will be enforced, only their orders will be implemented. Panjab University cannot impose any terms and conditions on the Central Government after it becomes a Central University. He, therefore, requested that their heritage is university and let it be a heritage.

Professor Chaman Lal said as the discussion is going on, one thing is clear from it that this is a very complex issue. It is better that they should first understand it dispassionately and then see what solution could be arrived at. At present the issue is that of the financial health of the University. The financial health of the University is in a very bad position for which one reason is that this is the only University of India which due to division of Punjab in 1966, became an Inter-state University. As informed by one of the members that in the University Grants Commission record it is a State University and on the other hand its Chancellor is Vice President of India. When on the one side there is Centre Government and on the other there is State Government. 60% percent of its liability was to be borne by the Centre and 40% by the State of Punjab. As told by Professor Ronki Ram that the issue is connected on the decision of Chandigarh city, at the time of division of Punjab. Actually, the issue relates to the decision on Chandigarh. As all of them are aware that the issue of Chandigarh has become a very complex issue. Similarly the issue of SYL Canal has also become so complex, though the farmers of Punjab and Haryana may die, but there is no solution to it. He wanted to caution that the Panjab University should not be made a third issue like that of Chandigarh and SYL. As Professor Ronki Ram has said that Dr. Dharamvir has given a statement, only in anticipation, that some compromise could be done on Panjab University. He, therefore, suggested that they should consider this issue very coolly. They should understand one thing very clearly that till the time the issue of Chandigarh is not solved, the issue of

Panjab University could also not be solved. They may be rationally very correct. If the Centre has given the grant this time, it cannot be taken as if they will keep it giving like this in the coming ten years. This cannot not happen. The University would keep on facing financial crunch. He said that without taking the Punjab Government into confidence, this matter is not going to be solved. He would like to caution on one issue also that the Hon'ble High Court has slightly suggested and the Haryana Government has again expressed their will that their colleges should be affiliated to Panjab University. He said that they should never accept Haryana and Himachal interference in the University. If they had allowed affiliation of Haryana and Himachal Colleges, they will be in a soup. He further said that if they take grant from Haryana and Himachal, it would become a much bigger issue. He suggested that they should not involved any other government except Punjab and Centre Government and stressed that no third government should be involved. He asked the Vice Chancellor that he is very clear about all these things, the High Court may suggest to involve Haryana or Himachal, but should say that he cannot take any decision without the consent of the Senate because that would be much complicated issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not his prerogative who would be attached with the University and who would not be.

Professor Chaman Lal further said that he can understand it, but the practical thing is that in this situation, a Committee may be constituted, where senior politicians such as Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji, Shri Satya Pal Jain ji and Dr. Amar Singh ji, who could have a serious discussion with both the Governments. The University may give them a Concept Note mentioning the financial problems and that for the coming 10 years they would be requiring this type of support. Both these things should be handed over to Punjab Government and 3-4 options could be given on the issue. He does not agree with the view point of Professor Navdeep Goyal. Allahabad University has never been declared as an Institute of National Importance, it is a Central University. Secondly, they should talk to the University Grants Commission and MHRD. As the Vice Chancellor has talked about equality that how Professor Chadha Committee and Professor Yash Pal Committee has brought College and University teachers equal to each other, now it is also required that the State Universities as well as the Central Universities' teachers should also be brought equal to each other. He said that it should be there that the Central University teachers would get everything and the State University teachers are deprived of everything. So all the financial resources of the country should be equally distributed in the Central as well as State Universities. The State Universities are not stepmothers. If the financial resources of the State Government are less, it is the responsibility of the Centre Government provide those resources. The Punjab Government should be impressed upon to negotiate with the Centre Government to meet the financial needs of Panjab University. The Centre Government may be requested to give 100% grant, but they should made aware of the conditions of Panjab University. It may be called as a Central University or Institute of National Importance, but it is a University of Punjab and it will remain Panjab University and that they will be simply asking to meet its financial needs. At the same governing concept, same Act, the Panjab University Act will not be changed, that will be the first condition of the Punjab Government. If the Punjab Government does not agree to it, then the Punjab Government may be requested that they should consider to enhance their 40% liability. They should tell the Panjab Government that they establish their right on Panjab University, but they do not enhance the grant. So Punjab Government must make its 40% financial release which is a part of the agreement also. So, the P.U. should work on 2-3 things as discussed. First they should involve the Punjab Government and then the Centre Government. They live in Chandigarh which, according to him, is a part of Punjab and he being Punjabi he can say that Chandigarh is for the Punjab. University is a part of Chandigarh and the Punjab Government should be convinced that the release of 40% grant to Panjab University is its moral and

administrative duty which should be fulfilled and if not they should be negotiated and be requested to bear whatever burden it could.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that if they declare this University as a Central University or national or an institute of national importance, this would be for long term sustenance of the University. If they were fighting for the funds for the last 2-3 years, which they were living on monthly basis and were not sure whether they would get the salaries. When the next Pay Commission recommendations are to be implemented soon, then they would have to again struggle for funds. If they look at the model of Allahabad University, declaring Panjab University a Central University, central status or centrally funded institution, does anybody have a regret. According to him, it is a step forward only in all respects. If they look at Panjab University, they still are not implementing pension on completion of 25 years service and struggling in 33 years. So, they are neither in the State nor the Central boat. They are lot of things that the students, teachers would get benefited. They are saying that the governance would not change, the Colleges would be staying intact. This would all remain intact when it would be declared as a central funded or Institution of national importance or whatever nomenclature is given. As Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal has said that there are no affiliated Colleges with Central University Bathinda and Central University Himachal Pradesh. These universities are newly created universities but not the upgraded ones. When they talk of upgradation, the College would stay as has been done in Puducherry University and other universities in the country.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that whatever he has learnt so far is that difficulties have been mentioned in getting the central status also difficulties experienced in the past. These difficulties apart, it appears to him to that there are too many advantages in going for that route. According to him, the Vice-Chancellor has studied all these things. The proposal made by Professor Navdeep Goyal is a via media as they are asking for the things to stay, asking for central status, asking for the governing structure to be the same, asking for the Colleges to remain affiliated, it is a very good proposal. He agrees with the proposal that they should consult the Punjab Government. But they should go with a definite mindset. The proposal if they pass it in the Senate would be an indication that this is what they desire and ask the Punjab Government whether it could help.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the issue of Central University came up when they started facing the financial problems. On the proposal of Dr. Gurmeet Singh, they held four meetings and he agreed that in order to get proper the financial position, it would be better if Panjab University is granted the status of institution of national importance or whatever has been proposed. This resolution is not a resolution by Professor Navdeep Goyal. Since it was decided in the Syndicate that let it go to the Senate and all the members should deliberate on the issue. The Syndicate has not forwarded it with any remarks whether accepted or not. Now when it comes for Central University, let they see the budget of the Central Universities as to what it was 5 years back and what it is right now. Has the Central Government or other funding agencies increased their budget? If the Central Government has not increased the budget of those universities, then should Panjab University expect it. The grass is greener on the other side. Panjab University is well known at the international level on all aspects and they should not change it and should maintain its present status. He would conclude it in the way if they have sold their land to a private person and he has made his structure, they cannot establish their claim.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that as said by Dr. Rajat Sandhir that when Allahabad University was made a Central University, there was no change in its status to which the Vice-Chancellor intervened and said that Allahabd University is not a Central University. Continuing, he said that as stated by Professor Ronki Ram that there is difference between circumstances and situation. At Allahabad University, there was not such political issue, but here due to Chandigarh being a joint capital of Punjab and Haryana, it

would not be possible to get the central status and they should not make unnecessary efforts and the status quo should be maintained.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that with this issue, so many issues like financial and political issues are attached. In addition to all these issues, the sentiments of the Punjabi are also attached with the Panjab University and they have neither allowed it to become a Central University nor would they allow it in future and also would not allow Haryana to attach their Colleges with Panjab University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has rightly concluded. Professor Navdeep Goyal has put hard work in preparing the resolution. Shri Malhi has clearly told that the present status would remain intact, if not declared a Central University, the status of centrally funded or heritage or institute of national importance, they should pass a resolution and approach the Punjab Government and ask if it would like to change anything. If the Punjab Government does not agree, then it is okay and they would remain where they are. They should not guess on their own that the Punjab Government would not accept it.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he agrees with what Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu has said. Whenever there is any domestic problem, they would not think of selling the house it but would try to solve the problem. The sentiments of the people of Punjab are attached with Panjab University. The talk of Central University status is nothing but a wastage of time. Most of the time of the Senate is wasted in deciding whether the resolution should be passed or not. Why they are wasting their time?

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they are talking of Central University, centrally funded or central status or institute of national importance. There is no University by the name of centrally funded. There are two terms, i.e., Central status or Institute of National Importance. Panjab University could not become an Institute of National Importance because such institutes are divided into four major sub-divisions like IIT, IIM, AIIMS and IIIT. Since the year 1863 till 2016, only 103 institutes of national importance have come up. During the years 2013-16 no such institute has been established. Up to the year 2010, only institutes with specialisation in engineering, science, medicine and agriculture sciences have been established. Then, how Panjab University could become an institute of national importance. If Panjab University is declared as an institute of national importance, there should be no effect on the affiliated Colleges, it should have no effect on the terms and conditions of the non-teaching staff and the UGC but they should get the central status and this should also have no effect on the Senate. Secondly, they are already centrally funded with some grant from the Punjab Government and that also in instalments. They are already following the UGC rules and regulations on the basis of which benefits like promotions under CAS, counting of past service are being granted. They are receiving the grants from the MHRD through UGC. Since everything is coming from the Centre, why not ask for the central status with the consent of Punjab Government. The next meeting of the Senate is scheduled to be held on 24th September and in the meantime by forming a Committee, the consent of the Punjab Government could be sought.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the colleagues are raising this issue time and again and do not honour the decision of the Syndicate which is an elected body by the Senators. Earlier also it was decided that a Committee would be formed, the recommendations of which would be placed before the Syndicate and then before the Senate. Shri Jarnail Singh is the Chairperson of that Committee. Without waiting for the decision of the Syndicate, the members raised the issue in the last meeting of the Senate. This time, the Syndicate had taken a decision. The earlier decision was not approved and Professor Navdeep Goyal was assigned the duty to submit a new proposal in consultation with other

members from the University. That proposal was first to be placed before the Syndicate and then before the Senate. The President, PUTA and others must be under pressure from the colleagues and are duty bound. It is also the duty of the House to honour the decision of the Syndicate. The proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal was first to be placed before the Syndicate and then before the Senate. That decision has not been honoured and the time of the Senate is being wasted. It would have been better to discuss some of the very important items of the agenda. There is a system and that should be adopted. He did not know as to why the members are in a hurry and think that they would get the status today itself. As said by one of the colleagues regarding affiliation of Colleges from Haryana about which the meetings are being held, he is not fully aware about it. He requested that such a decision should not be taken until this issue is clinched in the Syndicate and the Senate. Haryana Government has disaffiliated the Colleges on its own and now it is not known why Haryana is trying to attach its Colleges with Panjab University again. He requested the Vice-Chancellor not to take such a decision for which he might have to face embarrassment in the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the Senate has no role in it and the decision is to be taken by the Central Government in this regard. They could continue the discussion in the next meeting.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that first the matter should go to the Syndicate and then to the Senate. This matter could not be discussed here.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested to let the matter conclude.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter could not come to a conclusion because so many things are there to discuss. The discussion would continue in the next meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as said by Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Shri Jarnail Singh, all five are members of the Syndicate. He was under the impression as if the matter has come to the Senate as a recommendation of the Syndicate. Principal I.S. Sandhu is 100% correct that how come without the recommendation of the Syndicate, the resolution has been brought to the Senate. There is a set procedure of moving a resolution that it has to be submitted to the Registrar at least 4 weeks before the meeting of the Senate. Meaning thereby that the resolution of Professor Navdeep Goyal should have been there with the Registrar before 10th August. He did not know as to what happened to the resolution of Dr. Gurmeet Singh. There is no mention as to what the Syndicate has said except that the draft be amended. He did not know as to what is this procedure that they could do hanky-panky with the resolution of somebody. They could either not accept the resolution or tell the mover to amend the same. They are wasting a lot of time and how the matter could be clinched as the proper procedure has not been followed. The resolution is presented with a new tag by the name of Professor Navdeep Goyal instead of Dr. Gurmeet Singh. The meeting of the Syndicate was held on 20th August in which it was decided that Professor Navdeep Goyal would prepare an amended draft in consultation Shri Jarnail Singh. The same resolution with the name of Professor Navdeep Goyal has been circulated by e-mail to the members of the Syndicate for their perusal and consideration. That means that the members have not responded to that e-mail and it has been taken that since they have not responded by saying 'no' or 'yes', they agree with the resolution and the same be placed before the Senate. Shri Jarnail Singh has probably said that in the Syndicate it transpired that the discussion on this issue would be held in the Senate meeting. This is not the prerogative of the Syndicate. The Syndicate has to give its observations before the matter is placed before the Senate. He requested that proper procedure be followed. He did not want the Senate and the teachers of the University and the Colleges, the community of the University to be divided into two, here a blame game is being played that some of the members are in favour while the others are

not. If they are not able to play as a team, then probably they would not succeed. If the matter had been discussed in the Syndicate, everything would have been clear. If they want to clinch the issue, as one of the members had earlier said that the Senate should pass a resolution and send to the Punjab Government. If they understand Dr. Amar Singh, could this Senate pass a unanimous resolution and send the same to the Punjab Government instead of Central Government requesting the Panjab University be converted into Central University and to follow up with the Central Government. If the Punjab Government does not accede to it, then they could at least hold discussions with it. But the resolutions which till date they have sent to the Punjab Government, whether the same have been sent after consulting it. They could at least send the resolution to the Punjab Government. If the Senate agrees, but he would be the last person under these circumstances to ignore the Punjab Government because it is also the stakeholder. Without taking the Punjab Government into confidence, if they tried, as they failed in the past as Professor R.P. Bambah, Professor Ronki Ram have said that there were so many occasions when there was Akali or Congress Government, Punjab is not, he would not call it a successor State, but Punjab is a principal State as far as Panjab University is concerned. So, there is no intention of ignoring Punjab. But this Senate through the office of the Vice-Chancellor, the Hon'ble members of the Senate could put in efforts to persuade the Punjab Government and to plead and if they are able to convince it, then they jointly as the Senate of Panjab University and Punjab Government could follow it up with the Central Government to get the central status for Central University. But before that, he requested to follow the procedure laid down in the Calendar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, there is no consensus that Panjab University should become a Central University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if this would have been discussed in the Syndicate, then things thing could have come to the Senate that there is no consensus in the Syndicate. The matter could have been placed before the Senate if everybody in the Syndicate had consensus.

Professor Ronki Ram said that as Shri Ashok Goyal is saying that the Punjab Government should say that Panjab University be made a Central University, why not ask it give the grants.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has himself experienced in the past in the Syndicate that it says that the matter be sent to the Senate as it is without any discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the regulation says that the resolution shall then be brought to the notice of the Syndicate which shall refer it to the Senate with its observations but not as it is. The observations are that the members of the Syndicate feel, as he has gathered the spirit, they are not in favour of making Panjab University a Central University.

The Vice-Chancellor requested that they should not get bogged down in the nuances. The important thing is to understand the basics of this University. He requested the members to have discussions amongst themselves and understand as to what are the basics of this University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had the members known that there is no consensus in the Syndicate as after all the Syndicate is not outside, the community could talk with the Government about the pros and cons. But the matter has come as if the Syndicate is unanimous in recommending that it should be converted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested that a time of 10 minutes be given to them so that they could discuss the issue amongst themselves.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a consensus could not be arrived in a time of 10 minutes.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice-Chancellor to hold discussions for 10 minutes so that they could know what to do in the matter and solve the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let them not indulge in nuances of technicalities.

Since the discussion remained inconclusive on this item and other items were to be considered, the meeting was adjourned to be held on 24th September, 2017 at 10.00 a.m.

Confirmed

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Arun Kumar Grover

VICE CHANCELLOR

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Sunday, 24th September 2017 at 10.00 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Dr. Amit Joshi
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
6. Shri Amanpreet Singh
7. Dr. Ameer Sultana
8. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
9. Dr. Baljinder Singh
10. Professor B.S. Ghuman
11. Dr. B.C. Josan
12. Professor Chaman Lal
13. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
14. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
15. Dr. Dalip Kumar
16. Shri Deepak Kaushik
17. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
18. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
19. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
20. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
21. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
22. Shri H.S. Dua
23. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
24. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
25. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
26. Dr. Jagdish Chander
27. Shri Jarnail Singh
28. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
29. Dr. K.K. Sharma
30. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
31. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
32. Dr. N.R. Sharma
33. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
34. Dr. Neeru Malik
35. Professor Navdeep Goyal
36. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra
37. Shri Naresh Gaur
38. Dr. Parveen Goyal
39. Shri Prabhjit Singh
40. Professor Rajat Sandhir
41. Professor Ronki Ram
42. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
43. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
44. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
45. Professor R.P. Bambah
46. Shri Raghbir Dyal

47. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
48. Dr. S. S. Sangha
49. Dr. Subhash Sharma
50. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
51. Ms. Surinder Kaur
52. Shri Satya Pal Jain
53. Professor Shelly Walia
54. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
55. Shri Sandeep Singh
56. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
57. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
58. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
59. Shri V.K. Sibal
60. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Dr. Amod Gupta
2. Dr. Amar Singh
3. Professor Anita Kaushal
4. Ms. Anu Chatrath
5. Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary, Education Minister, Punjab
6. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
7. Professor Deepak Pental
8. Dr. Gurmit Singh
9. Justice Harbans Lal
10. Dr. Harsh Batra
11. Shri Harjit Singh, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
12. Dr. Harjodh Singh
13. Smt. Kirron Kher
14. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
15. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
16. Shri Parimal Rai
17. Shri Parmod Kumar
18. Professor Pam Rajput
19. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
20. Shri Punam Suri
21. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
22. Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director, Higher Education, Punjab
23. Dr. S.K. Sharma
24. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
25. Shri Sanjay Tandon
26. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
27. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
28. Shri Sandeep Kumar
29. Shri Varinder Singh

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

- (i) Highly regarded and profusely honoured, the World Renowned Nephrologist Professor Kirpal Singh Chugh of PGIMER on September 17, 2017. He was an alumnus of PU and the first qualified Indian nephrologist. He obtained

MD with specialization in urinary diseases as 'Nephrology'. He has been a member of our Senate one term from 1996 to 2000.

- (ii) I have also learnt communication and learnt that another colleague Dr. K.D. Gupta passed away.
- (iii) I have also received a message from Professor S.K. Sharma, Emeritus Professor and Hon'ble Member of the Senate that his sister passed away the day before yesterday.

The Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Kirpal Singh Chugh, Dr. K.D. Gupta and the sister of Professor S.K. Sharma and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

I. The Vice Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the Hon'ble members of the Senate that –

- xi) Dr. Kiran Bedi, Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor of Puducherry and alumnus PU, delivered Prof. J.C. Anand Memorial Oration hosted by Department of Political Science and interacted with the students who have joined the new courses on 'Leadership and Governance' and blessed them on September 22, 2017.
- xii) 6th Panjab University Foundation Day Lecture will be delivered by Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professor Shri Kailash Satyarthi, Nobel Laureate, on October 12, 2017 in the University Auditorium. He was honoured with Doctor of Law (*Honoris Causa*) during the 64th PU Annual Convocation held on March 14, 2015. He would spend full 24 hours in the campus and interact with several sections of the society during his visit. This is a visit which is a part of his Bharat Yatra, the mission which he started from Kanyakumari and would culminated in Delhi on 6th October, 2017.
- xiii) Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology, promoted by BIRAC, Department of Biotechnology launched its first product developed by an Innovation Fellow and Ph.D. Scholar, Ms. Shivanshi Vashist under the mentorship of Dr. Rohit Sharma, the Coordinator, CIC. The product is jointly manufactured by a new company floated by Ms. Shivanshi Vashist, Managing Director of Microradical 360 Pvt. Ltd. and the instrument has been co-fabricated by GAK Equipments, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali).

RESOLVED: That:

- (1) felicitation of the Senate be conveyed to –

Ms. Shivanshi Vashist, a Ph.D Scholar, under the mentorship of Dr. Rohit Sharma, the Coordinator, CIC for developing the first product launched by Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology, promoted by BIRAC.

- (2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor statement at Sr. No. (ii) and (iii) be noted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they now start the agenda. In the previous meeting held on 10th September, 2017, they had finished Item C-2 and now they would take up Item C-3.

II.

The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-3 on the agenda**, was read out, viz. –

C-3. That the date of promotion of the following persons be preponed and they be promoted from Assistant Professor in Information Technology (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor in Information Technology (Stage-2) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------|---|------------|
| 1. | Ms. Roopali | : | 31.12.2008 |
| 2. | Ms. Inderdeep Kaur | : | 31.12.2008 |

- 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 candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 2(ii)).

Shri V.K. Sibal said that the promotions are being done from the year 2008 under the UGC Guidelines of 2010. He just wanted to know whether those are applicable retrospectively. If the guidelines are applicable retrospectively, then it is okay and if not, then it should be clarified. No guideline could be applied to a date earlier than the date of issue of guidelines. So, unless the guidelines say so, it would not be applicable to these candidates. It is related with the several other items (C-3, C-4 and C-5) also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is the law of the land that on whichever date one is eligible, it is to be given.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that it should be clarified and the law of the land is that unless it is mentioned to be effective retrospective, they could not do it. He said that it could be withdrawn.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not going to withdraw as it had happened even before he arrived.

At this stage, Professor Rajesh Gill spoke on **Item C-2 (Item 20 of Board of Finance)** and that part of discussion has been separated from the discussion on **Item C-3** and put under Para III. Again, the discussion on **Item C-3** continued.

Again while taking up **Item C-3**, the Vice-Chancellor said that they are supposed to take care of all the recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission in 2008 onwards. This is also written there. So, nothing is being done which is beyond the UGC guidelines.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about the scales of 1996 under which those persons have got the promotion earlier, at that time it was senior scale, selection grade or Reader's scale and then Professor for which the time period was one more year up to senior scale. When these scales came, along with that it is written in the scales that these are effective from 31.12.2008. That is why although in this case, the total what should have been there for stage-2, but they have been given the scales from 31.12.2008.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-3 on the agenda**, be approved.

III.

While the discussion on **Item C-3** was in progress, at that stage, Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to know about **Item C-2 (Item 20 of Board of Finance)** as to what was resolved. They had a long discussion in the last meeting of the Senate on this item and there was a Committee which was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. When the second meeting of the Committee was held on 22nd September, 2017, the resolved part was shown to her which was opposite to what had been decided in the Senate. She requested that they should be enlightened as to what was resolved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the minutes of the resolved part would be circulated to all the members. Once the minutes are circulated and anyone who had a reservation, the people send comments as these are the draft minutes. If there is a need to change those things, it would get taken care of.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that then the minutes should not have been sent to the Committee which is going to decide the fate of hundreds of teachers. The option 'B' was decided here whereas the minutes say that option 'A' was decided.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said the videography could be seen.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had asked for the videography 6 times but the same were not being provided to her. Let them confirm it from the videography as to how the minutes have been wrongly recorded.

The Vice-Chancellor said that minutes have not been recorded wrongly.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the minutes were sent to the Committee. Dean of University Instruction, the Chairperson of the Committee is present here.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was also decided that a Committee would be formed which would look into the cases and the similar cases which could be considered would be brought up in this meeting. Maybe the time given to the Committee had been short and the number of cases is perhaps larger and the Committee did not have time to look into all those cases and take a call on it in the short time. In order to overcome this difficulty whatever they were supposed to do today. That means in addition to that case whatever other cases which were similar, they were to do those together. He proposed

that instead of doing it today, whatever they were to do today, it would be done during the next meeting of the Senate. Whatever time of 10 days was given, that time becomes 2 months and 10 days.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the issue did not relate to those cases. The issue is related with a specific case.

When Professor Keshav Malhotra started speaking, the Vice-Chancellor said that he was not allowed to speak without seeking the permission and would have to speak only permission was granted.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that whatever was to happen today, there was a case which was accepted in principle. Because it was accepted in principle, then the similar cases were to be added.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that, that case was not accepted in principle.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice-Chancellor not to twist the decision and the things.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that Professor R.P. Bambah had given option '2'.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Naresh Gaur not to speak without seeking the permission.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is talking about the case of Dr. Namita Gupta and not the other cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this issue is settled.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that 'no', this issue is not settled.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue is settled.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that then what is the decision?

When Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Naresh Gaur started speaking, the Vice-Chancellor said that he was not allowing them to speak.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he (Vice-Chancellor) has to permit.

When Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Naresh Gaur continued speaking, the Vice-Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting. But the discussion continued amongst the members.

When the meeting resumed, Professor R.P. Bambah was speaking. He said that if Dr. Ramanujam was denied admission by the Madras University, he would not have been a mathematician. Dr. Joshi used to say that when the University was started, the people got together and started the University. Later, the rules and regulations were framed. When they become mature, they take not the wording but the spirit of the rules. When he went to Cambridge, he was not listed for any degree. He asked a Professor there as to why he was not listed who asked him not to worry and do his work and after two years he was not only allowed to submit the Ph.D. thesis but the exemption of one year was also allowed. So, these are things that when one becomes mature, one has to see the spirit

also. One has to see whether one is doing good for the society or damaging the society. So, let them become more mature and have more confidence. Let them not get involved in small minor things. Unfortunately, the UGC is closing doors to everyone instead of opening. The whole idea of mature society is to see what is the effect or the action. What the action is for the good or for the bad. He is not bothered about the present case nor does he know who the person is. The question is that if a person is talented, then no experience is needed. Let them now act as mature society and do not look at the things objectively and not get involved in petty things. For example, independent of this case, if there is a case and they want to give some incentive, it could be considered. He was also given 6 increments. The benefit should be given if they want nice people to continue and at the same time, if it is thought that it is not practical. Then they could recognise the people with some experience. What the gap means? The experience might not be continuous. It could be two years at a stretch and after some break, again a two years experience. People take time off to have families. If somebody is doing well, why that person should not get the benefit. They have seen the situations when the jobs are not available. If one has worked for three years and there is no job available and one has to spend one year elsewhere and comes back, how could that person be denied the advantage of that three years experience. They have to see the idea. How does it matter whether there is a gap or not? Let them look at the things in a broad way. Let them be more generous and have more wisdom.

When the Vice-Chancellor announced Item C-3, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill enquired about the decision on Item C-2(20).

The Vice-Chancellor said that he stated before he went out that the matter was accepted in principle. They were supposed to form a Committee. The similar cases were to be identified. Those cases were to come back to them on 24th September together. The time is inadequate. He suggested that let it come back to the next meeting of the Senate to be held in the first or second week of December. This is where the matter is.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired whether this case is pending with those cases. The Vice-Chancellor replied that this case is approved in principle.

Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Naresh Gaur said no to it. Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the meaning of approved in principle.

Professor Rajesh Gill asked for displaying the videography to see exactly what was decided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is saying it again and again that the members have to seek his permission before speaking. He said to Professor Keshav Malhotra that he could not speak without seeking his permission. They have a responsibility to do as they have 70 items ahead. The Senate meets only a couple of times in a year. The Senate deals with the issues which come to it after a body elected by them to do the work on their behalf does that and presents those things to them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are responsible persons.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the approval had already been granted on 6th February.

The Vice-Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting again. But the members continued the discussion.

When the meeting resumed, Professor R.P. Bambah said that the Vice-Chancellor had told him that all cases would come back to the Senate including this case. But in principle advantage has to be given in such a case. Therefore, the advantage is to be given to all the cases by the Senate together.

When Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa wanted to speak, the Vice-Chancellor said that no further discussion on this item.

IV. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-4 on the agenda**, was read out, viz.

C-4. That the date of promotion of Dr. Yajvender Pal be preponed and he be promoted from Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronics Engg. (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronics Engg. (Stage-2) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. 31.12.2008, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and 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. The letter of promotion has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 2(iii))

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that he had reservations about the **Items C-3, 4, 5** and related items. Earlier, they used to get the complete bio-data of the faculty members being appointed. But for the many years, they were not getting all these details in the absence of which they did not know exactly as to what kind of expertise and experience the candidates. This is very important because there are inter-department collaborations and collaborations with other institutions. He requested to look into it and the bio-data should be provided to the members. He had been writing about it but there was no response.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was not correct. The entire CVs are placed.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that these were not placed. That is why he was saying so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the entire CVs are placed before the Syndicate, the minutes of which are uploaded and sent to all the members. He assured that the same would be sent to Professor Akhtar Mahmood.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the minutes of Syndicate are provided to them before the Senate meeting when the same are confirmed. He requested that the Syndicate minutes and the agenda should be uploaded for the information of all the members well in advance so that they could come to know as to what they have to discuss.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate agenda papers are meant for the Syndicate members. If the Senate wanted to pass it, it is for the Senate to decide. But as of now this is the practice that he inherited and he has followed it. The Syndicate agenda is for the Syndicate members and it is not to be circulated to all the members of the Senate. He proposed something out of the box. They had discussed the issue in the previous Syndicate but the discussion is not complete. The matters which come to the Senate are endorsed by the Syndicate. As soon as the Syndicate endorses a matter, minutes are approved, then those items of a given Syndicate which have to go to the Senate, those would be sent as soon as the minutes of the Syndicate are approved. Then the members would receive in piecemeal as to what are the matters that would come to the Senate. But all this also has to envisage that the members have an advance information. But no matter would come to the Senate of a Syndicate meeting which is of a recent kind unless the matter is urgent like the Board of Finance which has certain deadlines. Otherwise only those matters would come to the Senate unless there is an emergency whose minutes have been approved and circulated at least 10 days before the start of the Senate meeting. Supposing they were meeting in the month of March and the next meeting would happen in the month of September. So between the period of March to September, all those items which have been approved by various meetings of the Syndicate and have to go to the Senate, they would keep sending all such items to the members which the members could read at their own leisure and had enough time to browse through the papers as to what is to be deliberated in the Senate meeting and there is no anxiety that so many things came in and how anybody could read all those things in a time of 10 days. So, he did propose this in the meeting of Syndicate held yesterday and the deliberations are going on. So, the Syndicate members are deliberating on their behalf as to how to reduce the huge volume being sent. But the Syndicate members have not yet fully deliberated on it and come back to him. If the Senate members have suggestions, they could send the same to him and he would put the same before the Syndicate members who have taken the responsibility to make the suggestions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Akhtar Mahmood has spoken something very pertinent which the Vice-Chancellor would appreciate that what has happened while approving some cases in the Senate that they did not have the background papers on the basis of which the item they are considering and approving. What used to happen earlier was that whatever papers were annexed with the agenda of the Syndicate item, the same papers were annexed with the Senate items also. What Professor Keshav Malhotra has suggested is that there is a via media that along with the minutes of the Syndicate, all the annexures which have been annexed with the agenda, those should also be annexed with the minutes where the annexure has been mentioned but the annexures are not annexed. So, at least the Senate should know as to what exactly the annexure says. That is what Professor Akhtar Mahmood has said that all background papers should be given on the basis of which the Syndicate has recommended to the Senate and the Senate should also consider those papers so that if there is some lacuna or something fabricated, deleted or added, that should be before them. That is what he wanted to suggest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had not started any new practice. He had been following what his predecessors were doing. If there is a desire that the agenda papers of the Syndicate should also be sent to all the Senate members as they receive the minutes of the Syndicate meetings, in some form whether written form or scanned form/soft copy which would save much of the paper. The agenda papers could be uploaded along with the minutes and whoever wanted, he/she could download the same.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that as and when the agenda papers for the Syndicate meeting are sent, these should be uploaded the same day.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that to make the system more accountable and transparent, he had already made a request in this regard when he was a member of the Syndicate, again repeating and pleading the same thing before this House that whatever agenda papers, either for the Syndicate or the Senate, they are receiving, the papers should be sent with all the annexures and the same thing should be uploaded on the Panjab University website where the link for the Syndicate/Senate is available. The discussion and resolved/decision part is uploaded on the Panjab University website but the related documents are not uploaded. Secondly, to make the system as non-transparent, they have done something like that the videography of the Senate could be asked only by a Senator, similar is the case with the Syndicate videography and these are not meant for others. It is a public document as all these are being prepared with the public money. He requested the House that they should decide in principle that whatever agenda is provided to them, the same should be provided with all the annexures and the same alongwith the annexures should also be uploaded on the Panjab University website so that anybody sitting anywhere in the world or even a remote village could have access to the same. If such persons wanted to know about some rules or wanted to take some benefit, they could also demand the same.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-4 on the agenda**, be approved.

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

C-5. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them.

Sr. No.	Name	Department
*1.	Dr. Gaurav Rattan (w.e.f 11.08.2014)	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 2(iv))		
2.	Dr. Amrita Sher Gill (w.e.f. 11.11.2012)	Economics
(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 2(i))		
3.	Dr. Namita (w.e.f. 14.08.2011)	Centre for Human Rights and Duties
(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 2(ii))		
*4.	Dr. Avneet Saini (w.e.f. 22.07.2014)	Biophysics
(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 2(iv))		
5.	Dr. Sarv narinder Kaur (w.e.f.05.03.2013)	Biophysics
(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 2(v))		

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.
4. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

6.	Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur (w.e.f. 4.8.2013)	Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education
(Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 Para 2(xv))		

NOTE:

1. As per decision of the Syndicate the appointment letter has been issued after obtaining the legal opinion.
2. The above recommendations of the Syndicate were placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para VI). But after discussion the Vice-Chancellor said that the item stands withdrawn and they would come back later on. In the meantime, he would follow it up with the UGC as mentioned in the legal opinion. If the UGC accords its approval the benefit would be given to all the similarly placed persons.
This was agreed to.
3. The issue of the promotion of Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur was discussed during Zero Hour in the meeting of Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 and it was agreed that the item in this regard be placed before the Senate on 24.09.2017 for consideration.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there were two cases, one is related with Dr. Namita and the other one of Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur which has been placed as table agenda. These two should also be clubbed with other cases of past service.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the case of Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur is little different in a way that she joined on a post when she was recruited as Assistant Professor in a regular manner because the nomenclature of that post was temporary likely to be permanent. Later such practice was stopped. Advertisement was made and against that post, on the same post she was selected. Meaning thereby that she would be considered as regular from the same date on which she was appointed on the same post. There is a latest judgment. The same issue was raised in the Senate in its meeting held in October 2016 and it was unanimously resolved for the same.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she has gone through the proceedings of the Syndicate and it was decided that legal opinion would be taken and clarification from UGC would be sought. All these papers neither the legal opinion nor the clarification are not attached with the item.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he is having the papers and could show the same.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that why these two cases should not be clubbed with the other cases as the same is being done in the case of others.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the papers are available in the files and they could have a look on the files.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the minutes of the Senate dated 9th October 2016 it is clearly mentioned that first it was approved but later on it is mentioned that “after some time the legal opinion was shown to Professor Keshav Malhotra, and the Vice-Chancellor said that now the item stands withdrawn and they would come back to it later on. In the meantime, he would follow it up with the UGC. If the UGC accords its approval, the benefit would be given to all the similarly placed persons.” So, it is very clear. There is no approval of the UGC with the papers.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to look in the files as everything is there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that so all the similarly placed cases of past service would be considered together.

When Shri V.K. Sibal enquired about C-3, the Vice-Chancellor said that there is no issue in C-3.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that if the Vice-Chancellor is saying that the regulation is in operation retrospectively, then it is okay.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said as far the UGC regulations are concerned, the date of 31st December 2008 is given there. If they go by the guidelines of 2010, the teachers were eligible even before 31.12.2008 but they have been given the Stage-2 from 31.12.2008 because from that date only, the UGC regulations are implemented.

RESOLVED: That all the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5 on the agenda**, be approved.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh abstained from the meeting when the **Item C-6** was considered.

VI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-6. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Gurmeet Singh (w.e.f. 27.7.2016)	Hindi
(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 2(iii))		
2.	Dr. Amit Chauhan (Mechanical Engg) (w.e.f 06.06.2016)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 2(vi))		
3.	Dr. Vishal Gupta (Computer Science & Engg.) (w.e.f. 03.07.2016)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 2(viii))		

- 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.
 4. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate

VII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-7 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-7. That the Dr. Vinod Kumar, Assistant Professor in Economics be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. 27.02.2014 under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs. 9000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the 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.
4. The letter of promotion has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 2(i))

VIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-8 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

C-8. That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (Stage-4) to Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (Stage-5) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f the date mentioned against each, 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 incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. Dr. Harish Kumar | : | 01.07.2016 |
| 2. Dr. Sarbjeet Singh | : | 01.07.2016 |
| 3. Dr. Sakshi Kaushal | : | 01.07.2016. |

- 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 candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to third amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 4. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 Para 2(vii))

Dr. Parveen Goyal enquired as to what is the essential academic qualification for becoming a Professor in CAS promotion in Computer Science Engineering. The essential qualification as per UGC is Ph.D. degree with first class in Bachelor or Master degree in the appropriate branch of engineering. Under the item, there are three cases under CAS promotion. But in the API proforma attached, one column is incomplete. It should have been complete. There is no mention of as to which branch of the engineering branch the candidate has qualified. They have to give the promotions as per UGC CAS rules. They have already undergone some problem in the June 2013.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired specifically as to what had been violated.

Continuing, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that it was nowhere mentioned whether the candidates had the Ph.D. degree in computer science engineering or in science.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the computer science is an application oriented area. In the University, the Department of Computer Science is a part of the Faculty of Science but not a part of the Faculty of Engineering. But that did not mean that if somebody had done Ph.D. in Computer Science, he/she could not be a Professor of Computer Science and Engineering in University Institute of Engineering and Technology (UIET). Where is this narrow definition that Ph.D. in Computer Science which in a given University is in the Faculty of Science, could not be a Professor of Computer Science and Engineering in an Engineering Institution. Such kind of narrow interpretation has no meaning in the academics.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that there is a lot of difference between Computer Science and Engineering. Secondly, for the recruitment of a Lecturer or Assistant Professor in Computer Science in Engineering UGC is first class M.E. or M.Tech. in appropriate branch of engineering and technology as per UGC Gazette Notification 18.9.2008 (4.4.c). But in case of Science, for recruitment of Lecturer or Assistant Professor in Departments of Sciences is Master degree with NET qualified or Ph.D. There is a lot of difference between the recruitment of Lecturer or Assistant Professor between engineering and science. Then how could they equate both these in the case of promotions under CAS. He is not against anybody. But they should not violate the UGC guidelines.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that there is no violation of UGC rules. He did not think that this governing body should abandon its responsibility of providing an academic administration. A person is an Associate Professor in Department of Computer Science and Engineering in the UIET. When he/she has done Ph.D. while in service in his/her subject and the Computer Scientist is there and in a University where the Computer Science falls under the Faculty of Science or does it matter or could they say that a person is not entitled to CAS promotion in a discipline in which he has published papers and obtained the Ph.D. and also guide the students in that area, according to him, they should not involve the UGC in all these things. He proposed that this is not a matter for which they should refer to the UGC.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that in the year 2010-11, there was a case that an Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering of UIET got enrolled in Department of Chemical Engineering, the candidate was disqualified and the RDC was again held. But this is the case of science subject and the person is doing Ph.D. in science. How could such a person become a Professor on the basis of this qualification? This should be kept in view.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that the qualification when the person is recruited directly is applicable and in interdisciplinary subjects like engineering, basic sciences are taught. Once a person is recruited directly, then till the Professorship, he/she would earn all the promotions and no qualification equivalent to that level of engineering would be applicable. If a person is appointed as Assistant Professor in Chemistry, then that person should be allowed to go up to Professor as far as CAS is concerned. In case of CAS, direct qualifications are not applicable in case of promotions. This had been done in many cases. There are teachers in management also who are basically psychologists, political scientists and go up to the level of Professor. At the level of direct recruitment, they should see what are the qualifications and the specialisation. Once a person enters the service, he/she should get all the opportunities as the others are getting.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if they see the name of the experts who were there at the time of selection (at page 90 of the CAS proceedings), all of them belonged to a particular field of computer science and engineering. Even all the experts belonging to different areas (mentioned in the item C-39), they also conducted the CAS proceedings without giving any note that the candidates were not eligible. He said that all the candidates are eligible under CAS.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he could get from Professor B.S. Ghuman and also convinced and it should be seen on the basis of which qualification the person into question has been appointed as Assistant Professor in UIET. If that person has continued on the basis of that qualification, then, of course, as Professor Ghuman said that he should be allowed to go up to Professor. Again he is saying at the cost of repetition, they should see as to what they were considering even without the application of the candidate not having been annexed with the agenda and did not know the particulars of the candidate while considering his request for promotion under CAS, nothing is mentioned. What he could gather is that probably the candidate was selected as Assistant Professor in UIET on the basis of an M.Tech. degree and not MCA. Had he been recruited as Assistant Professor in UIET on the basis of MCA and thereafter if he pursues Ph.D. in computer science, he could understand it. What they need to understand is the difference between the computer science technology and computer science applications. There is a difference of hardware and software. According to him, 70% of the course content in the computer science is software and 30% hardware and vice-versa 70% hardware in engineering and technology and 30% software. There are some universities where Mathematics is in Science Faculty like Panjab University. There are some universities where Mathematics falls under Arts Faculty. So, it does not matter under which the candidate has done Ph.D. What matter is in which subject he has done his Ph.D.? According to UGC, it should be in the concerned field. Why the candidate has not done Ph.D. in Computer Science Engineering and Technology and had the papers been there, he would have been able to contribute more. But to say that they have to decide what is equivalent to UGC. He is not opposing any case. But while considering in the Senate, they should at least know what they were doing and that they could know only if all the papers had been annexed. He is sure that the members of the Syndicate must have been supplied those papers, unlike they as members of the Senate have not been supplied the papers even along with minutes of the Syndicate wherein recommendation for the promotion is being made. In this light, according to him, this needs clarification about what is the difference between computer science and computer engineering.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Dr. Harish Kumar was appointed directly as Reader in the year 2010. Did they not know at that time that the qualifications were not proper? Now it is a case of CAS and it should be cleared as the candidate is possessing the qualification of B.Tech., M.Tech. and has also done Ph.D. in Computer. He did not know as to what is the deficiency. It should not be so. Since the candidate is having the Ph.D., the case should be cleared.

Professor Chaman Lal said that it is just complication of technicalities. Somewhere Computer Science is part of Computer Science Faculty as well as Computer Science and Engineering. When the qualifications for recruitment are to be prepared, at that time it should be very clear that if a person is being recruited in Computer Science and Engineering, it should be clearly mentioned whether MCA or M.Tech. is the requirement. In some universities, it is M.Tech. while in others it is MCA. For all practical purposes, the promotion could not be debarred because he has become a part of Engineering Faculty though coming from Computer Science Faculty. But these things should be taken care of at least for future that when the qualifications are to be prepared it should be clearly

mentioned that the candidate should be for both kind of things otherwise later on it creates complications. According to him, no person should be debarred from promotion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about Dr. Harish Kumar, he completed Ph.D. in the year 2009 and after that, in fact, he was directly appointed as a Reader on 12.05.2010 on the basis of the qualifications which he already had, i.e., M.Tech. in Computer Science and Engineering and Ph.D. in Computer Science. After that, the candidate could not be debarred from promotion as Professor. Secondly, what Shri Ashok Goyal says that the course content of Computer Science and Engineering, it is not 70% hardware, it is almost 70-90% software and only little bit of hardware.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are evolving things and it is not an issue at all. Professor G.D. Sondhi's grandson is a theoretical Physicist. He was the Head of the Bell Labs Theory Group. He is a Professor of Electrical Engineering in Princeton University and Dean of Graduate Admissions in Electrical Engineering.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is no issue in it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the clarification from the UGC should be sought on this issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no need of seeking any clarification from UGC. So many complaints were filed before his promotion case came in. He had put up all the complaints before the Selection Committee. The Chancellor's nominee on the Selection Committee was none other than Professor Ravi Grover who was India's negotiator in nuclear deal and is also a member of the Atomic Energy Commission even today. He was also the Vice-Chancellor of Homi Bhabha National Institute which got a NAAC accreditation of 3.55 when the NAAC team was headed by none other than Professor R.C. Sobti. A person of the stature of Professor Ravi Grover just disregarded whatever the objections were there. He (Vice-Chancellor) did not hide the complaints that came to him. He sent all those complaints which Professor Ravi Grover said that all those complaints are frivolous and no need to bother about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had they got the papers annexed with the item, might be he could not have spoken. It has just come to his information that the person has been directly appointed as Reader on the basis of the same qualifications. Why the papers have not been annexed?

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not by intent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then what else it is.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal could accuse him but he did not accept that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the papers have not been annexed with other items also, he is not saying so just for this item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already decided in future all the agenda papers sent to the Syndicate would be uploaded along with the minutes as and when the same are uploaded.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether it has been decided.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'yes', they have just taken a decision.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-8 on the agenda**, be approved.

IX. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-9 on the agenda** were read out viz. –

C-9. That recommendations of the Committee dated 19.03.2016 (Appendix) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to decision of the Senate dated 27.09.2015 (Para LV) along with additional papers.

(Syndicate dated 1/15.5.2016 Para 16)

NOTE: 1. In the Senate meeting dated 27.3.2016 (Appendix) (Para XXXV), the Vice-Chancellor said that the papers related to the item were sent to the members in a sealed cover on 21st March relating to the recommendation of a Committee which looked into the Garg Committee report relating to the conduct of one the members of the House. There is an action taken report. There was a Garg Committee the report of which was put up in the Senate and the Senate had directed certain things to be done and this is the output of that. He requested the members to have a look and take up as the time progresses.

This was agreed to.

2. The report of the Enquiry Committee pursuant to the Syndicate meeting dated 26.04.2014 was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.01.2015 as Item No. 44 and it was resolved that for the time being, the consideration of the item be deferred and the item be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting and all the relevant documents/annexures be supplied to the members in sealed envelopes. The matter was again placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 as Item No.29 and it was resolved that the report of the Enquiry Committee be forwarded to the Senate.

The Senate at its meeting held on 27.09.2015 (Para LV) (Item C-63) considered the enquiry report forwarded by the Syndicate and it was resolved that:

- (1) the report of the Enquiry Committee, pursuant to a discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26.04.2014, be accepted; and
- (2) a Committee, comprising members of Senate and the Syndicate, be constituted to give input/ recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor ensuring that no injustice is done to any individual and at the same

time, the operating system in the University is made foolproof.

Pursuant to the decision of the Senate, the Committee was constituted and recommendations of the Committee were sent to the Fellows vide letter No. S.T. 2902-300 dated 21.03.2016. In addition to this some additional papers concerning to Action Taken Report in respect of Senate Para LV dated 27.09.2015 were also sent to the Fellows.

A copy of letter No. 12094-97/C dated 29.6.2016 sent to Special Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab and D.P.I., (Colleges), Chandigarh is enclosed (Appendix).

3. The above item was placed before the Senate as an information item (I-1) in its meeting dated 24.07.2016 but the same could not be taken up and again was placed before the Senate on 3.9.2016 as an information item (I-1). The same was read out and noted by the Senate.
4. During the General discussion in the meeting of the Senate dated 9.10.2016 Ambassador I.S. Chadha raised the issue in this regard and said that the fact is that a committee set up by the Senate had made recommendations, this is incumbent on the Senate to consider those recommendations as to whether these recommendations were wholly or partially acceptable or rejected, whatever. He said that they cannot just say to note it by way of these heaps of papers. A copy of relevant page of senate proceeding is enclosed (Appendix). The proceedings of the senate dated 9.10.2016 have already been finalized after inviting the objection/discrepancies from the Fellow, and have also been uploaded on the P.U. website.
5. The above item i.e. C-32 was placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 26.3.2017 and it was resolved that consideration of the item be deferred and the item be put up in the beginning of the agenda in the next meeting of the Senate.
6. A detailed office note enclosed (Appendix).

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that this is an old agenda item which somehow has got delayed and was not considered in successive Senate meetings. It is a report of a Committee under his Chairmanship and the Senate has to take a decision on that report. He presumed that it accepts the report, then the recommendations made therein would be implemented if they are not already being implemented in some degree. He made a point that the recommendation in relation to Mr. Munish Verma has now become infructuous. The recommendation made in this report is that he should be removed as a member of the Senate. This was long ago when he was a member of the Senate, but now he is no longer a member of the Senate. Therefore, that recommendation does not make any sense. The question, therefore, is do they still need to take some action in this regard to Mr. Munish Verma. His feeling is 'yes', because if he (Mr. Munish Verma) remains eligible to contest the election from the Graduate constituency. He did contest this time but could not make it. But if his name remains on the electoral rolls and if he remains eligible to seek election as a Senator, that would be defeating the intent of this recommendation. There is a provision in Section 37 (page 14) of the Panjab University Act that "the Chancellor, with the concurrence of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Senate shall have power to remove the name of any person from the register of Registered Graduates". Therefore, if they invoke this provision and take a decision now to recommend to the Chancellor to remove his (Mr. Munish Verma) name from the register of Registered Graduates, then the intent behind the recommendation of removing him as a member of the Senate would be fulfilled and he would never be eligible to seek election as Senator again.

Some of the members said that the recommendation be accepted.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in this case whatever has been the finding. His argument is only pertaining to the case of Professor Karanbir Singh. All proceedings qua him be dropped, if any because there was no complaint against him whether in writing or oral and there are contradictions between the Deputy Registrar's (Conduct) statement and the actual what happened. He is having the RTI information. Even in the meeting on 27th September, 2015, there is a statement of the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue of Mr. Karanbir Singh is a separate one. Right now they are taking a call on Mr. Munish Verma. That issue is arising out of it.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that then the House might decide anything but anything qua Professor Karanbir Singh in this case be dropped.

Some of the members agreed to it.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that this should form a part of the resolved part.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Mr. Karanbir's case has already been handled by the court.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether they could debar Mr. Munish Verma from contesting the election.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Ambassador I.S. Chadha read out the provision and most of the members have approved it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to what has been resolved in Item C-9, whether Mr. Munish Verma has been debarred from contesting the election?

The Vice-Chancellor said that his (Mr. Munish Verma) name is recommended to be removed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that for this recommendation, they need 2/3rd majority meaning that they need 61 members who say 'yes'. He is against it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 61 members meant the present members and not of the total number.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to what is the provision? It is 2/3rd members of the Senate, that meant that they need 61 persons in favour of removing the name of Mr. Munish Verma. He enquired whether there are 61 persons present in the House. Let them follow the Calendar in spirit.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that the question of 2/3rd majority arises only when there is voting. There is no voting and he presumed that what he has suggested has the unanimous approval of the House.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not unanimous as some people are objecting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said no to it.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to whether it is 2/3rd of the present or is it 2/3rd of the total.

Some of the members said that it is 2/3rd of the present members.

Professor Chaman Lal appreciated the concern of the House that they should remove the name for the conduct of the Senator. His (Mr. Munish Verma) name should be removed from Registered Graduates and that has an implication which means that his Graduation degree is also got debarred. He meant to say that generally the Courts say that speaking orders should be passed which means that the explanation should be given. They could recommend that his (Mr. Munish Verma) name be removed because of his conduct and this person should not be allowed to contest the Senate election from the Registered Graduate Constituency. This explanation should be given and when the Chancellor gives the order only then it would stand the test in the Court.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that the clause is very clear that "the Chancellor, with the concurrence of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Senate shall have power to remove the name of any person from the register of Registered Graduates". Wherever there is an intention that it should be present and voting like in the Constitution, it is provided there. Here it is not provided. As per his knowledge of law, 2/3rd members of the Senate means 2/3rd of the total members of the Senate but not of the present and voting. But in the case of Constitutional amendment, the majority of the members present at that particular time, 2/3rd of the present and voting but not less than 50% of the total members. For Parliament majority wherever it is required, it is particularly mentioned whether it is 2/3rd of the present and voting. In the case of the Senate it is 2/3rd of the total strength of the Senate. There are certain rulings in Municipal laws. At some time, there were 20 members out of which 3 resigned, then the question was raised whether it would be majority of the total or of the present and voting. The Court says that unless it is prescribed of present and voting, it would be total members. He is legally speaking so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the Chapter II(A)(i) The Senate, under Regulation 20(b) it is mentioned that all questions shall be decided by majority of votes of the members present and voting.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that wherever the Parliament wanted as 2/3rd of the present and voting, it has been clearly mentioned there. In the clause for the removal from the register of Registered Graduates, the present and voting is not mentioned, but it is mentioned as 2/3rd of the members of the Senate. That was the intention which the Vice-Chancellor is saying. There are different clauses and different requirements. Somewhere it is the requirement of simple majority, somewhere 2/3rd majority, somewhere 2/3rd of the present and voting, somewhere simple of the present and voting. The law says that they have to see the intention of a particular regulation which they refer. One could not read and import any other article while interpreting this clause. Secondly, this matter has to go to the Chancellor and they (Senate) are not the final authority. This resolution has to go to the Chancellor. Supposing they approve it and the Chancellor says that it is not 2/3rd majority of the members, then they would make mockery of the whole House. According to his interpretation strictly legally speaking, it has to be 2/3rd of the total number of the members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever is written is the concurrence of the Senate members. Obviously, if they decide today that the Registrar would send a letter for concurrence of all the members whether they are in favour or not in favour and if it is 2/3rd, then the matter goes to the Chancellor. If the majority is not 2/3rd, obviously it is dropped.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that in order to assess whether this kind of proposal which is being now suggested would receive the support of the 2/3rd of the members of the Senate, it is essential that every single member of the Senate responds to the Registrar's query. If they do receive, if they say that the 2/3rd of the total members is 61 or 62, if they receive 62 assents, then the matter would have been settled by 2/3rd majority. He did not know whether there is a precedent how this kind of poll had been conducted in the past. But if that is the wish of the Senate, they could do that and if they do receive consent of 2/3rd of the members of the Senate, then they could go forward.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that basically two issues are involved in it. One is about the conduct of an ex-Fellow Mr. Munish Verma and the other is that the Committee was formed as to how to make the system foolproof in future so that such things did not happen. Now, they are discussing only one part but not discussing the second part. As far as first part regarding cancellation of the appointment of the Fellow is concerned, since now Mr. Munish Verma is not a Fellow of the University, the question of cancellation of the appointment has become null and void. Secondly, the register of Registered Graduates is the list of electors. Whether the Senate has taken a decision that first it should be done and then they go according to law or they are taking it *suo moto* that these are recommendations of the Committee. It is very vague. If they are taking this decision, he is against it as he has already recorded his dissent, they should follow the Calendar. If they have to remove the name of a Registered Graduate from the register of Registered Graduates, as Shri Satya Pal Jain has said, they need 2/3rd of the members of the Senate. The 2/3rd majority out of 91 would be 61 members. As per the roll call, there is not this attendance of 61 members. Then it is not the issue. The second important thing is as to how to make the system foolproof. Could they say on record that all the Assistant Superintendents and Superintendents which are being appointed, are all those approved. They say that since the recommendation comes from the Principals, that is why they appoint them. But there are cases of guest faculty also which have been recommended by the Principals. When the examination is conducted, such teachers are not on the rolls of

the Colleges and these guest faculty members are appointed as Superintendents. It is also not sure whether those persons would continue in the College or not. The Principals recommend the names two months before the start of the examination when the teacher is on the rolls of the University although he/she is not approved teacher of the University. Still there are lacunae in the system about which they are silent. He had pointed out this in the last Senate also. He is not diverting from the agenda, still there are so many flaws in the examination system. It should be discussed that there are two parts of the Enquiry Committee. The first part is not applicable as on today as neither that person is a Fellow nor they have 61 members present in the Senate. If there is a majority of 61 members and they could remove the name from the Registered Graduates, then he would have no objection. But there is no use of discussing this today. They should also think about how to make the examination system foolproof.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if they are going to follow the recommendations made by Ambassador I.S. Chadha, there are certain members present and they could take a roll call as to how many of them are in support of barring Mr. Munish Verma so that this task is over. From getting the response of the remaining members, the Registrar could send a letter.

On a point of order, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that this could not be the way. They have to take this decision in a particular meeting in the presence of the members.

Continuing, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they need to expedite this matter and could not allow it go on for years together. They could take the votes of the present members and the Registrar could get the consent of the remaining members.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this could save the time.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that there are two provisions. One is about the Senate membership. The other thing is the question of how do they vote in the Senate when a question is debated. In this case, an enquiry was conducted and it was accepted and the issue is arising out of that. Now the Senate is having a look at it and for that they have to see the members present and voting. In law, there is some harmonious construction. When there are two provisions, they have to harmonise the same. They have to see both the provisions. He personally felt that there is a need to harmonise that. Since they are debating this issue, they should now be looking at the members present and voting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to him, now they are considering the recommendations of the Committee. The Committee has not recommended the deletion of his (Mr. Munish Verma) name from the register of Registered Graduates. Could anything be decided even without agenda qua that before them? Secondly, he is not questioning the authority of the Committee. But for his consumption, he wanted to understand that the Committee which was constituted comprising the members of the Syndicate and Senate dated 27th September 2015 to give input recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor on ensuring proper appointment of Superintendents in the University examination centres and that no injustice is done to any individual and at the same time, the operating system in the University is made foolproof. This was the jurisdiction of the Committee which was constituted as per the decision of the Senate. But because after the discussion in the Senate, it was said that they are accepting the report. But he had said that the genesis of the report is a complaint by the Flying Squad which had reported the irregularity and as per the University's own admission in writing, on that particular date, no flying squad visited that Centre. So it was said that the genesis of the report or the genesis of the

accusation itself is not based on facts. However, it was said that they were not interested in punishing, the DVDs of the meeting could be seen, but they want the examination system to be made foolproof for which a Committee would be constituted to give the inputs. Now the Committee has come with the inputs that such and such person should be removed from the Senate, this should be recommendation though that was discussed only when they had discussed the original report of the Committee which had gone into the facts of the case. This Committee was to give only the inputs as to how to streamline the system. But the Committee has come out with a recommendation which the earlier Committee within whose jurisdiction it was to suggest what is to be done, even it did not suggest anything. But this Committee whose jurisdiction was only to suggest what are the foolproof systems to streamline the examination system in the University, it is saying that he (Mr. Munish Verma) be removed. But since that recommendation, as rightly pointed out by Ambassador I.S. Chadha, has become infructuous as he (Mr. Munish Verma) is no more a member of the Senate. Now, if at all they have to consider any other proposal which is not contained in the recommendations of the Committee, could it be said here only that let they take the recommendation because the Chairman of the Committee is saying in the House. After all, what are they doing. It has to go to the Chancellor as Shri Satya Pal Jain has rightly said that here 2/3rd Senate means, they could not go in piecemeal that they ask 50 people on a particular day and the remaining on some other day. Once the decision is taken, they have to ask all the members as to what are their views on the recommendations of the Committee. Since this recommendation has become infructuous because of the fact that the man against whom the recommendation has been made is no more a member of the Senate. There is a proposal which was discussed in the Senate though no decision could be taken under the regulations. It could not be done they take the viewpoints of the members present today and from the remaining later on. That meant that those who would be asked subsequently, would they not be influenced by what the members have said today. Are they taking independent opinion or they want opinion to be influenced by members. That is what he wanted to say. He suggested that whatever is to be decided, an item be brought and only thereafter whatever is provided in the Regulations that should be followed.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan said that he has studied the report in which only one person (Senator) is being held guilty. The Principal had recommended the name. Mr. Munish Verma has not signed the form. The conduct branch assigns the duties. Since he is the Principal of a College, he also sends the teachers of the teachers. The conduct branch assigns the duty only after looking into the list. Where was the lacunae? Has any action been taken against the person in the conduct branch as to how the duty was assigned to the person? If the action is not taken against the official then why the action is to be taken against a Senator who has not even signed the form. It could not be done that on the asking by a person they are removing Mr. Munish Verma from the Senate. Why there is no action against the persons who assigned the duty. First take action against the official only then they could consider action against the Senator.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that Panjab University is a big University and has a good reputation in the world. If any such an incident happens, it brings disrepute to the University. The outside people do not know as to who had assigned the duty and who had recommended. They also do not know who is at fault. But the prestige of the University suffers and the effects are felt for a long time. Such kind of incident involving any employee of the University or some outside persons comes to their notice after a long time. He has a firm view and it could be possible that some hon'ble members might feel anguished with it. Whenever any such incident comes to their knowledge and is proved, whoever might be the person belonging to any group, they should not show any leniency and strict action should be taken so that no person could dare to do such things in future. It should be applicable to all. If they say that it was a recommendation of such

and such person, then no Enquiry Committee would conduct the enquiry. It is not a criminal trial of murder by a Court where 100% evidence is required. Secondly, when they start taking action, the election for the Senate is to be held after three years, by taking such a drastic step of revoking the name of someone, it should be done after giving a proper thought and as per the law. If they take half-baked decision and the person challenges the same in the Court and submits the orders from the Court, then it would be more insulting. Therefore, they should not take half-baked and sudden decisions. They have already faced such situations where the persons were involved in many cases against whom the University had taken action and the same was reversed by the Court on the basis of violation of principles of natural justice. In such cases, the persons who had taken the action also get demoralised. Thirdly, whenever such an incident comes to their notice, the same should be taken to its logical end. He has been associated with the House for a long time and has seen both the peaks. Sometimes a decision is taken that the person should be punished. After some gap of having taken the decision, due to some review or such like petition, the same persons favour the persons whom they had earlier punished. Therefore, 5-6 persons sit together and make their mind on the issue. The persons from every section should be involved in it. It should neither be made an issue of vote nor college versus University teachers nor Senator versus non-Senator nor of the Conduct or Examination branch. They should take the decision objectively. There have been instances in the High Court also, Shri V.K. Sibal must be knowing it, the persons have forged the signatures of the High Court Judges and getting the bail. But whenever the incident comes to the notice, action should be taken and taken to its logical end due to which nobody would dare to repeat. If they take half-baked decisions, then the other persons would also indulge in such activities on the plea that since the action has not been taken against any person, the other persons would also indulge in the same thing. Therefore, they should take a firm stand even if it anguishes someone. He is a public man and if he says something here, he gets phone calls after the meeting as to why he has said such and such things. But in the interest of the institution unless they have the capacity to take bitter decisions also, they could not perform the responsibility that has been entrusted upon them.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is very sorry to say that the Syndicate or the Senate could not resolve this issue going on since 2014 despite having eminent Principals, Professors and members like Professor B.S. Ghuman and Ambassador I.S. Chadha. The matter had been twice discussed in the Syndicate and Senate. Once the issue could not be taken up in the Senate on the plea that it was coming in the agenda very late and decided that it should be brought in the agenda in the beginning. But today since the item has been put in the agenda in the beginning, now they are saying that such and such thing could not be done. Ultimately, they all together are destroying the reputation of the University. A Committee which had been constituted by the Vice-Chancellor had submitted its report and they had accepted the report. Thereafter, the culprit had to be awarded the punishment. When it came to award the punishment recommended by the Committee, that person (Mr. Munish Verma) was a Fellow. They deliberately prolonged the matter so that the person could remain a Senator and no decision was taken. Now they are saying that there is no recommendation. There was a recommendation regarding the cancellation from the Senate. Ambassador I.S. Chadha has clearly read out the regulation. If they did not want to take action against anybody, then why they are wasting the money of the University and wasting time. The newsmen are sitting here and they would also say that all this is being done to save a Fellow. Now, he (Mr. Munish Verma) is not a Fellow and even if they cancel the Fellowship today, nobody could say whether that person would contest the next election or not. Whether the cancellation is done or not, that person has an opportunity to approach the Court. The person did not appear before the Enquiry Committee to save himself but they are becoming his witness. If the action is not to be taken, they should not waste the time of the House and the

money of the University. As said by Ambassador I.S. Chadha, they are talking about removal of the name of that person from the register of Registered Graduates, what kind of effect it would have, it would send a message that the University is taking action against its own Fellow. If they did not want to take a decision, some other such items would come and go on in this way.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in this case not only one person is guilty but so many persons are involved. He pointed out that Mr. Gurnam Chand was appointed as Centre Superintendent at an examination centre in Jalalabad about 15 years ago. He (Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal) was working at Garhdiwala and went on flying squad duty to Jalalabad and caught impersonation cases at that Centre. This could be verified from the records. Therefore, the action should be initiated against all the guilty persons. Regarding the 2/3rd majority there could be a solution that they could solicit the response of the members who are absent today whether they are in favour or against. Then they could come to know as to how many persons are in favour and how many against. There is no use of raising the hands because sometimes one raises his/her hand even not being interested. The Registrar could send a mail to the members and then it could be known. He suggested that in addition to Mr. Gurnam Chand, the officials of the conduct or the examination branch and others involved should also be punished.

The Vice-Chancellor while responding said that the genesis of the case is a complaint by a sitting member of the Syndicate that an incident of this kind occurred. When the first time, the sitting member of the Syndicate complained, then several sitting members of the Syndicate at that time said that it is a very serious case and should be investigated and severe punishment should be given. One of the sitting Syndicate members at that time is also currently a member of this House. So, an enquiry was conducted. Sitting members of the Syndicate were made members of this enquiry. When the report is presented, one of the sitting members said that (p.112) said that he did not attend the meeting of the enquiry as he was afraid. So, this is a case which has a very murky history, an extremely murky history. He agreed that nothing should be done as Shri Satya Pal Jain has said that which could ultimately result that due to some technicalities whatever the Syndicate had recommended, it becomes null and void. He accepted and recommended what Shri Satya Pal Jain has said. Let the people look into this in entirety in the background that something should be done on behalf of the governing body of this University that they respect that spirit when the case came to the genesis that the severest action should be taken that nobody, at least no member of the Senate, no member of the governing body of this House should indulge in this thing. Something is done by a petty official in the University under whatever pressure, let they not equate that with a misconduct by a sitting member of the Senate. He (the member) should not say that until the officials are punished, they would not allow the punishment to the member of the governing body. There is an inequality inherent. The members of the governing body have to have an exemplary record otherwise the society would not have confidence in the governing body. Let they do the things carefully. He requested Shri Satya Pal Jain to chair such a Committee and have people like Shri V.K. Sibal and whatever other members that he deems appropriate across the opinion in the House and come back to it because they have to take just a decision on behalf of the Senate. He would be happy if this matter concludes before his term ends.

Professor Chaman Lal suggested that Shri Satya Pal Jain, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa from the legal profession, Ambassador I.S. Chadha discuss the matter threadbare and come up recommendation and on the basis of that recommendation whatever has been suggested, the Registrar should send the same for approval to the Senate members. He said that it would be a wiser Committee. He respects Shri Satya Pal Jain but there could be other complications also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has suggested Shri Satya Pal Jain, Shri V.K. Sibal and he would have a few more members.

Professor Chaman Lal said that a wiser Committee be formed which could include Mrs. Anu Chatrath and Ambassador I.S. Chadha.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was not proposing the name of Ambassador I.S. Chadha because somebody has to take a call on whatever he has suggested.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the report of the Committee should come up before the December meeting of the Senate. He has suggested some names for the 7-member Committee and the Vice-Chancellor could finalise the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Satya Pal Jain whether he would like to spell out those names or would like to discuss those names with him (Vice-Chancellor) later on.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he has no problem whether he is made a Chairman of the Committee or a member. He is ready to perform the duty. But as the names have been suggested, it might be that someone might have objection of his becoming as Chairman. Therefore, the Vice-Chancellor should form a Committee which should not be an all-party Committee. The Committee should be formed in such a way that it could objectively look into the matter. It should not be such a case that if his (Shri Satya Pal Jain) name is suggested, the name of the other person has also to be there, it is not an all-party Committee. It does not matter whether he is made a Chairman of the Committee or a member or a special invitee. If his assistance is required even if he is not made a member of the Committee, he is ready to help. It is the question of performing the job for saving the image, integrity and honesty of the University. He is ready to go to any extent possible and has no reservation at all. But if his name is suggested, the other name has also to come simultaneously, according to him that should not be the spirit. He said that they authorise the Vice-Chancellor to constitute the Committee and he is ready to provide his services anywhere. There is no problem at all.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that let Shri Satya Pal Jain be the Chairman.

The Vice-Chancellor asked if the members authorise him to constitute the Committee to which most of the members said, 'yes', they authorise the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to what would be the domain of this Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the Committee would examine everything and recommend some action in particular so that the governing body members should not be seen doing what has happened. As Shri Satya Pal Jain said, a Committee would be appointed. He has been given an authorisation to appoint that Committee which would look into the thing in entirety and since a former member of this House has been seen doing something which is inappropriate. So, they have to recommend some action that if some corrective action could be taken vis-a-vis that no one from this House should ever do and if necessary something is to be recommended that such a person should not become a member of this House. Whatever is possible, they would look into the things in entirety and come back to it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested that the report of the Committee should be submitted by the Committee before the December meeting of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could request but could not force the things.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since the Centre Superintendent and Assistant Superintendents for the examinations are appointed in the month of November, they should also do something in this regard.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the recommendations of the Committee dated 19.03.2016 (Appendix) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to decision of the Senate dated 27.09.2015 (Para LV) along with additional papers, be accepted; and
- (ii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee to examine the matter in its entirety and to determine the nature of the action to be taken against Sh. Munish Verma under the provisions of Regulations of Panjab University so as to resist his membership to the Senate in future and the recommendations of the Committee be placed before the Senate in its next meeting.

X.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-10, on the agenda** was read out viz.–

C-10. That -

- (i) the term of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, the present Dean of University Instruction be not extended beyond 06.06.2017;
- (ii) Professor Meenakshi Malhotra be appointed as the Dean of University Instruction for a period of one year w.e.f. the date she joins, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and
- (iii) In case, Professor Meenakshi Malhotra proceeds on ex-India leave, during the leave period of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, Professor Shankarji Jha will officiate as Dean of University Instruction.

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

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 3)

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether Professor Shankarji Jha would officiate as Dean of University Instruction only when Professor Meenakshi Malhotra proceeds on ex-India leave or even during other leave also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was relevant on that day when she had applied to go. She decided eventually not to proceed on leave and now this part has actually become infructuous.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is good. He suggested that in future whenever the Dean of University Instruction proceeds on leave, it would be better if the next senior most person is given the charge of Dean of University Instruction. Otherwise there would be heart burning as other persons are below in the hierarchy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Dean of University Instruction goes on one day leave and then asking somebody to come to occupy the Dean of University Instruction office would not be appropriate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the officiating charge should be given if the Dean of University Instruction goes on leave for a week.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. But for a day or two that is not appropriate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what they do when the Dean of University Instruction goes on leave for a day or two.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that there is the Director, Research Promotion Cell who is a part of the Vice-Chancellor office and request that person just to perform the duty of the Dean of University Instruction for a day.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to introduce the Dean of University Instruction.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Dean of University Instruction is not in the meeting for the first time. She had attended the last meeting also.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor did not introduce the Dean of University Instruction. He would like her to spell out the agenda for the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not asking her to do so.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had said that if she desires to do so.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that she desires the University to go ahead and progress.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-10 on the agenda**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That in case the Dean of University Instruction proceeds on leave for a week or more, the next senior most person would officiate as Dean of University Instruction.

XI.

The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-11 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

C-11. That the title of Professor Emeritus be conferred on the following distinguished teachers of Panjab University:

1. Professor B.S. Brar : Political Science
(Re-employment upto 20.08.2107
Department of Political Science,
Panjab University
P.U. # 733, Sector 11-B'
Chandigarh
2. Professor Sudesh Kaur Khanduja : Mathematics
Retd. Professor, Department of
Mathematics
Panjab University
1297, Sector 37-B
Chandigarh-160036
3. Professor B.M. Deb, FNA, FTWAS : Chemistry
(Retd.)
INSA Senior Scientist
Visva Bharti University
6 A.J.C. Bose Road
Kolkata-700017

4. Professor Suman Bala Beri : Physics
Retd. Professor, Department of
Physics
Panjab University
Chandigarh
5. Professor Rani Balbir Kaur : Indian Theatre
Retd. Professor, Department of Indian
Theatre
359, Sector 9-D
Chandigarh

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 3)

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Syndicate in its meeting held on 25.6.2017 decided to confer the status of Professor Emeritus on five teachers and a Committee was to be formed which must have held a meeting. He enquired as to what are the criteria adopted for conferring the status on these five persons and how these persons have been selected. In the meeting of the Syndicate, there was some tussle on the issue of the term. The Vice-Chancellor was authorised to form a Committee on the issue of term and this Committee held its meeting on 19th July 2017. Thereafter, the recommendations of the Committee were to be placed before the Syndicate. He enquired whether these recommendations were placed before the Syndicate. While recommending these names has it been seen whether the person who had also got the re-employment had done any work after the retirement. It seems that a pick and choose policy has been adopted and it should be deferred. The person at Sr.No.1 had retired in the year 2012 and got re-employment for five years. If a person has a desire to serve the University during his/her lifetime, then the Professor Emeritus status could be granted to the person even before completion of the age of 60 years. There is no mention in the bio-data relating to research work after the year 2012.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) has not known the things nor understands what is the meaning of Professor Emeritus? Professor B.S. Brar reached the age of 60 years and his case was processed for the Emeritus Professor. His case was also recommended. When the case was recommended, it was stated that he is eminently suitable person to be an Emeritus Professor. But in view of the fact that he is going to be re-employed for 5 years, at the end of 5 years a reconsideration should happen on his Emeritus Professorship and a Committee once again examined his C.V. and looked at what has he contributed over the last 5 years and how he has been honoured by his peer group academically as well as other contribution to the University with a full review that happened at the age of 65 years. The Committee unanimously recommended his name. Now it is inappropriate that the Committees of the kind which recommended these names, they say anything which amounts to saying that those Committees have not done their job competently and not keeping the dignity of the University in view. According to him, they should refrain from making any comment which amounts to casting aspersions on the jobs done on behalf of this University at the highest level. He requested that they should not insist on having discussion on the issue.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar got his dissent recorded on this item.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that when these apply, it goes to the Department. So, the Department whether there is a space or not for the person to be accommodated. Therefore, it varies from Department to Department. The requirements are different in Departments of Arts, Languages and Sciences. Therefore, generalising that it would be given for 5 years is not proper.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have amicably resolved it that the Emeritus Professors would be provided accommodation in the Department. Arising out of it, they also took a decision that in every building, there would a room with all the facilities for retired Professors of the University. If necessary, two rooms in a building could be reserved to be shared by the retired Professors. All retired Professors of the University who want to visit the University and remain engaged in academic, this University would go out of the way to facilitate their academic work. The Emeritus Professors are recognised names who have been invited to be the Emeritus Professor. So, the spirit of the Calendar shall be respected.

Professor Chaman Lal appreciated that they are conferring the status of Emeritus Professor on these persons. He is not talking about these cases. But in some universities there are certain sorts of favouritism in terms of designating persons as Emeritus Professor. To resolve that kind of complaints, in the Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), certain Committees have been formed which have formulated certain criteria as to who are the persons to be considered for the status of Professor Emeritus. There departmental conflicts also even when if a person is very good, the department does not allow because of personal conflicts. For that certain objective formula has to be followed. He suggested that a Committee should be formed which should for future, but not for these cases, which should formulate certain criteria. One of the criteria could be that the person must have at least 5 years experience as Professor. JNU has kept it at 15 years.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that it is 10 years as per Panjab University Calendar.

Continuing, Professor Chaman Lal said that it is fine. The publication etc. should also be taken into account. He suggested that the departmental permission should not be necessary to which the Vice-Chancellor replied that it is not necessary. He said that he would suggest the name of a teacher for Emeritus Professorship which may be forwarded to the Committee.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that there is a misconception that the Emeritus Professor is an employment. It is not an employment. It is just saying that one has contributed to the University and also appreciation from outside for which the University could express its thanks for serving the University very well. It is not employment. It is not that the person is active or should be active later and teach the students. That is not the ideal for the Professor Emeritus. It is not employment, it is a title. That is why it should be positive. As far as the facilities are concerned, that is a separate thing. The title is one thing and giving the facilities is other thing. The facilities depend upon the availability of space for which the Vice-Chancellor has said that perhaps it could be on sharing basis. For other contingencies and other things, it depends on resources. So, they should not mix up all these things. They should be liberal about Professor Emeritus as the person has served well and done the job properly. Professor Emeritus is something that a person is a member of this University and would carry on this conception for life.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is a part of what has been approved by the Syndicate. But what one of the members has said about Professor B.S. Brar, that is not right as Professor Brar is a very respected person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want any debate on this thing which casts aspersions otherwise the people would not accept the Professor Emeritus status in the University. It would be more undignified.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that Professor Brar has not done any research work after the year 2012.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that who he (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) is to do this judgment.

At this stage, heated arguments took place between Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Shri Jagdeep Kumar. The Vice-Chancellor said that is not the way to discuss a dignified thing otherwise he would have to adjourn the meeting.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that in the last meeting of the Senate, they were discussing the issue of central status for Panjab University and the Vice-Chancellor had said that the discussion remained inconclusive.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting.

When the meeting resumed, the Vice-Chancellor said that the Items C-11 and C-12 are not the matters in which the merits of the individuals are to be deliberated upon. He proposed that items C-11 and C-12 be approved and those who have objection could raise their hands.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this practice should not be started as they are all with Professor B.S. Brar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a question of Professor Brar.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the viewpoints of PUTA should also be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a matter which pertains to PUTA.

When Dr. Gurmeet Singh insisted on saying something, the Vice-Chancellor said that the items C-11 and C-12 are over and anybody who wanted to record the dissent the same would be recorded.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor again had to adjourn the meeting.

When the meeting resumed, Professor Rajesh Gill appreciated the Professor Emeritus (Professor B.S. Brar) as he is a social scientist. She also appreciated the authorities for designating him as Professor Emeritus because he is academically known nationally and internationally. He has been a wonderful administrator as Dean of University Instruction. So, she appreciated and endorsed this.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired about the decision on the tenure.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that still no decision about the tenure has been taken. The title of Professor Emeritus is permanent and the space would be provided. He had a meeting with all the Emeritus Professors of the University and all of them have gracefully offered to share the accommodation wherever necessary with the new Emeritus Professor in case a department is not able to spare extra room. Wherever the space is not available, then the University would explore to provide the space to a given Emeritus Professor. If another Emeritus Professor gets appointed in that department, it might be the next would have to share the space with the earlier one. But every Emeritus Professor would be given an honour on behalf of this University the way it has happened from time immemorial. He is conscious that there are retired Professors in the University who wish to continue with their academic work. They want to come and participate in the academic programmes of the University. So, every building would have one room for the retired Professors. Where a building belongs to a given department, then that room is for the retired Professors of that department. But there could be a building in which there are more than one department, then the room would be shared by more than one department. So, adequate accommodation would get provided. The

University would go out of the way to enable to every academic member of the University, who has been an honoured member of this University, to continuously engage in the academics.

Professor Ronki Ram said that being the Chairman of the Committee regarding space and other things, they tried to resolve many issues so that there could be no problems. Many of the colleagues also put their ideas that some of the Professors who are given Emeritus Professorship in a given department, their rooms are lying vacant. So, they tried to work on that and in that case the title would be for life whereas the space would be there. There is no objection to the names recommended by the august Committee because they are known nationally and internationally as has already been said. But there are certain things that some Professors were of the opinion that when the names come to the office of the Vice-Chancellor to be placed before the august Committee, those names should be forwarded by the Chairpersons of the departments. But the Vice-Chancellor office should do it and the Chairpersons should not be involved in that.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-11 on the agenda**, be approved.

The following persons recorded their dissent on this item:

1. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
2. Dr. K. K. Sharma
3. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
4. Shri Sandeep Sikri

XII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-12 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-12. That –

- (i) the terms and conditions of the Professors Emeritus already in place would be remain unchanged;
- (ii) the office space shall be provided by the respective Chairpersons initially for a period of five years

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to convene a meeting of existing Professors Emeritus of the University to apprise them about the decision of the Syndicate to seek their inputs on the issue of office space made available to them.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 7)

XIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-13 on the agenda**, was read out, viz. –

C-13. That the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, subject to CWP No.17501 of 2011 and CWP No.24115 of 2014:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
*1.	Dr. Sunaina	Assistant Professor in Law, PUSGRC, Hoshiarpur	19.11.1979	01.12.2014 (A.N.)	29.11.2015
*2	Dr. Ritu Salaria	-do-	18.01.1979	01.12.2014 (A.N.)	30.11.2015

* Their appointment was subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No.24115 of 2014 vide which their appointment had been challenged by Ms. Rajni Nanda, who was one of the candidates for the said posts. Therefore, their confirmation will also be subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court CWP No.24115 of 2014.

NOTE: The Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para XI) while confirming certain faculty members had also extended the probation period of Dr. Sunaina and Dr. Ritu Salaria, Assistant Professor in Law, SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur by one more year.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 26)

Shri V.K. Sibal said that the University had good reason to bring this item. But he wanted to point out something. These two persons had misbehaved and therefore their probation was extended. He has at least 50 years of experience in the administration and has not come across even a single case where the probation was reviewed and nullified or preponed. This kind of thing is not possible. Therefore, these persons should be confirmed only after the probation is over. It is not possible otherwise. That is what he wanted to point out to the Vice-Chancellor and if he is not convinced, he could look at it later and take decision accordingly. But he is not comfortable with this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri V.K. Sibal has said these people had misbehaved and an enquiry was done into this thing. These persons were fighting with each other and vitiating the atmosphere. Some of them even went to the Court and lot of unpleasant things happened. In that background, their probation was extended. But that was also challenged in the Court on the basis that the notice was not given. So, two years have passed. At the end of it, good sense prevailed and they resolved their differences and started giving attention to the institution where they were attached and the Director of the Institute also said that now the things have settled down. In the background of this, the probation is now over. When the probation gets extended, Shri Sibal is saying that if the probation was extended, the confirmation should be done after second year. What the University has done is that whatever were the reports, the

same have been put in their file. But technically, again it could become a court case that why the confirmation is not being done after one year. But he personally did not want that if these persons are continuing in the University for their life, whether they are seen to be confirmed on one date or the other date, it would not matter. They have to get work done out of these persons and let them improve in the background of whatever their misdemeanours, it is recorded in their file. But, technically, they are confirmed. It is with this spirit let this thing happen this way.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that it should be after two years.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he agreed with what Professor R.P. Bambah had said.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor R.P. Bambah is saying that the confirmation should be done after the completion of two years and not on completion of one year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that with the new seniority rules, it would not matter as to what is the date of confirmation. Rightly, it should be after two years.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that all this was being done due to misunderstanding. When Dr. Ritu Salaria entered the service, there was nobody to guide them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so much time of the Vice-Chancellor's office, senior Professors of this University is wasted to look into these things. Those persons did something and if were in the private management, would have been thrown out of service. Since they are a part of this liberal University where everybody gets time because the things are very difficult to get across through this complicated governance structure of this University. When a person goes to the Court and gets a stay, the lawyers of the University keep running after these cases. So, they should understand that it is a very difficult place to govern, very heterogeneous and complicated. The Vice-Chancellor is supposed to be the Chief Executive and the Senate behaves as if there is a ruling party and an anti-ruling party whereas there is nothing like this. Every elected person represents some constituency and surely one has to represent that constituency.

It has been said that the confirmation be done after two years as it would not matter and not practically affect anything as the period of two years is over now.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if a person is confirmed after two years, he/she would have a feeling that he/she has been punished. They could not punish the persons twice as they have already censured them.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that what Professor Keshav Malhotra is saying is not right and it is not a punishment.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what decision they have taken in this case.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that the confirmation would be done after completion of two years.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to when the probation was extended after one year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the misdemeanours of the persons were going on, enquiry was being done and a period of one year passed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his query is whether they had extended the probation period before December 2015, then how could they extend it now.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the probation period was not extended.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is a case of deemed confirmation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is right even when the misconduct was going on. That is why a censure had been put and it is already noted in the file.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this was also discussed in the Syndicate meeting last year.

Professor R.P. Bambah enquired as to whether their probation was extended or not.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the recommendation for extension came only after the completion of one year. Thereby, it became deemed to be confirmed.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that automatic confirmation as per Panjab University Calendar is only for the Colleges and not for the University.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-13 on the agenda**, be approved with the modification that both the persons be confirmed after completion of two years of service from the date of their joining.

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

C-14. That the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

(i) Department of Environment Studies

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Harminder Pal Singh	Professor	25.4.1971	15.03.2016	15.03.2017

(ii) Department of Biotechnology

1.	Dr. Desh Deepak Singh	Professor	3.07.1967	16.05.2016	16.05.2017
----	-----------------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------

(iii) Department of Physical Education

1.	Dr. Thingnam Nandalal Singh	Associate Professor	01.02.1978	06.05.2016 (A.N.)	07.05.2017
----	-----------------------------	---------------------	------------	-------------------	------------

(iv) Department of Biochemistry

1.	Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura	Associate Professor	24.01.1974	08.04.2016	08.04.2017
----	-------------------------	---------------------	------------	------------	------------

(v) Department of Geography

1.	Dr. Gaurav Kalotra	Associate Professor	24.10.1974	11.05.2016	11.05.2017
----	--------------------	---------------------	------------	------------	------------

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

1.	Dr. Santanu Basu	Associate Professor in Food Technology	13.06.1974	04.03.2016 (A.N.)	05.03.2017
----	------------------	--	------------	-------------------	------------

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

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 13)

XV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

C-15. That Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Associate Professor, Department of Biochemistry, be confirmed as Assistant Professor on his previous post in the same Department w.e.f. 15.01.2015 i.e., after one year from the date of his actual joining, i.e. 15.1.2014, the date from which he was treated on duty.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 6)

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the case of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, the problem actually lies with the date of confirmation. The person came in the University service through a court case which was decided by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in November 2013. He requested the House and the Chair that Dr. Naura be given the benefit at par with another case which had been decided by the Hon'ble Court one year after his case. The case of Pooja Ahuja versus Panjab University had been decided by the Court on 19th December 2014. Actually, the order given by the Court was that all benefits including the seniority would be given to Dr. Pooja Ahuja from her original deemed date of joining which in her case was 1st October, 2011. She had been given the benefit whereas she had joined on 13th January, 2015. He requested that the date of confirmation of Dr. Naura be preponed on parity with this case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not proper to give a date of confirmation to someone from a date even he has not started to serve the University.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the case of Dr. Pooja Ahuja, the benefit has already been given by the Hon'ble Court and the University has done it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no direction given by the Court that the benefit is to be given. They are supposed to take a call that the person had joined on a certain date and after one year, he is to be confirmed or is he to be confirmed from a date from which he is to be given the benefits and no salary is being paid for that. Only the salary is being fixed as if he had joined.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if some benefit has been given to someone, that did not mean that the benefit is to be given to all.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the case of Dr. Naura was decided in the year 2013. Thereafter another case of Dr. Pooja Ahuja versus Panjab University was decided in the year 2014. In the case of Dr. Naura it has not been specifically mentioned that he would not be given the seniority benefit. But it was ordered that all the consequential benefits would be given to him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the confirmation is not a benefit.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that perhaps Dr. Naura does not need this thing as he is already an Associate Professor and within a year or two, he would become a Professor. If something is legally right, then what is the problem on doing the same by the House.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter, as is being proposed by Dr. Ajay Ranga, has to be considered in the Syndicate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the date of confirmation of Dr. Naura should be from the original deemed date of joining as the Court has counted all the period notionally and the University allowed him to join. They are giving the benefit of confirmation after one year from the date of joining in another case while this is not being done in the case of Dr. Naura. There could not be different rules. Therefore, both the cases should be considered on the same ground. There is an order from the High Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is right. He did not know as to how it has omitted the attention of the Syndicate that if in one case, the Court has ordered with all consequential benefits. In this case also as Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the court has passed orders with all consequential benefits and that in one case, the University has given on notional basis. As they have discussed if they do something in one case, even if what Shri Malhi has said the benefit does not transfer to the other person automatically, but if they as Senate have taken a decision under the orders of the Court in one case, nobody debars them from taking the same decision in the other case also especially in view of the fact that the Court has said that with all consequential benefits from the date of his deemed joining. This is what the Court has said. The only thing is the date of confirmation from the notional period. The Vice-Chancellor is right that probation is for the purpose of checking the conduct of a person. But in one case, they have done without checking the work and conduct.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that in that case there would have been contempt of Court. But in this case, there is no contempt of court.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that with consequential benefits is written in the orders. So, the Vice-Chancellor is right. Let the matter be reconsidered by the Syndicate in the light of that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then somebody could go the MHRD saying that the University is a law in itself, the University is confirming the people from the back date even when a person had not joined on that, what is this going on. Then he would have to reply all these things. Let the matter happen in a considered so that as a Vice-Chancellor he is able to reply.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that then both the cases go back to the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would come back to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the case of Dr. Naura, the Court's order is that "the petitioner would be entitled to all the consequential benefits except monetary benefits for the period he remained out of service". In the case of Pooja Ahuja, the same court passes the order "needless to say that the petitioner would be entitled to seniority etc. from the date when the appointments pursuant to the same selection were made. However, no monetary benefits will be given to the petitioner as she has not worked for that period". The order is the same. As far as seniority is concerned, seniority would also remain the same. Her date of seniority would be counted from the date of joining and his seniority would be counted from the date of joining. But in her case, in spite of the fact that the court has not ordered that she be confirmed after year after from the date of deemed joining, but they have done that. In this case also, they have to do the same thing what has been done in the other case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the case go back to the Syndicate.

Shri V.K. Sibal pointed out that they need not blindly duplicate the decisions because they could also revise in this case. They are not bound by the Court. Suppose they have made a mistake and realise it, then they could revise that. Secondly, there is an office note in the agenda which is not very legible which he could not read. So, in future, such things should be neat and clear so that it is legible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item before them is approval of the item.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the item is approved. But as Shri Ashok Goyal has said, the date should be preponed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would go to the Syndicate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the CPF is not deposited of the notionally counted period and monetary benefits have also not been given. But the request of Dr. Naura is that he should be allowed to deposit his share of the CPF in his PF account.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Senate could not take a call on financial matters of this kind that if a person has made the contribution of CPF, the University would also have to contribute.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the person is ready to give in writing that he would not claim for the share of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a solution to it that let they confirm the person from the date as has been proposed by the Syndicate so that the PF problem is solved and treating at par be considered by the Syndicate. By this, both the problems could be solved. He enquired whether the person is confirmed.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that the person is confirmed.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15 on the agenda**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the matter to decide the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura keeping in view the case of Dr. Pooja Ahuja be referred back to the Syndicate.

Professor Emanuel Nahar abstained from the meeting when the Item C-16 was considered.

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

C-16. That the term of appointment of Professor Emanuel Nahar, University School of Open Learning, as Dean Student Welfare and Professor Neena Capalash, Department of Biotechnology as Dean Student Welfare (Women), be extended for one more year, w.e.f. 01.06.2017, under Regulation 1 and 2.2 appearing at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 Para 27)

XVII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-17 on the agenda**, was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-17. That the term of appointment of Dr. Rattan Singh, University Institute of Legal Studies as Associate Dean Student Welfare be extended for one more year, w.e.f. 01.06.2017.

(Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 Para 28)

XVIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-18 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-18. That the following correction, be made in the decision of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 29), as proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal vide his letter dated 16.08.2017: –

Present decision of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 29)	Correction as proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal
Resolved: That proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal dated 20.04.2017 that the pay of Dr. Ruchi Sharma nee Ruchi Vashisht, Assistant Professor (on temporary basis), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, be fixed at a stage of Rs.21020 in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 plus D.A., HRA and NPA as applicable from time to time, as per appendix , be approved.	That proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal dated 20.04.2017 that the pay of Dr. Ruchi Sharma nee Ruchi Vashisht, Assistant Professor (on temporary basis), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, be fixed at a stage of Rs.21020 in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.7000/- plus D.A., HRA and NPA as applicable from time to time, as per appendix , be approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 36)

XXIX The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19 on the agenda** was read out viz:-

C-19. That the following three Demonstrators appointed on purely temporary basis be re-appointed further w.e.f. 03.07.2017 to 30.06.2018 after one day break on 01.07.2017 & 02.07.2017 being Sunday or till a regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the scale

of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions. The persons possessing Medical/Dental qualifications i.e. M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practising Allowances (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic Pay + NPA shall not exceed Rs.85000/- p.m. in terms of Senate decision dated 29.09.2013 (Para LX) Item No. 20 (III):

1. Dr. Harkirat Sethi
Department of Pharmacology
2. Dr. Anupam Vijayvergia
Department of Physiology
3. Dr. Ravi Kant Sharma
Department of Biochemistry

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 8)

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is no problem in re-appointment of these persons. But for how long it would continue, why these persons are not being regularised. From the resolved part, it seems that these persons were appointed before the year 2013. Since these persons possess the required qualifications and have been appointed through proper procedure, he suggested that these persons should be regularised as otherwise also they are getting the same salary as for a regular person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not regularise the persons just like that and the posts have to be advertised.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is also saying that these persons should be regularised after advertising the posts.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not advertise any post unless the Central Government permits him to do so. Several times, he has taken up the matter with the Government.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that since these persons are drawing the full salary, there is no extra financial burden.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has taken up the matter with the Central Government but they should give a nod.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is having some knowledge in the matter which might not be known to the Vice-Chancellor. He clarified that the posts were advertised as likely to be made permanent. Earlier also, they have discussed a similar issue in which the appointment had been made on the posts advertise likely to be permanent. He has no relations with these persons. He is just pointing out what is proper as per rules. These persons were appointed through properly constituted Committee and the advertisement was made likely to be made permanent. These persons are continuing since the year 2013 and are drawing the full salary. He requested that when the posts were advertised as likely to continue/permanent, then what is the hitch/problem in regularising these persons. If what he has been told is right, the House could authorise the Vice-Chancellor to regularise these persons.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to take on himself the things of doing the regularisation with his authority and he would check up it and if necessary put it to the governing bodies.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the agenda item is the appointment purely on temporary basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the item before them is whatever it is. He could not have all the information. The members could say anything. He requested and made a plea to the members that in future if somebody wanted to enlighten something which is not the item, the members should submit a note after the agenda goes to the members. In future, the members would have adequate time about certain items so that the office should also come prepared after looking into those things. Otherwise they are consuming everybody's time in the background of inadequate information with him or the office.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19 on the agenda**, be approved.

XX. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-20 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

C-20. That Dr. G.C. Bansal (Retd.), Department of Library & Information Science, be granted the benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension under Regulation 3.9 at pages 184-85 of P.U. Calendar Vol.-I, 2007, as recommended by the Administrative and Academic Committees of the Department of Library and Information Science dated 17.01.2017.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 9)

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he wanted to confirm whether the period for which this person served on leave vacancy has been included in it or not. It is not clear to him. But he has a more substantive point that under the Regulation, the person must have postgraduate research or specialist qualification or experience in scientific, technological or professional field. When that person was recruited, did he have this specialist qualification or specialist experience. They are talking that during the teaching, the person had given specialised knowledge to the students. That meant that every teacher has got a specialist experience. So, that is not a very good interpretation. He suggested that it should be looked at thoroughly and carefully and already 3 years' privilege has been given to the person by the Registrar. So, this point needed to be looked into.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has also been said in the proceedings of the joint meeting of Academic-cum-Administrative Committee dated 17.1.2017 that "the case relates to the period of 1968-70; Delhi University was the only University offering the Master's degree in Library Science during that the above said period; during that period, it was the highest qualification in this professional discipline as no one was registered for Ph.D. programme (being offered by Delhi University only); after going through the report of the UGC Review Committee, 1965 (as attached in the file), the objective of the M.Lib.Sc. degree was to give specialised knowledge to the students in respect of different types of libraries and to make them proficient in advance techniques of library classification and cataloguing. After considering the above facts, the members unanimously resolved to recommend that M.Lib.Sc. degree earned by Prof. G.C. Bansal (Retd.) in 1968 is a specialist qualification". He was supposed to have a specialist qualification before joining. So, the Committee felt that it was a specialist qualification, something which a very few people have. It is like that Dr. K.S. Chugh desiring that he wanted to do specialisation in certain thing which was not designated as Nephrology at that time. Did he qualify to be a specialist of few of his kind when he did it? This is a recommendation from a Committee which is made of academicians and he has not influenced these things nor does he know all these things. According to him, one should be

given the benefit and there is no point in having such a narrow interpretation of these things. This is his advice.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-20 on the agenda**, be approved.

Principal I.S. Sandhu abstained from the meeting when the Item C-21 was considered.

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

C-21. That Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib be confirmed as such on his post w.e.f. the due date i.e. 01.06.2017, after completion of one year probation period subject to the acceptance of the self performance appraisal report by the Vice-Chancellor to be submitted by Principal I.S. Sandhu.

(Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 Para 27)

Principal N.R. Sharma abstained from the meeting when the Item C-22 was considered.

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

C-22. That Dr. N. R. Sharma, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur be confirmed as such on his post w.e.f. the due date i.e. 15.7.2017, after completion of one year probation period.

(Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 Para 32)

XXIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-23 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-23. That the following Part-time Assistant Professors be appointed in the Department of Laws, P.U. w.e.f. the date they join as such for the coming session 2017-18, against the vacant positions of the Department or till posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions according to which they have worked previously:

1. Yashesvi Singh
2. Sonia
3. Reena Kansal
4. Gurpreet Singh
5. Naveender P.K. Singh
6. Neetu Gupta
7. Ms. Priyanka Bedi

(Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 Para 3)

XXIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-24 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-24. That the recommendations of the Grievance Redressal Committee dated 28.02.2017, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor on the pattern of Standing Committee (in terms of authorization given by the Syndicate dated 27.02.2016/14.03.2016 (Para 49), to examine the representation dated 23.06.2016 of Dr.(Ms.) Amandeep, Assistant Professor in English, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC regarding pre-ponement of date of promotion as Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) and Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), be approved.

(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 10).

XXV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-25 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-25. That in pursuance of earlier decisions, Dr. Jayanti Dutta, Deputy Director, Human Resource Development Centre, be designated as Associate Professor in the Human Resource Development Centre subject to the following conditions that

- (i) she would not be entitled for pension.
- (ii) she would be entitled for CAS promotion as per UGC norms for teachers in University Departments.
- (iii) if the scheme of HRDC is discontinued by UGC at any time in future, she could be adjusted at an equivalent position in the Centre for Public Health. As at present she could be offered Adjunct position in the same Centre.
- (iv) she would not stake claim for the Directorship of Human Resource Development Centre via CAS provision

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 8)

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is a long overdue case of Dr. Jayanti Dutta. She requested that this benefit should be given to her which she deserves as she has been the moving spirit behind the Academic Staff College of the University.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-25 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXVI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-26 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

C-26. That ‘censure’ be imposed on Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh and accordingly a red entry be made in his service book for proceeding on leave without prior permission of the competent authority and a warning be issued to him not to repeat this and to be careful in future. However, this will not affect the retirement benefits of Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 10)

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether the 'censure' has been imposed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person did something for which a harsher punishment could be given.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the person proceed on leave without permission.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if somebody does such acts habitually, what they should do with him. Such actions could be condoned once or twice but if somebody is habitual, what they should do.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that habitually they are sanctioning the leave time and again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not control it as the University is a very large institution.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if a person is proceeding on leave habitually, even then the leave is being sanctioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what he could do, this is what the University is.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that such a practice should be stopped.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-26 on the agenda**, be approved.

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

C-27. That minutes dated 24.07.2017 of the Screening Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the promotion case of Dr. Rakesh Malik, Deputy Director, Physical Education & Sports from Stage-3 to Stage-4 as per 2nd amendment of UGC (which had already been approved by the Senate), be approved

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 24)

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

C-28. That the resignation of Dr. Manoj Anand, Professor, University Institute of Applied Management Studies (UIAMS), P.U., be accepted w.e.f. 31.08.2017, by waiving off the condition of short period of two days from actual requirement of one month notice, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2009:

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 25))

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

C-29 That minutes of the Committee dated 31.07.2017 of the office of the Dean Student Welfare, P.U., be approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 27))

XXX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-30 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-30. That the recommendation (17 (i)) of the Academic Council dated 21.06.2017 (Para XIX) regarding introduction of NSS (National Service Scheme) as an elective subject, at Undergraduate level under CBCS framework, be approved and be given effect to from the session 2018-19.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 28))

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

C-31. That the following Assistant Registrar, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch / Department	Date of Appointment	Date of confirmation
1.	Mrs. Saroj, UIET	07.11.2013	01.05.2015
2.	Shri Jag Mohan Singh, Estate Cell	28.01.2014	01.07.2015
3.	Mrs. Amita Bansal, UMC	12.04.2010	01.08.2015
4.	Mrs. Saroj Bala Vyas, U.S.O.L.	01.07.2014	01.09.2015
5.	Mrs. Usha Kumari Sehgal nee Usha Kapoor, Exam. I	21.04.2014	02.09.2015
6.	Late Sh. Girish Kumar Gulati, Accounts	28.05.2014	01.02.2016
7.	Mrs. Veena Sharma, Exam. II	01.10.2014	02.02.2016
8.	Mrs. Neelam Kumari, Deptt. of Laws	01.10.2014	01.03.2016
9.	Shri Pardeep Kumar Bhasin, Accounts	01.10.2014	01.04.2016
10.	Shri Harish Kumar, Accounts	03.11.2014	01.08.2016
11.	Mrs. Suraksha Sobti, Secrecy	05.11.2014	01.02.2017
12.	Mrs. Devinder Kaur, CET Cell	06.01.2015	02.02.2017
13.	Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund, DSW	17.03.2011 (A.N.)	01.04.2017
14.	Dr. Satish Kumar Patil, Establishment-II	15.06.2016	15.06.2017

NOTE: 1. The date of confirmation of the above Assistant Registrars is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.

2. The persons listed at Sr. No. 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 & 11 retired from Service and Sr. No 6 expired while in service. But, their date of confirmation falls prior to the date of their retirement/ date of death, thus their confirmation has also been proposed.

(Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 Para 14)

Shri V.K. Sibal said that this is the case of confirmation of the people out of which 6 persons have retired and one has died. Normally, whenever an employee retires or dies, the connection with the body where one was employed, is severed. So, he did not see any justification in confirming these people who have left the University or left the world. He did not know whether this aspect had been seen or not. What anyone would gain if he/she has retired. How could they confirm a person who is not even on rolls?

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that it is being done in retrospect and whatever benefits were due to those persons have to be calculated in that manner.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that they did not have the power to confirm somebody who is no more with them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the confirmations should have been done earlier and why they are delaying it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this practice is an old one. Earlier, this was also the practice in Punjab Government. Supposing a person has been appointed as a Clerk, he/she has to be confirmed as Clerk and that person is promoted as Assistant, then he/she has to be confirmed as Assistant. But about 8-10 years ago, the Punjab Government took a decision that when a person is confirmed in a cadre in whatever capacity whether the post is vacant or not, he did not know as to why the University is not following that procedure. When a person has been confirmed on a post, then there is no need to confirm the employee at every step. He requested to follow the Punjab Government instructions so that the burden of the University is reduced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that that is what the UGC has recommended.

Continuing, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the recommendation of the UGC is meant only for the teaching staff. Therefore, they should follow the Punjab Government instructions and not waste the time of the University. Once an employee is confirmed on a post, then there is no effect on that employee. Why they are confirming the employees again and again without any reason?

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that in view of this reference given by Shri Prabhjit Singh, the matter could be reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this could be put up to the Syndicate and this item stands approved.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang suggested that this should be followed for the teachers also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is approved and they do not have to face such an embarrassment in future, they should do something on this issue.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that similar is the issue of the College teachers. When a teacher moves from one College to the other, he/she is again to be confirmed.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is not a similar case as in that case the appointment is made afresh.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this case does not apply to the Principals approved by the University where the case is that once a Principal is approved, he/she is always an approved Principal in the case of affiliated Colleges of Panjab University.

Principal I.S. Sandhu and a few members said that such used to be case a long time ago, but presently it is not so.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the decision of the Punjab Government be reviewed by the Syndicate.

XXXII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-32 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-32. That Shri Sukh Pal Sharma, Assistant Manager, P.U. Press, be confirmed as such in his post w.e.f. 14.08.2008.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 4)

XXXIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-33 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

C-33. That the following names proposed by the Committee dated 17.4.2017, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.3.2017 (Para 6) for PUCASH for the term of two years, i.e., 01.08.2017 to 31.07.2019, with additional names, be approved.

1. Professor Manvinder Kaur (Chairperson)
Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies & Development
2. Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Bio-Chemistry
3. Professor Sanjay Chaturvedi, Department of Political Science
4. Smt. Poonam Chopra, Deputy Registrar (Estt.)
5. Mr. Surinder Sharma, Supdt. Exam. Branch
6. Dr. Navnnet Kaur, Department of Geography

7. Ms. Rita Kohli, Additional Advocate General, Pb. & Hry. High Court
8. Ms. Subreet Kaur, Advocate
9. Mrs. Sunita Dhariwal
10. Professor Promila Pathak
11. Dr. Ameer S. Sultana (Convener)
Centre for Women Studies

(Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 Para 37))

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 23.7.2017 (Para 43 (v)) has extended the term of present PUCASH ending on 31.07.2017 upto 30.09.2017 and it be directed to take action in matter within the period prescribed in the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal), Act, 2013.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(v))

2. Since the term of the existing PUCASH was to expire on **31.07.2017** the term of new PUCASH was to be effective from **1.8.2017**, but the same will now take **effective from 1.10.2017 for two years in view of above decision under note-1.**

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the PUCASH is to be formed or it has already been formed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is the proposed one and the names have been suggested.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is already available on the website.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know as to why it is so as it has not yet been approved by the Senate and how it could be put on the website.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to whether it is not very serious (mistake)

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not asked to put it on the website.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who has put it on the website.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, the Chairperson of PUCASH is Professor Nishtha Jaswal. He would look into it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should see it after the lunch as it is a serious matter. A PUCASH is working while on the Panjab University website, there is a different PUCASH. As the Vice-Chancellor is saying that it is a proposal for a new PUCASH, but it is already on the website.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not authorised it.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who has put it on the website and under whose directions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into it, go back and report to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant not to hold somebody accountable who has done the blunder.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would find out. Unless he finds it out, what he could say. If necessary, whatever administrative action has to be taken, it would be taken.

It was pointed out by that there is typographical error in the name, which needed to be corrected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the bio-data or other particulars of the names being proposed for PUCASH should have been provided to the Senate as to how these names are covered as per the provisions of the Act. He enquired whether it is sufficient simply to write the designations or the addresses. In one of the case, the Vice-Chancellor on record has said that that the name has been recommended by some member of the National Commission for Women. These are very intricate things and in the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor had said that if somebody wanted to give any more names, they could give and the names have also been given. This should also be suggested to the members of the Senate also that if somebody wanted to give any other name to be added, that could be added also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee has been constituted as per the Act. He consulted one of the members of the National Commission for Women who happened to be a resident of this area to suggest few names who belonged to a particular category. She suggested to him someone who is a part of PUCASH on Infosys. He accepted and put that name for consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as the names have been proposed whether there is any bio-data that such and such person is associated with such and such NGO.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he knew that there must be some bio-data in the office of the University. He wanted to know whether those papers have been supplied to the members of the Syndicate and the Senate. If the papers have not been supplied, then what they are considering. According to him, the next item is about continuation of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this Committee had a term up to a certain date and by that time they had not constituted a new Committee. But the University is supposed to have a Committee continuing. So, the previous Committee's term was extended till the new Committee comes into being.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to which is the item for continuation of the earlier PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Item C-33 relates to the term which was extended for two years and it also relates to constitution of new PUCASH. The term of new PUCASH was to commence w.e.f. 1st August, 2017. But the meeting of the Senate could not be held till 1st August where it was to be approved. He had hoped that they would hold a meeting of the Senate. But in view of the two special meetings of the Senate that they had, so many meetings could not be planned and held before 31st July and that meeting is now being held in September. That is why that the agenda has become so heavy. If they had one more meeting in between, the agenda would not have become so heavy and they would not have to have two meetings of the Senate. So, it became a complicated exercise. Now the term of the new PUCASH is to start only when they approve it. If it is not approved, then the term of the earlier PUCASH would have to be extended.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if the bio-data would have been attached, they could know as to with which NGO, a particular person is associated. It is very important because there is only one outside person and they must know about the person.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to provide all the related papers. He enquired as to whether there is anything mentioned about the continuation of the existing PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is mentioned at the end of the Item C-33 that “since the term of the existing PUCASH was to expire on 31.07.2017 the term of new PUCASH was to be effective from 1.8.2017, but the same will now take effective from 1.10.2017 for two years in view of above decision under note-1”. Since the item is to be approved in today’s meeting, the term would commence from 1st October.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is talking as per the Act, technically, could anybody other than the appointing authority, i.e., the Senate in the instant case, extend the term of a Committee which is appointed by the Senate? Secondly, the Senate knew it pretty well, the University knew it pretty well that the Committee which was appointed in the year 2014 was expiring on 31.07.2017. Why they did not take the steps to ensure that the new Committee was appointed before 31st July so that the Act is not amended and no illegal act is done by the University. The first illegal act is that the Act says specifically that no Committee could continue for more than three years. Then, under what provisions they have got the power to extend the term of a Committee beyond three years.

On a point of order, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the first Committee was for two years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that term could be extended for one more year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it was for two years, the records be got checked. As far as his knowledge goes, it was for three years. It is for the first time that it has been brought for two years. Had the background papers been given about when the term of the earlier Committee started and when it ended, that has to be seen. It has also to be seen as to what are the provisions of the Act. It has also to be seen as to under what provisions the Syndicate has extended the term under what circumstances, as the Vice-Chancellor has said that because the Senate meeting could not be convened. The Senate met in March, 2017 and they knew that the term was expiring on 31st July. The Senate again met on 7th May, 2017 and they knew that the term was expiring on 31st July. Why they were waiting for the meeting to be held in September? The responsibility has to be fixed as to why the item did not come before the competent authority, that too for appointment of a Committee which is a statutory Committee as per the law of the land. Instead of explaining that, they are extending the term and that is also not

brought to the Senate, the competent appointing authority for the ratification of the act though illegal. He was looking for where is the item, whether for information, ratification or in any column, it was not there. But it was in the footnote of the proposal of the constitution of new PUCASH. He felt sorry as he could not find, of course, the Vice-Chancellor has read it and helped him find it out that there is a mention of this also. If what he is saying is correct, that the Syndicate did not have the authority to extend the term of the Committee, what would happen to those cases which have been dealt by that Committee after 31.07.2017 and if his information is correct that the Committee has lasted for three years, the maximum period given in the Act, what would happen to those cases which have been conducted by that Committee, which legally could not have existed. These are his queries and requested for reply to these queries. He would be very apologetic if his information that the period is two years and not three years, then he is really sorry.

The Vice-Chancellor responding to it said that they had formed a Committee but that Committee had to be reconstituted. When they reconstituted, then the term of that Committee was two years. They were asked to reconstitute this Committee and they reconstituted that Committee with the same Chairperson continuing. Few members were changed because few members were not available for whatever reasons. They reconstituted a Committee, the Chairperson remaining the same, few members have been changed. The earlier Committee was reconstituted. It is that spirit. The Senate meeting did not happen. He has made the members known about whatever the things they have gone through. If the meeting could not be held, he believes that the Vice-Chancellor has been given some authority that in emergency he could take some executive action just to keep the system running. So if a well constituted Committee has been given an extension for two months on the premise that the Senate would meet and pass it. They could have technicalities. But the point is that they are running an academic institution as per certain governing procedures. If there is a mal-intent to do this, then there is a point continuously worrying about technicalities. If there is no mal-intent to do anything and the system has not suffered in any way, what is the issue?

Professor Chaman Lal drew attention of the House relating to this issue but on entirely different perspective. PUCASH or whatever Committees are formed in the University, the UGC has made its own rules for that. Secondly, there are universities which have much better Committees and function much better. He cited the example of Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) where there is GSCASH where all the components of the University, i.e., students, teachers, employees and officers, they have elected representations and other members of the Committee and the term is one year. What recently the JNU has done is that on the basis of UGC guidelines, they call it as Internal Complaints Committee (ICC) which is being disputed by the students and also by the teachers, leave aside this, but according to ICC, three student members have to be elected from the student from themselves. There is no student representation in this PUCASH which is entirely wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Chaman Lal not to mislead because in per the Central Act, there is no student representative.

Professor Chaman Lal requested to go by the UGC guidelines, which has now changed the rules.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have been asked to constitute PUCASH by the MHRD as per the Central Act. The University has even been asked to constitute another Committee for a special case having outside members instead of inside members. It is a directive given by the MHRD even at that time. But the Chancellor did not approve that Committee.

Professor Chaman Lal said that if Central Universities are not following the central directive, how could the Panjab University follow that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this very House adopted that how PUCASH is to be done. Whatever this House has approved and whatever has been done, that is as per the directive of this very House. If whatever was done when they reconstituted the previous Committee, the same thing has been followed. What is the objection that Professor Chaman Lal has?

Professor Chaman Lal said that he has a very grave objection.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Chaman Lal to enunciate that grave objection.

Professor Chaman Lal said that his grave objection is that this is a very sensitive Committee where students, employees, teachers and officers, all the constituents of the University must have their elected representatives because only the elected representatives could protect their interests better because the nominated members from outside the University would not protect the interest of the University community better. He proposed that they should consider the whole composition of this Committee and must have elected representation from the students, teachers and PUTA should support it, PUSU should support it and Shri Deepak Kaushik, representative of employees should also support it and they should elect their representatives themselves.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that they could not go by their gut feeling or what they believe should be done. Whether the students should be there or not, whether the members should be elected or not, they could not decide on their own. They are bound by the provisions of a Central Act. The composition of the PUCASH is specified under that Act. The category of people has been specified in the Act. Whatever the JNU or the UGC and others do is not relevant. They have to act under the provisions of that Act.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that as an employer, it is the duty to create a respectable workplace and that is the intention of the Act. To create a respectable workplace, it is very important that there is sensitisation courses at various levels and they must start this training immediately and should not wait for the complaints to come. The more responsible part for the employer is proactive part where they need to train the senior people. So, regular sensitisation course should be conducted for the teachers, students and employees. That is why he wanted to know as to which is the NGO to which this lady belongs because the lady from the NGO would have a large role to play in this sensitisation. They want to convert Panjab University into a very respectable workplace where everybody feels empowered and feels happy to come to work and there is not sexual harassment of any kind. That is the ultimate intention of the Act.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he has no objection to the name of Ms. Rita Kohli at Sr.No.7, but she is no more the Additional Advocate General. Therefore, it should be checked and necessary correction be made.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to provide the background papers of all the members of the Committee. Otherwise they have faith in the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would send all the background papers to the members. There is no issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as one of the members has now pointed out that one of the members of the Committee is no more Additional Advocate General.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how does it matter if she is not an Additional Advocate General.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it matters. Otherwise, what is the background of that member.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that she is a person from a legal background and had a standing in the society for which she was considered for this position. He further mentioned about Mrs. Sunita Dhariwal who is a passionate social activist, blogger, writer, social motivator, media producer who selflessly contributes all her skills and time for social development. She has done for the last 27 years. Being a member of Internal Complaints Committee (ICC) in Infosys, Chandigarh and Haryana Sahitya Academy, she is dealing with the complaints of sexual harassment women at Infosys campus and has served with the Department of Haryana Police. She conducted hundreds of training and awareness workshops for workplace employees and professional college students under a self designed project Workplace Euphoria aimed at prevention of sexual harassment of women at workplace. She has touched the life of 12,000 teenage girls in the past one year and made them aware about their psychological and mental health by addressing more than 150 training and awareness workshops in Haryana. She had successfully engaged more than 3000 women in voluntary video production initiatives TV India and imparting capacity building programme to them. She had worked for capacity building programme of Panchayati Raj Institutions and imparted social development training in 150 Gram Panchayats of three districts of Haryana. She had worked for promotion of national integration among youth and organised more than 80 cultural exchange camps and three national camps and motivated them. She conducted more than two dozen lectures and presentations in various organisations on prevention of sexual harassment of women at workplace. She is a recipient of Pride of India National Award for Toppers Education Society, New Delhi. More than hundreds of social NGOs have given her award to recognise her social deeds. She frequently delivers lectures in various colleges and organisations to make them aware of the need of gender sensitive society. So, this is one person and Shri V.K. Sibal has said that Mrs. Rita Kohli is a very eminent person.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is just to put the sentiments on record that they want to make Panjab University a respectable workplace and there would be sensitisation workshops at various levels in order to sensitise and prevent any kind of complaints.

Professor Ronki Ram said that what Shri Ashok Goyal has said is right and there is no problem because he is saying that the proper papers have not been provided. He is also saying that sometimes the decision are taken by the Senate due to the shortage of time or the exigencies where decision has to be taken at the spur of the moment, the Vice-Chancellor has to take time. Even in future if such urgent cases are there they could be done for the time being. But if the time permits, the same can come again to the Senate, there is no issue at all.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that they could solve the issue in two ways, one is which they have already done. The other is as suggested by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that they should be sensitize the people.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not the first Committee and Professor Nishtha Jaswal has already organised such workshops and he himself has participated in such a workshop that she had organised.

Professor B.S. Ghuman suggested that the Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies and Development should be made as the nodal agency for this purpose as it is their mandate. Let it conduct the orientation/training courses on sensitization.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that the Centre has already received a circular from the Dean Student Welfare office and they have submitted a proposal to organise workshops regarding spreading awareness about this at every level for the students, teachers and the staff.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he requested the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar also, but somehow they have not been able to lay the hands on the Act under which this Committee is being constituted and he has been told that the Act is not available here but is lying in the office. He drew the attention of the Vice-Chancellor towards section 4 of the Act. In one of the sub-clauses it bars any Chairman of the Committee to go beyond three years. That is why he wanted to come to the point that are they allowed to commit any illegality even if they have their own constraints. He has been told that the term is two years, but now he has been told that the term is one year plus two years and the Chairman remaining the same. It is specifically barred that the Chairman could not go beyond three years. He is not alleging but he is sure that something must have been done innocently and unintentionally, but when the question comes to legality, the innocence of law lack of knowledge is no excuse. The Vice-Chancellor has spoken something about Mrs. Dhariwal about whom it has been explained, though in the absence of any papers, that she is a very eminent person associated not only with NGO but also with Internal Complaints Committee of different organisations. Is there anybody else who falls in this category whose name has been proposed in this Committee who is associated with NGO or is a social worker? This name of Mrs. Dhariwal has been included on the suggestion of the member of the National Commission for Women. The earlier Committee which was constituted to propose the names which that name is which covers this criterion as per the Act. Earlier, there were 9 names. In the Syndicate, two more names were added, one name on the suggestion of the member of the National Commission for Women.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not ask that member to nominate anyone but asked her to give the names of such people who have been members of such an organisation in the city. She gave him a name and he forwarded this name to the Chairman of the Committee. It is not that he has asked her to nominate anybody.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was not saying so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she (that member of NCW) had once come to his office enquiring about certain things and is a resident of Panchkula and her name is Mrs. Rekha Sharma.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is why he is saying that they should have full faith in the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in what way his asking her a name amounts to that he did not have the faith in the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is by saying that somebody who is residing in this vicinity. In the Syndicate, it is the Vice-Chancellor who had said that Mrs. Rekha Sharma is a member of National Commission for Women but not said that she is staying in the vicinity of Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if he has forgotten momentarily the name what he asked and told him (Shri Ashok Goyal) then what is the problem and what is he hinting at.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he is saying is that he has to answer the question as they have to go by the Act.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has answered the question.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is there such provision to extend the term of anybody contrary to the law.

The Vice-Chancellor asked as to what is the provision and said that what is contrary which he has done to the law.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is why he is drawing his attention to Section 4 of the Act.

The Vice-Chancellor said that PUCASH was appointed by this Body for a period of two years. He has merely extended the term of that committee by two months because of the exigency of the situation. If he has done something illegal, okay, file a case against him in the Court and he will go and explain to the judge.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they are considering the appointment of the Committee. It is a legal issue. It is not a technical and academic issue.

The Vice-Chancellor asked as to what illegality has been committed by him. On what account does he want to censor him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he is not censoring him, but he just wanted to know who is responsible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is responsible for extending the term of the committee for two months and that he is responsible for not convening the meeting of the Senate before 31st July.

Shri Ashok Goyal thanked the Vice-Chancellor for accepting it.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that he has no problem how the Committee has been constituted. He has a simple query. He wanted to know the deliberations of the Syndicate. The Vice Chancellor told that Mrs. Rekha Sharma from National Commission for Women suggested him a name, but the name is being spoken by Dr. Dalip. Professor Pam Rajput wants to speak the name of some person to which he (Vice Chancellor) answered okay. But he has proposed the name of Professor Mrs. Promila Pathak. He desired that the wording of the syndicate should be written properly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he cannot control everything so minutely. He could not control the wording with that degree of accuracy. Finally they have to go by what the resolved part is.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that it seems from the file that the Vice-Chancellor has constituted the whole Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said all right that they could assume whatever they want to.

The Vice-Chancellor said they could attribute or impute everything to me, but that does not mean that it is the resolved part of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor get any part resolved, legal or illegal, they do not mind. But all that may be noted down what they are saying there. Section 4.3 of the Act says that the presiding officer and every member of the committee shall hold office for such period not exceeding three years from the date of their nomination as may be specified by

the employer. So the Vice-Chancellor has already admitted that the chairman has been allowed to continue beyond three years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that yes, up to the three years whatever the date of 31st July that is not allowed by him. That was done by Senate. All that was done, is in exigency permitted it to be extended by two more months.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no such power of taking any decision in exigency.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he propose that let it be post-facto approved.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage, however, several members opined to approve it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they do not approve because they do not authority to approve it.

The Vice-Chancellor said fine.

Shri Raghbir Dayal, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Naresh Gaur said that their dissent be noted. However, later on Professor Rajesh Gill also got her dissent recorded.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the proposal of the Vice Chancellor is that the action of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that action of the Syndicate was up to 31st July. Whatever the Vice-Chancellor did, it was to attend to the exigency of the situation. He is also a member of the Senate and he is presiding this House on behalf of the Chancellor. He is only proposing to his fellow Senate members to accept his plea that he did that action for the interest of the University.

Several members approved the action of the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that proposal is in violation of the Act and no authority, including the Senate, has any such power to condone the action of the Syndicate, or the Vice-Chancellor, as the case may be because they are not empowered to do so.

The Vice-Chancellor said, fine, and the dissent of five people may be noted. At this stage, the Vice Chancellor said that now the meeting will be held after lunch break.

When the meeting resumed after lunch Professor Chaman Lal said that his dissent must be noted in his own words, i.e., not one word dissent. While getting his dissent noted he said that his considered opinion is that PUCASH must have two elected representatives, out of which one should be essentially a male and a female from students, teachers, and employees. For the present year if they cannot hold election, then the nominees of PUTA, Student and employees organisations should be appointed on the PUCASH, otherwise he has a grave objection. Although, he is happy that Dr. Ameer Sultana is the Convener of the Committee. He has no objection to that, but representatives elected either through the election or if the elections could not be held, then from PUTA, student and employees organisations should be in the PUCASH. Elaborating he said that two nominees of them which includes 50% female essentially, this should be the PUCASH. If that could not be made, his dissent be noted.

RESOLVED: That the following names proposed by the Committee dated 17.4.2017, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.3.2017 (Para 6) for PUCASH for the term of two years, i.e., 01.10.2017 to 30.09.2019, be approved.

1. Professor Manvinder Kaur (Chairperson)
Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies & Development
2. Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Bio-Chemistry
3. Professor Sanjay Chaturvedi, Department of Political Science
4. Smt. Poonam Chopra, Deputy Registrar (Estt.)
5. Mr. Surinder Sharma, Supdt. Exam. Branch
6. Dr. Navneet Kaur, Department of Geography
7. Ms. Rita Kohli, Advocate
8. Ms. Subreet Kaur, Advocate
9. Mrs. Sunita Dhariwal
10. Professor Promila Pathak
11. Dr. Ameer Sultana (Convener)
Centre for Women Studies

The following members recorded their dissent:

1. Shri Raghbir Dyal
2. Professor Keshav Malhotra
3. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
4. Shri Naresh Gaur
5. Professor Rajesh Gill
6. Professor Chaman Lal

XXXIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-34 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

C-34. That

- (1) the report of PUCASH dated 7.12.2015 submitted by Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Chairperson, PUCASH be accepted.

- NOTE:** (i) the Syndicate authorised the Vice Chancellor to form a Committee to determine the major penalty to be awarded to the Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration on having been found guilty of sexual harassment;
- (ii) an enquiry be conducted for the delay caused in implementation of recommendations of PUCASH; and
- (iii) the service rules be amended to be in consonance with the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 30)

- (2) major penalty, i.e., removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment, be awarded to Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration on having been found guilty of Sexual Harassment.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 21)

The Vice-Chancellor said that Item No. C-34 pertains to a follow up action on indicting a faculty member of the University for Acts which are unacceptable. So the recommendation is major penalty, i.e., removal from service of the University which does not disqualify him for future employment be awarded to Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration. So there have been unacceptable acts by a colleague of theirs, repeatedly, and for some of them PUCASH has taken a call, he has been told that at least one more matter is pending before the current PUCASH. One member of the PUCASH is present in today's Senate meeting. But this recommendation is on the basis of reports which have already filed by the PUCASH. So the matter is that the recommendations be approved.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Syndicate has recommended to the Senate the penalty of removal from service to Mr. Komal Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration on the recommendation of Committee. He stated that there are many loopholes in enquiry that has been held. First thing is that there is no copy of the complaint in the agenda as to what exactly the complaint was and what was written against Mr. Komal Singh, what absurd language he used and what wrong act he had done. He does not mean to say that there should be complete copy of complaint but by hiding complainant's name, copy could be given so that it could be cross checked what was the complaint and what was inquired in the enquiry. Second thing as to what has been written in the inquiry as per service laws, before any employee is punished, two types of enquires are conducted, i.e., preliminary enquiry and regular enquiry. In this case, they could say

that the sexual harassment enquiry is the preliminary enquiry. But simultaneously separately after that they should have conducted a proper regular enquiry for that. If from that regular enquiry, a report is submitted and if the issue of punishment was taken, that is against the service laws. Thirdly, he has read all the Syndicate proceedings, but, not a single member of syndicate has asked about major penalty. There is no statement from any member of the Syndicate, in spite of this, he is being awarded major penalty, for that the Vice-Chancellor has been authorised. But, while feeling sorry, he said that it is not against him (Vice Chancellor) individually. In the meeting of Syndicate not even a single member, out of the fifteen members of the Syndicate, authorised the Vice-Chancellor or the Committee to decide the punishment, but that is the part of the resolved part and that is wrong from his point of view which should not have been. The enquiry report is with all the fellows and referred to see at page 618, under Para 2 and stated that all three witnesses appeared before the Committee. All the witnesses due to pressure from different corner expressed their desire to withdraw themselves from the proceedings of the complaint, that means there were three witnesses in that case and all the three witness have withdrawn their statement from the case. He again referred to page No. 620 of the enquiry report. All the witnesses corroborated their statement that Mr. Komal Singh used sexually coloured remarks towards the candidate. Now there are two contradictory statements in the enquiry report. At one place they said no witness has participated and they have withdrawn themselves due to some internal or outside pressure, whereas on the other hand they said that all the witness corroborated their statement. Whereas no discussion in took place in the Syndicate meeting regarding this report or its language. While feeling sorry, he said that he is not accusing any member of the Syndicate. He wanted to know as to how the Syndicate members or any authority has recommended that he be removed from the service, whereas that report is not proper. So far as he knows that the candidate's application is not in the agenda of the Senate. They were not aware what actually was happened, and what Mr. Komal Singh has said and what act he did. Does it come under the preview of sexual harassment Act and what is the ruling? There is nothing about it. Neither, there is any letter of the candidate, nor there is any witness, even then there is punishment. Thirdly, he would like to say unofficially on the report that if they provide the copy of the complaint, then he would talk about the same. He has a request to the House that he did not say that Mr. Komal Singh is right, but he has problems of being alcoholic. But Mr. Komal Singh is not alone but has a family which is dependent on him. He may not be awarded such a harsh punishment which along with him might also ruin his family. In the University many people were doing such types of misdeeds and he is totally against them. Many people were doing, are doing and would be doing such kind of misdeeds.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he has only one submission to Dr. Ranga that he should not blame Syndicate and requested him and all others to read the first para of page 618 to which Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is not blaming anybody.

The Vice-Chancellor said he is (Dr. Ranga) attributing guilt to members who are not there. Without naming when he does that he is actually passing aspersions on the community. He could not use that platform, being a member of the Governing Body and said things which amount to defaming the community. It is not acceptable to him. That is not personally acceptable to him. This is not the platform to do such things.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he takes his words back and requested not to make it a part of the proceedings.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he (Dr. Ranga) is accusing the members of the Syndicate. He referred to pages 611 to 621 and said that it is basically the PUCASH which has conducted the enquiry and submitted its report. It is not the Syndicate, if he has to accuse, it is the Committee.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he (Sh. Jarnail Singh) should not take it as personal.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that as per law of the land the only Body which is competent to carry out inquiry into such things is Sexual Harassment Committee and the same has been constituted as per the Govt. of India Act. This Committee has been approved by this very House, so whichever committee has done the job, it is competent authority and submitted a report. There could not be any other committee for this. If something has to be done, that is the job of the governing body of the University. On behalf of that governing body, the Syndicate of the University, which is elected by the larger house, has recommended a punishment, so whatever he has to say, he should say it on the punishment. That is not a place where they are further conducting an enquiry and going through these documents and details that who what said, what not said. All that has been gone through by a properly constituted committee and he does not think that they should go into further details.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is very different on that point. He is sorry to say again to all the Syndicate members. He is not raising any question against their ability.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is raising the question on his ability as well as the ability of the entire House. It is that House which has constituted the PUCASH and the PUCASH has done the enquiry, not once but twice.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that means whatever an enquiry report is submitted by PUCASH, will it be blindly stamped by them? They have to approve it. Are they not supposed to apply their mind? Is the Syndicate supposed to apply its mind? Then what is the need to bring this report, and he (Dr. Komal Singh) should have been penalised there only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Syndicate has applied its mind and recommended the penalty. He could not give reply to the details. He has not conducted the enquiry. He has not gone through the microscopic details of that and he could not expect an answer from him and he ought not demand an answer from him.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there are many lacune and problems that he does not want to discuss. He has a request to the House, rather than to terminate the service of Mr. Komal Singh, and if House feels and he also feels so, that Mr. Komal Singh has a problem, he be punished, but, not ruin his family. Rather than to terminate his services, as Professor Navdeep Goyal and others gave a statement to stop his three-four increments. He be punished, must be punished. But not so harsh a punishment be imposed on him that he and his family would be ruined. His pay scale might be lowered and his increments could be stopped, whatever part of the major penalty, except removal from service. His request is that to look into the matter.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that what Dr. Ranga has requested and he said in the Syndicate's meeting, he also does not want, no one would want, but that is the House who would decide to impose punishment, i.e., removal of service or some financial penalty may be imposed. But he has to read page 618 "all the above-said three witnesses appeared before the committee, they were called one by one and asked to state the whole incident and in general behaviour of Dr. Komal Singh with other girl students. One uniform statement by all of them was that Mr. Komal Singh used sexually coloured remarks towards Ms. Anu Verma and he is in the habit of calling almost all the girl students in his room. All the three witnesses expressed concern about their safety because of their appearing as witnesses before the PUCASH". He does not mean to say that Syndicate has not read the report. Syndicate has given that decisions naturally there were different views, everybody

has a different view. Somebody's view point was that this is not his first, second or third, it is his fourth mistake. He does not want to say anything about that is his fourth, third, second or first mistake. His view point is that while imposing punishment on Mr. Komal Singh, his plight of his family/children might be kept in mind. He stated that it would be better if his services are not removed. Any other punishment could be given to him, i.e., to stop his increments or to lower his designation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue got discussed in the Syndicate and the background was that Mr. Komal Singh is doing that repeatedly. How do they ensure the safety of the woman students of this University? They could not let him continuously be in contact with the woman students because it is the question of their safety. Do they not have a responsibility towards students for which the university exists. If there are no students, there would be no university. So how do they prevent Mr. Komal's contact with the students. So that is what they have to keep in mind. Because in spite of being so much having happened, there is another incident.

Some member asked if they could suspend him now?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not suspend Mr. Komal Singh because he does not want that there should be some trouble. If he suspends Mr. Komal Singh, he has to hear that Vice-Chancellor is like this or that. He has only made arrangements to prevent Mr. Komal Singh's contact with the students. First time when Mr. Komal Singh made a misdeed, he removed him from his parent Department to prevent him to come in contact with the (women) students of that Department. He got him (Mr. Komal Singh) transferred to USOL and told him to get medical attention. He needed continuous attention and rehabilitation. He should have come back after rehabilitation. However, Mr. Komal Singh insisted that he will go back to his parent Department. He had given him a safety option. Mr. Komal Singh does not want to take the safety option. He insisted on coming back. He forced him to come back to the department and the department accepted him. Another incident happened. In the meanwhile for a long time, when first enquiry report against him came, no action was taken. That report just remained somewhere in the Establishment Section, did not come to him (i.e., VC). When this was repeated then they got worried about it. It is at that stage that they started to keep a tab on it to what was happening. When second report came then it became apparent that Mr. Komal Singh is incorrigible, he was refusing to cooperate, at least he should have cooperated in getting rehabilitated. When he was asked to go to USOL where there was no contact with the students, he had to do a different job where he could have used his intellect and tried to get himself rehabilitated, reform himself and let the community not be confronted by his repeated misdemeanours. He was given the option of full salary in USOL. He had been just transferred from one department to another department of the University, at least he should have done his job sincerely. People told him that Mr. Komal Singh is a good teacher, when he is in senses and not under the influence of alcohol. He should have done his job for the society for which the taxpayers were paying them. But he did not take that option. Mr. Komal Singh went and insisted on the Chief Medical Officer of Panjab University for issue of a medical fitness certificate. He called the C.M.O. and C.M.O. was under pressure for issuance of a medical fitness certificate. Now it is a very difficult situation, what they would do. At one stage they want to take a sympathetic view of a human being and the family of that human being. But who is paying for the family of that human being, the tax payers, and the tax payers, means students of those tax payers and what they are doing, amounts to making those tax payers wards unsafe and law of the land says that such people should be severely punished. Why was this Act brought in? This Act was brought in because in the nation there was hue and cry so it was because of that a very stringent Act was brought in. A stringent Act also has safety valve so that nobody can make a false complaint against anybody, this act should not be used by somebody to target the male population of the country so DoPT deliberated on it and it also put some safety valve in it. So that is the law

of the land and they tell him what is to be done. Mr. Komal Singh was given this option already once, that he should take up a job on behalf of the University, academic in nature, where he does not come in contact of the students and where the working hours are also a little relaxed. It is not that he has to come at 8.30 a.m. sharp, but do his work, he could use his intellect and slowly rehabilitate himself. But if a person does not want to rehabilitate, then what does one do. There is one report, another report, the third enquiry is already on. So that is the background. If they do not want to take a call on it today, it is okay with him. But they have to take a call on it. They want time to take a call on it, that is okay with me. But till then, Mr. Komal Singh would not be permitted to come and take the classes. So, if they think that matter needs a debate, that matter needs consultation amongst them so that they can suggest him some solution, it is okay with him. But, what he would like to say they should not discuss that matter for more than ten minutes. If they need more than ten minutes then they should come back to it after they have time to talk on that issue.

Shri V.K. Sibal, said that he has gone through the papers and he thinks it is a very serious case. Why do they have to hush, just look into at all the facts and examine the witnesses and come with a considered opinion. He does not find anything wrong in it. What is the signal that the Senate will send to the outside world through the press that a person held guilty of such an offence, it is considered of no consequence and removal from service is a concession, which they already have shown in the report. If he is good enough, he could get a job somewhere else also. There was case of dismissal also, but he thinks that they did a right thing which would not deprive him from the job and he could get it somewhere else. This kind of shock will help to improve. If they show him sympathies, they are challenging their own objectivity and their desire to do the right thing at the right time.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha (Retd.) said that he supports what Shri V.K. Sibal has said. They are mixing up two issues. Even those who question the finding of PUCASH, and went on to comment on the type of punishment to be awarded. The second issue does not arise unless they accept the report of PUCASH. He suggested and he is sure that the whole House should accept the report. Then he wanted to talk on the question of punishment. He was of the opinion that removal from the service which has provision that he could come back, is the least and the kindest thing they can do to him because they owe a responsibility not only to his family, but at the same time they have to see about the poor girls who are scared to go anywhere near this man. The teacher offender, despite warnings, failure to reform himself and the more complicating factor is that he is alcoholic. Even if there was no charge of sexual harassment against him, he would like to question the wisdom of an alcoholic continuing in service in this University. They have to think of the reputation of the University, why did this Act has become necessary. Why did they have to strengthen the provision of punishing the sexual offenders, because they have found that the offenders went on doing that kind of offences with impunity. If they do not award a severe punishment, there would be an impression that nothing happens and that one could indulge in such acts which are not only against the poor girls, but also against University and the society. If they just ignore the acts of such people, did it mean that they allow such a person to be a teacher in this University? What would be the reputation of the University, they have to think about it also. He said they should not delay it and take a decision and this is the kindest thing which they can do to him. If he could reform himself and becomes employable, he could be employed again.

Professor R.P. Bambah said, obviously, it is a very serious case and the PUCASH is entitled to as an authority to go into it. Procedurally, if he remembers, they have to accept the report first and as Ambassador I.S. Chadha has said, the second after that. If they accept the report, he suggested two steps have to be taken. Even in the major penalty, he

has to be given a notice as to why the penalty should not be imposed on him and he has to be given a chance to explain and they could even consider bigger punishment.

Since the voice of Professor Bambah was not audible, the Vice Chancellor while repeating his version said that Professor Bambah is saying that they have to serve a notice to him and while giving a notice, they could even consider of imposing harsher penalty than this and then he could plead.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that after serving the notice, they would have a choice to impose any penalty and could even say as to why he should not be dismissed from service. Obviously, his actions are not in the interest of the students and suggested that the person should be placed under suspension immediately. If they accept the report, then the person should be given a notice why he should not be dismissed. The enquiry report could also be sent to him. After that when the reply comes, in the meantime, they could apply their mind again and see as to what could be the adequate punishment at that stage. At this stage, they should serve a notice of dismissal.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this is indeed a very serious case, he is a repeat offender and to his mind the punishment which has been proposed is fair and just. They in this Body have to balance the interest of the victim versus the interest of the accused. The quantum of punishment prescribed under the Act is far larger than this, but this is what they are proposing taking into consideration all the mitigating circumstances. This is regarding part one, but as regards part two, he said that he beg to disagree with Professor R.P. Bambah as he does not think that a notice is required because PUCASH, under the Act is empowered to recommend punishment and it bounden duty of the employer to go by the recommendations. He cannot change the recommendations. So, to his mind, PUCASH, in its wisdom recommended punishment, it is a fair punishment, they must impose the punishment today and now and do not delay the procedure any further by all this nitty-gritty of various procedures.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first of all he would like reply whatever Dr. Ranga was talking about. This case was discussed in the Syndicate twice. In the first meeting when they discussed this case, that time they simply suggested that a major penalty was to be imposed and that was the recommendation of the PUCASH. They accepted the report and then decided that as far as the penalty to be imposed, that will be decided in the next meeting. If they go through the minutes of the Syndicate meeting which was held subsequent to that, many persons recommended, whatever was approved by the Syndicate i.e. removal from the position of Assistant Professor. To say that it was not proposed by anybody is not correct because that was proposed in the second meeting of the Syndicate. If they look at this case, two years have already passed when this case was given to PUCASH. PUCASH completed, whatever was required, within the stipulated period. As per the Act, the employer has to act within 60 days, but somehow that could not happen. This was also discussed in the Syndicate and it was decided that whatever were the shortcomings as to why it could not be brought to Syndicate in time, that was discussed and decided over there. So, right now, because they have already delayed it, it is a Central Act and they have violated this Act, but they should not try to violate it further to the extent that now it is the first opportunity that has come to Senate when they have to decide on this case. If they now say that it will be decided later on, that will not be a proper thing to do. As far as show cause notice is concerned, that was already served on Mr. Komal Singh and the same is attached with the proceedings. He believed whatever Mr. Malhi has said, that is correct. As per the Act, whatever are the recommendations, one is bound by that. The recommendation is, of course, the major penalty, i.e., removal from service. But the removal has been decided by the Syndicate and now the Senate has to ponder over that and he believed that should be accepted.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that before the start of every Senate and Syndicate meeting, they recite anthem of Panjab University for praising its name and fame. But when such news is published in the national newspapers, they could themselves imagine how much name and fame of Panjab University would be there. Just after reciting the anthem, they forget about the reputation of Panjab University. This affects the image when the NAAC teams visit the University. It is the question of reputation of the University. If this case would have been with the police, will the judge see that he has a family or will he (Judge) think that he would be ruined if he is removed from the service. A culprit is a culprit and before law, his family, his father or his mother cannot become any hindrance before a Judge while awarding punishment. If a judge starts taking into account all these things, then he cannot award sentence to anybody. As per the Act and also the recommendations of the PUCASH, as has been said Mr. Malhi, they have to act. He said they should not act as teachers here, they are administrators here. Whatever is written in the Calendar and what the Committee has said, that is according to the Central Act as has been stated by Shri Malhi. They are not sympathisers here, they have to decide on the facts and the facts are going against him. This is the fourth complaint against him. Such things are being published daily in the news papers and the news paper persons must be thinking, what the Senate members are doing. He stated that they just find small mistakes in the report, but they do not take the action which is required. If they are not to do anything, why the enquiry report is placed before the Senate. Why they are wasting time money of the University. He asked if any decision has been taken in the last five years on the recommendation of any committee. He said that the members belonging to Graduate Constituency represent at least two lacs of people. They are answerable to the society. What answer they would give to the society. Is it proper to let free all culprits just by saying that their families or their children would suffer. He suggested that this case should be decided today itself and he should be removed from the service as has been recommended by the Syndicate.

Professor Shelley Walia said that according to him Mr. Komal Singh has some psychological problem. He further stated that he is also absolutely for giving him very strict punishment as heseems to be incorrigible. But on the other hand he (Mr. Komal Singh) has a mental problem. He just wonders that their first action of putting him in another department, i.e., the Correspondence department, so that he could be cut off from all those girl students, was a very right step. But if they give him a choice, keeping in mind that he needs rehabilitation, he thinks, if they were to punish him like this, they might destabilize the poor fellow. He is saying him a poor fellow because he is sick, and not because of his actions as his actions are terrible. If they were to give him an option that they are transferring him to Correspondence department to work there, but if he does not do that, then they could suspend him.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that she would like to start from the point that she is not in favour whether he would be removed or not, as has been stated by Dr. Ranga. On humanitarian ground, they are right that he is having the liability to look after the family as well as the kids. But on the other hand, they have to look after the safety of the girl students. While referring to a letter written by Mr. Komal Singh to the Chancellor (page 655 of the agenda), she said that in this letter Mr. Komal Singh has admitted that he got married in the year 2002 to an upper caste girl, but due to some domestic misunderstandings, his wife started living separately from him with her kids since 2010. It means that from 2010 to 2017, his family is not living with him. So, they must see whether he is actually looking after the responsibility of his family as well as the kids. Neither he is performing his family life responsibility, nor he is serious to the professional commitments. He is committing mistakes time and again. He is psychologically sick, as has been stated by Professor Shelley Walia also, he has a problem and not fit for the job. Therefore, either they should do whatever Professor Shelley has suggested or Mr. Komal Singh should go on 2-3 years leave without pay and get himself treated and rehabilitated.

After that he should give a fitness certificate from all quarters, only then he could be allowed to serve, otherwise, she is of the opinion, it would be better if his services are terminated.

Professor Chaman Lal said that this is a very very serious and sensitive case and he has no sympathy for Mr. Komal Singh as a teacher. He would like to share the anguish of those girl students who are going through the torture from his comments and all that. He also accepts, rather let all of them accept, the PUCASH report and make a Committee. His only suggestion, in continuation with Professor Shelley Walia and Dr. Neeru Malik, that in the area of major penalty, he is also of the view that he is a psychological sick man. But he would alternatively suggest that he should be sent on forced leave without pay for one year and referred to PGI's Psychiatric Centre. If after one year, after getting treatment from the PGI Psychiatric Centre, if he gets a fitness certificate, he may be allowed to join. In the meantime, he may be transferred to some other department to which the Vice Chancellor said that they have already done this. Professor Chaman Lal said, it is okay. Continuing, he further stated that for the present he should be sent on one year forced leave, referred to Psychiatric Department and if after one year he could bring fitness certificate, then he may be allowed to join. He said he want to conclude by saying that there are two types of justice in the world, one is retributive justice and the other is reformist justice, even Principal Sandhu has also referred to it. He suggested that they should go for the reformist justice as this is the principle of liberal society. Even in Norway, a murderer of 73 kids has not been hanged. So they have to think of the reformist justice and not retributive justice. Suppose, tomorrow if he commits suicide or something more happens, so then there will be some sort of moral guilt. So he suggested to give him a chance to have one year forced leave with reference to Psychiatric Department of PGI, leave out University CMO as he could be under pressure, but the Psychiatric Department of PGI will not be under pressure. If they can refract, but he is not ready to accept this punishment, then let his expulsion be done.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he would like to talk on this issues in two parts. One as a member of the Senate. As has already been talked about regarding his family and his children. They all live in the Campus and Mr. Komal Singh has also been allotted accommodation in the campus in the teachers' flats. Apart from the PUCASH, it is necessary to talk here about the things attached to his personal life. It has also been talked here that he has a family and that his family may not be ruined. etc, etc. If they start from the beginning of his life when his parents were living with him, how he used to kick out his parents from his house and how they used to cry outside the house. He also used to hang his small daughter by holding her hand from the third floor where he was residing. They could ask this from the people living around his house about what was used to happen there. They used to advise him, but he did not care. The people residing in the nearby houses, namely, Dr. Devinder and Dr. Amrinder used to ask his (Mr. Komal Singh's) parents to come to their home to spend the night. He even treated his parents very badly, what to talk of his wife. Once he tried to kill his wife by ramming his car on her and she escaped herself by entering in the Ankur School building. Then a person who was passing through that road, came there. He knows that he was a teacher in the University. When he (the person) enquired about the incident, Mr. Komal Singh asked him, had he came there (to save his office) because he (that person) belonged to upper caste and he (Mr. Komal Singh) belongs to a lower caste. Since Mr. Komal Singh was in a drunkard condition and that person apologised to him and said he was not going to do anything in this regard. Dr. Ronki Ram further said that not only the students, but his family members were also scared of him. He used to beat his wife and throw her out of the house. She was living in a state of great distress. They tried to advise Mr. Komal Singh and told him that he is like their kids and also like their younger brother, but he was not able to understand anything. What they can do in such type of a situation. They

are living in a society and if something wrong is happening they should talk about it with open mind though that belongs to their own family or to their neighbour, but sometimes people did not want to disclose such things. He stressed that they should disclose such things without any fear because there is a question of our society. When there are repeated complaints about their colleague, then how they could justify their actions, what reply they could give to the society. This House consists of University and Colleges Professors, now a report has come, he opined that they should not take it personally, rather they should do something objective, as Professor Bambah has said that he had been given the space to come back if he improved himself. He further said that if someone commits a mistake and realise it, and wants to return and make up, he must be forgiven and welcomed. He stated that whatever punishment, the PUCASH has recommended, it has been recommended after having much thought. While recommending a sentence, a space has been kept for him to come back if he improves himself as he has not been disqualified for future service, which he has to accept.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that on the one side they are saying that he is a very good teacher and on the other hand they are saying that he is a mental case.

The Vice Chancellor said he has been just told that he is an alcoholic and it is nowhere mentioned in the report that he is a good teacher. The Vice Chancellor said that a person who is alcoholic, what type of teacher he could be, he does not know and nobody is saying that he is a good teacher. He has not completed his Ph.D. so far.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood further said that he would like to say that they should accept the PUCASH report as it is, but before that they must get the legal opinion and if that is okay, they should accept it.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he thought that he would not like to speak, but after listening the view points of certain persons, he could not stop himself to speak. He (Mr. Komal Singh) has written a letter to the Chancellor. On the one hand, he says that he has got married to a girl of upper class, but on the other hand that he is being targeted for being a scheduled caste. Thirdly, he says that the Committee is not acceptable to him. Further, he is talking about his family. If he is to be pardoned even after committing mistakes persistently, then they should also request that Baba Ram Rahim should also be pardoned as he is also having a family. He requested that he should be pardoned if he had said something wrong. He emphatically requested that they should take some action in this matter. They should not just justify by saying that he has a family, whereas he does not have a family. The people who are sitting around him, they are telling very much about his misdeeds. After listening all that, he was of the opinion that there is no scope to pardon him.

The Vice Chancellor said that first part of the proposal is, do they accept the report or not.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that he wants to speak on this.

The Vice Chancellor asked, does he (Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa) not accept the report.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is just putting Part-(i) to them.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that he (Vice Chancellor) is putting before them the options, but there could be difference of opinion and before giving his dissent, wants to speak on this.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not giving them options, but he is just saying, do they accept the PUCASH report or not.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor whether he (Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa) accepts the PUCASH report, Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said 'no' to which the Vice Chancellor asked to record his dissent.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that he accepts the report.

However, some members were in favour to accept the report while some did not accept it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are many points to be discussed and they should listen to the members and that there is no hurry in it.

Dr. R.P.S. Randhawa that first of all he would like to share with the feelings of Professor Chaman Lal that they should go for reformatory method than punishment.

The Vice Chancellor asked to speak on as to what is his call on PUCASH report, is that to be accepted or not to be accepted and then say something.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that everybody spoke on this issue before he gave the options, but if he (Vice Chancellor) wants to do that he could do so because he is Chairing the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that he also has a responsibility to carry this agenda. They cannot sit here for holding the meetings every week.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that he (Vice Chancellor) has also the duty to give everybody a balanced and reasonable time to give inputs without any distinction.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has asked a simple question, does he accept the report or not, after that he can speak. The Vice Chancellor asked to first tell him whether he accepts the report or not. If he does not accept, give the reason, to which Dr. Randhawa said he is giving reason.

The Vice Chancellor further stated that it means he does not accept the report.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said his point is that they should adopt reformatory method rather than punishment.

The Vice Chancellor again asked as to whether he accepts the report or not.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said if he says that the report is accept, then what would be left to say.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if the report is accepted, what is left. Let it be discussed. They are open for penalty.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is being discussed whether the report is to be accepted or not, it is the prerogative of the House, but first they should see what is there in the report. What is there in it, is it right or wrong, at least first they should read the report. He mentioned the case of a teacher who had physically abused a girl very badly about

which the PUCASH had submitted a report. The report was discussed in the Senate where it decided to impose the penalty of just stopping two increments. He questioned as to why harsher punishment of removal from the service is being inflicted upon him. It means this all is being done on the face value of a person and also who has no godfather. He further stated that various allegations are being levelled against him time and again, he wanted to mention about the one complaint which has been received against him. 32 students have attended his class, he has the photographs of all this and could send these photographs to all of them. The students have signed on these papers in their own handwriting stating as to which classes they had attended along with the dates. The 17 students who have complained against him, 7 out of them were not even present in the class. They could get the complaint examined forensically. The complaint was written, along with the Ph.D. students of the Chairperson, in the room of the Chairperson and it was got signed from the students of first year. As is the saying, a bad man is better than a bad name, unfortunately, he has been tagged with tarnished image. That is why everyone has been trying to get benefit from his situation. People talk of him out of proportion. Everybody is just talking about him, but has anybody seen his position. If he so bad, shoot him. There are so many such people and all the persons who are sitting here knew them. There are many persons who are indulging in different type of corruption. On being asked by Shri H.S. Dua, Dr. Ranga said that all this is being published in the newspapers and media is also watching them. Students have complained against it.

Shri H.S. Dua asked as to which person has been let free by this House who has committed something wrong. On the one hand they are saying that he (Mr. Komal Singh) is at fault and also an alcoholic and on the other hand they say that he should be pardoned of. Simultaneously, he (Dr. Ranga) is saying that other persons are also doing wrong things, he wanted to know who is doing the mistakes.

Dr. Ajay Ranga further stated that he is not saying that Mr. Komal Singh be allowed to commit more mistakes. Rather he wants to say that he agrees to the opinion expressed by Professor Chaman Lal.

Shri H.S. Dua said that how they can certify whether the students were there when they do not know about the complaint. He is just putting allegations on others.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that they do not know the history of the earlier case against him. He (Dr. Ranga) has the facts and speaking on the basis of those facts, but they are not aware of the facts. But they are representing on the basis that this person is putting allegations on the Vice Chancellor, on the Committee, on PUCASH and moreover, he (Mr. Komal Singh) has said that he is being discriminated on the basis of caste, sometimes he says that he had married to an upper caste girl, thus, he is not stable. Then he says that just on the saying of one student, the complaint has been made against him and further termed the complaint as normal.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that a person could become mentally ill because of his family circumstances. He admitted that he (Mr. Komal Singh) has a problem, but instead of giving him rehabilitation, should they destroy him.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that there is no question of destroying him, but should they wait, so that, they he would destroy someone.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he (Mr. Komal Singh) should be given the sentence as has been stated by Professor Chaman Lal and he has no objection to it. He unofficially told that in this case, he would like to tell about a complaint, the copy of which they might not

have got, but he has a copy of it. The student is living in Panchkula and a teacher rang him in the night and three students residing in the hostel brings his statement and become witnesses. So he suggested to first read the complaint and then discuss.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that his point was in between. This Committee is made against sexual harassment. He said whether he (Mr. Komal Singh) has made two offences or four offences, but all the offences were of the same nature as per the allegations. The sexual harassment begins for passing any comments of the highest extent. He (Mr. Komal Singh) has said something verbally which has been made an offence, meaning thereby that the gravity of the offence is not as harsh as they are going to give him the punishment. If they say that a person who has just slapped someone should be shot, then it is a barbarism which is not appropriate in the learned and liberal society.

The Vice Chancellor said that no one has said to shoot him, then why he is saying so.

Dr. R.P.S. Randhawa said that he is just citing an example that a person who has just slapped, his sentence cannot be a gunshot or it also cannot be hanging.

While clarifying the statement of Dr. Randhawa, Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. Randhawa means to say that it has been heard that a murderer could be hanged, but it has not been heard that a person who has just slapped would be hanged. Dr. Randhawa also supported this clarification and said that he would exactly like to say the same thing.

Continuing, Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa stated that if he (Mr. Komal Singh) has said something verbally and has not committed any offence further to it, then they can think of reducing the harsher punishment proposed to be given to him. As regards his rehabilitation issue, despite his family circumstances, as they all admit that whosoever is appointed in Panjab University, has at least some expertise in his subject. So, he is very intelligent person and secondly he has also cleared Civil Services Examination of the State and he went upto the interview stage, but could not be finally selected. He requested that if any punishment is to be given to him, these things should be considered. If a Court gives any sentence, they have legal luminaries present in the House, they are called to determine the quantum of sentence. Again, there is provision that they can contest their case on the quantum of the sentence, over the gravity of the nature of the offence. He was, therefore, of the opinion that he should be sent on forced leave for one or two years without pay. His past service could be cut out to some extent and he should be sent to some rehabilitation centre for two years' treatment to an expert of it, so that they can rehabilitate him after two years. That is his only appeal, he said.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he would like to talk about some part of the report. He stated that he is not against the report, but in the report, it has also not been written that he is to be dismissed. In the report major penalty has been recommended, but it is up to the House as to what penalty is to be given to him. In the first part the sentence has been recommended by the PUCASH. He said that they do not favour Mr. Komal Singh. If he has committed some wrong thing, then punishment must be given to him. As Dr. Chaman Lal and Dr. Randhawa have said, Mr. Komal Singh may be punished in such a way that it should not look like as if they are shooting him. He may be given such punishment that in the eyes of public, it should look like that he has been given punishment, simultaneously it should also give the impression that they have tried to improve him. Both things look like as if they have done a proper thing. That is not the first issue and many such things are happening in country. Recently a big case took place in Chandigarh. Had it not happened, it might not have come to light and they may not know about it. They do not know what would happen in that case. He said that they have no contradiction with the PUCASH report. PUCASH report did not say anything about

penalty, but it only said that major penalty proceeding be initiated against him. Under major penalty proceedings it is up to the House what ruling or punishment has to be given. He requested, as some other members have said that Mr. Komal Singh be referred to P.G.I., or he be sent on leave for one or two years. He may also be downed with four or five increments or lower grade. He could also be lowered from his present stage or he be sent to some other place or regional Centre of the University. This will send a message to both sides that he has been given punishment as also he has been given a chance to improve. This is also the duty of the University to allow him to improve his mental sickness. That is his request.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he agrees with the viewpoints expressed by Shri Gaur, Dr. Ranga and Dr. Randhawa. Mr. Komal Singh has committed an offence about which PUCASH has also mentioned. But they have to keep in mind that if they talk about Punjab Government, they (Punjab Government) have opened de-addiction centres at different places in State instead of hospitals. They could also put such addicts in prisons. He does not know if Mr. Komal Singh has committed some crime, because he is new to the House. As Dr. Ranga has said in the past someone had also been blamed for this type of offence, but his increments were not withdrawn. But in the case of Mr. Komal Singh, they have come directly on removal of service. He does not want to say that he be forgiven, but as has been stated by other members, he should be sent on two years leave. That is his suggestion.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that he want to request to all members of the House and Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor that he said during the last to last meeting of the Senate about the episode that happened. He does not know whether there are any witness or not, he did not read the report completely. Whatever he knows is because he has been born and brought up at the Panjab University. He personally knows Mr. Komal Singh and all others. His request is that punishment must be awarded to Mr. Komal Singh. Anyone who has done a blunder against the society must be awarded punishment. There is no problem in it. That is a good thing. He is with both in favour of those who say that he should be given punishment or not to award punishment. But he has to make a request, if a faculty member commits mistake for four times, the Vice-Chancellor did not suspend him and chance for improvement was given to him. He has to request with folded hands if non-teaching employee commits a small mistake of any type, he/she should also be given chance to improve his/her mistake. They should not be punished immediately. He further said that Mr. Ashish Goyal, Clerk of House Allotment Branch was suspended immediately. The Registrar issued the suspension orders. They did not have access to the Vice-Chancellor. They could not say anything to Registrar because orders were issued already. There was not a very big mistake, the only mistake was in a note that he had written. He is also of the view that if someone has committed a mistake, he must be punished. In the case of suspension, half salary is paid to the non-teaching employee. Families of non-teaching employee are also depending on the salary of the employee. The punishment must be awarded, but it should be in commensurate with the mistake committed. In the morning, a memo was issued for a small wrong note and in the afternoon suspension orders were issued. A teacher has committed mistake four times, but still he is being defended and another chance is being advocated. He, therefore, requested that such a chance should also be extended to the non-teaching staff.

Shri V.K.Sibal said, it seems that there is almost a majority view that the PUCASH report should be accepted. There is some difference of opinion as to what major penalty should be there. He wanted to point out that once they accept the report, the Calendar says that the penalty has to be under the PUCASH rules, i.e., Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. They have to examine under these rules as to what penalty should be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that frankly speaking he is not sure what they were considering, because the item in the index says that they are considering the PUCASH report and that is what it is the report of PUCASH. While as per his understanding the Senate is considering the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 30th April and May meeting. These reports have already been considered by the Syndicate and they are examining only the recommendations of the Syndicate. He said, first of all, before he proceeds further, let him tell them that he is not at all in favour of anybody whether from teaching staff or from non-teaching staff who indulges in these kinds of acts. He is the first votary to punish such a person with the kind of punishment one deserves. But if really do they have a will to punish such a person and they are really interested in sending the signal outside, they must not escape the responsibility with which they have been shouldered. Is it possible for them just to send the strong signal to the society that they are very very particular that they are responsible Senate and University. So without taking all that into consideration they are capable of punishing somebody. Even the Court of law does not punish anybody when the whole world knows that the person is guilty. The opportunity as per the principle of natural justice is given by the Court also even if takes years altogether. As Principal Gosal has said that he was referring to somebody whose case has taken fifteen years, though in the meantime so many people kept on raising the issue. But the Court completed its procedure before finally punishing. So his first suggestion is that if they really want to punish, they must punish somebody strictly in accordance with law of the land, the rules of the University, so that in the name of sending the strong signal, they are not to eat a humble pie in the Court of law, if somebody goes and gets a stay, they have to face so many cases. First of all, they do not take any action against anybody and if at all they take any action against anybody, they seek stay from the Court because they do not do their homework. He thought that legal luminaries, administrators are also there. There are people who are well versed with the service law also. Then somebody points out, is there any system by which anybody, other than the competent authority, can recommend this punishment to be awarded. Could Syndicate recommend that this punishment be awarded meaning thereby that it is the recommendations of the Syndicate which they are discussing and they are discussing whether to accept it as it is, diluting it or furthering it. To his knowledge, nobody could add full stop or comma to the PUCASH report. The PUCASH report, even if it was to be routed through Syndicate, they could not have discussed it all. It should have straight away come to the Senate so that the discussion that have taken place till now on the issue, can they speak that he may not be removed from the service, his increment would be stopped or his family may also be kept in mind. If the PUCASH report came straight forward to Senate then House take an independent decision for the punishment to be awarded to him. Second thing is that Sexual Harassment Act, under which this Committee has been formed, what are their findings and what they have written. They have written that according to his service rules, considering sexual harassment as misconduct, action may be taken against him. Where there is no such rule, then rules that are under Act, action may be taken accordingly. They have service rules, meaning thereby if the committee has found somebody guilty of sexual harassment misconduct then that case has to be processed as per the service rules of the concerned employee. Another thing which he has seen in the file and that has been said also in the Senate, that show cause notice has already been issued to him in 2016. He just wants to know, within whose jurisdiction, it is to issue the show cause notice. He said as Professor Bambah has stated is right that after receiving the report, if they want to punish him, they have to issue him the show cause notice. What is understood by him is that show cause notice will be issued by the competent authority, not by the DUI, Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar, so that the competent authority could say that after examining the report submitted by PUCASH, that is what they proposed to do. Now Act says that they have to proceed against that person as per rules and they have accepted that PUCASH is the competent authority to examine the case. Though his view is that even if the court

convicts somebody, who is in employment of the University except moral turpitude in any other case if somebody is convicted by the Court of law, he has to be given an opportunity by asking that since he has been convicted in such a such case, why should he not be proceeded against as per his service rules because if someone is challaned for not having driving licence then he is not covered under these service rules. But if he is convicted for murder, then it is moral turpitude, but if he is convicted for minor theft, it is not moral turpitude. But he is convicted by report; the employer has to give him opportunity as per the service rules. But in both the cases even for a moment, if they presume as PUCASH is competent to submit the report to the Senate or the report of the Regular Enquiry Committee should have come to the Senate as per service rules. In both the cases Syndicate was not supposed to touch the reports. As he also knows that there are so many reports and in the meeting of Syndicate they are saying that Syndicate is not competent authority. It be forwarded as it is, to the Senate. But, what they have done, they have examined the report in the Syndicate as if the Syndicate is the punishing authority, but this is not. So much so that in the first meeting the Syndicate decided that the report be accepted and for determining the punishment, the time was given to next meeting and in the next meeting it was said that major penalty be imposed. There were four resolutions and the resolution was passed in four parts i.e. (1) report be accepted, (2) Vice-Chancellor be authorised to determine the major penalty and was done, (3) inquiry be conducted for the delay in implementation of the recommendations of PUCASH, (4) the service rules be amended to be in consonance with sexual harassment. Now only one item has been brought before them. That is of 30th April, 2017. Out of four resolutions, only two parts were dealt with. What are the other two parts? Where was this report pending after December 2015? Has any accountability been fixed? Again it is the violation of the Act. Of course some senior members of the Syndicate have pointed out that the employer, i.e., Senate was to deal with this report within 60 days of its submission. Now all these loopholes, somebody who will be cornered to the extent that, he is compelled to go to the Court and thereafter, he gets relief against their error, in spite of their best intention to punish such a man. If he comes with flying colours out of Court what reply do they have? Now they have already committed a fault by bringing on record the recommendations of the Syndicate and that too by way of a committee. It clearly violates the principle of application of independent mind by the punishing authority. They are making their opinion based on the recommendation of somebody which should not have been there. Thirdly, he was dealing with that case. He thought that this issue would have come, but why after December 2015. The issue got delayed so much. He is not the one who always try to say that camera be closed as he wants to say something off the record. He will say everything on record and that is for the consumption of the House. He does not want to believe what people are talking in public, but what they are talking, he has to hear. People say that Mr. Komal Singh was found guilty by the PUCASH in December 2015. But there were some people whose name are publically known who were telling Mr. Komal Singh, do not worry, they are there to protect him and that is why the report did not see the light of the day for such a long time. He has not said it that he would not to believe it because people talk so many things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not want to believe such averation being made, but he did not have any option, but to hear such things. He continued to state that he is not a Gandhi who would close his ears. But even now there is no explanation as to why it has taken almost two years for this report to be tabled before the Senate which should have come latest in the month of March, 2016. That was the first meeting of the Senate after the report was submitted whereas it could have been possible in meeting of December 2016 also. His simple solution is because his friends told him that he says something which is very useful for the House but your tone and tenor is not likable. He confessed that he is very easily provoked. So he asked to help him by telling others not to provoke him. But he has raised one point. He knows there are some people who would be

accusing him that he wants to share something. While the fact of the matter is that he wants such a person to be punished with an exemplary punishment as per law so that the message which they want to send, is sent. So his solution is that this item be brought to the Senate without any recommendations of any committee straight away as report of the PUCASH for the consideration of the House, what is to be done and what is not to be done.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that it has been opined by many members that whatever he has committed is not sufficient to punish him. Should they be waiting for him to commit a bigger offence and only then they will punish him? Whatever the recommendations of the PUCASH are, those should be accepted and it is for the House to decide. In his opinion major penalty should be given.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that as stated by Shri Ashok Goyal, there are three major points. One point is undue delay since 2015. He thinks that is the matter of concern. The delay should not have been further. The decision must be taken within 60 days otherwise that is a wrong procedure. But, now it has occurred, it should not be delayed further. Second point is that Shri Ashok Goyal has mentioned about recommendations made by the Syndicate, this case should come without the recommendations of the Syndicate. He could not say that the recommendations are made rightly or wrongly because better people are there to judge the rules and regulations. But recommendation is just a recommendation. It is for them to accept or not. But to say that if they come back again, he thinks that it will only delaying. It is for the House to see to increase or decrease the punishment. Whatever they want to do, it is for them to decide. The major penalty, he personally feel, which is one in this case, i.e., removal from service is a just penalty and it should be imposed on him. But to say that they should come again is only bureaucratic. The third point is, as Shri Ashok Goyal has said that Mr. Komal Singh can go to the Court of law and come back again, looks very silly. He said, let him put a question, the other way because none of them has spoken about the victim. This happened three years ago. They have delayed the justice for three years. Under the Act both the victim and the accused can go to the Court of Law. If he is the victim he can go to the Court of law and can say that it (Senate) is useless and the University does not take any action, they just keep on debating and meanwhile this fellow is doing the same thing again and again. What will the Court do in that case, he asked? He said, a person as a victim, is allowed to file a case under the Act. They must keep the interest of the victim in mind. So, let them not delay this case. Either, they should say that he (Mr. Komal Singh) is not guilty, which he (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) would accept. But if he is guilty and they fail to do their duty to punish him and there is another case against him in future, all the persons would be as guilty as he is. The Court will prove that the entire Senate is guilty of sexual harassment because they failed to protect the victim.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that as per report of the PUCASH and the scenario of Mr. Komal Singh, to avoid the occurrence of any other incident in the University, there should be punishment. But major penalty, or something else, discussion should be held on the same. He should be referred for medical treatment with at least half pay for expensing of his medical treatment. If he would have no money, then treatment would not be done. After a particular time period, if he submits a certificate with all terms and conditions, then he could join otherwise not. He has become habitual and they should refer him for medical treatment immediately.

Prof. Meenakshi Malhotra, said that she had been Dean Student Welfare (Women) for almost five years of this University. Cases like this should be taken up very seriously and the kind of message, as Shri Malhi has said, they are sending the message to the

people around that their children are not safe there. The Senate should take call so that society in general should have trust in them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that allegations have been put on against Mr. Komal Singh. He is alcoholic and is physically and mentally sick, they know all that. The kind of allegations that fall in the line of verbal misbehaviour amounting to sexual harassment, if proved. The report has to be examined very pertinently. She agrees with Dr. Ajay Ranga that there should be discussion on the report, on the merits of the report, only then the penalty would come. The penalty should be in proportionate to the offences committed by him.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he would like to say something that happened in 2014 or 2015 when he was the President of PUTA. Mr. Komal Singh had falsely verified one of the admission forms to admission in the Hostel. Then there was complaint against him by one of the girl students that he dragged her out of the car. They asked him to go on leave for three to four months and he was in consultation with Chief Medical Officer of Panjab University and he was asked to come back to the Panjab University only when he would become fit. When he came back, we told him that since there were issues, he should step down for the chairpersonship, he did that. They thought that he would reform after that. There are multiple incidents after this. So he would say that PUCASH report be accepted and debate on penalty as the society is also looking on the Senate. Girl students are looking at them that have to be thought of. If they think of two/three year's forcible leave without pay, he is okay with that. But they have to make sure that somebody would take the responsibility of him so that this type of incident does not happen again. It is their responsibility to see that such type of incident does not happen in Panjab University Campus again. A new case has already been added against him and how many more will be added, they do not know.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that she has one question. She is not sure about that and she would like her wise friends to tell her there. Now the report that has come from PUCASH, could it be debateable. Is that report debateable, or they have to accept as it comes. Her friends here has said that they must look into the report but she is not sure as she is not a legal person. She further asked if they can discuss the report given by PUCASH.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he does not think that the report is debatable. They have to accepted it. If somebody is aggrieved by this report, he could go to the court of law. Either of the party could go to the court of law. They may refer it to the lawyer who is present here.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they know there have been cases earlier also. She would like to refer to a case of GTB College, Dasuya. Enquiry was made and she was the Chairperson of that enquiry committee. On being asked by a member, she said that it was in 2013. She said that the case was enquired as per the Vishakha Guidelines to which one of the members said that would not be applicable. She said, what she meant to say was that a teacher's report was prepared and it came to the Senate. She was not in the Senate. The report was discussed threadbare. The report is to be discussed in the Senate to look into the merits and procedural lapses. That is exactly the job of the Senate. They have to see that procedurally the report holds merit because the aggrieved party would definitely go to the Court and what it will do with the culprit at that time. He was proved to be guilty. There are so many cases. What have been done in those cases. They have to move in consistent fashion as the society has been looking at them.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that her question is very simple. She is not aware whether the report can be debateable or not. Her friends who are from law would be knowing better the law as she is a layperson.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in some universities, there are Committees like ICCs and somewhere there is Executive Council, somewhere there is Senate & Syndicate. The report is presented to the Governing Body and they are supposed to examine the report on merits and procedure

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that normally, it is right.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is a difference between a normal Committee and the PUCASH as PUCASH is established under the Central Act and is empowered whereas the normal Committees are not empowered.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Shri Malhi is absolutely right as he has more administrative experience than her. But anything could stand in the court of law on the basis of procedures and anything also falls on the basis of procedural lapses.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that but how much procedures they could ensure, they had set up a Committee for three years comprising of 9 members which had a certain task to do.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is not commenting on it. She is just responding to what Professor Meenakshi Malhotra had asked. She added that there have been so many other serious cases and enquiries which they have done.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that a point is being raised about the procedures. In the court of law if a procedure is in substantive departure which goes to the root of the fact, then the case could fall. But, normally procedural actions which are minor in nature are of no consequences. This is a statutory Committee. Therefore, such a Committee has distinctive powers. They could just challenge the malafide if it is established and it is on record that these two things are not there. Then there is nothing to discuss because they have not seen the evidence, witness, documents, they have not examined the people. So who are they to see so? An Act has been passed and the rules are provided under that and the penalty has to be processed under those rules. This is for them to examine.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that it is not known whether they would be able to take to a decision on the item but perhaps the concept of constituting small Committees would end. It is because whenever such an item is placed for consideration and some small Committee is constituted, first there is a long discussion on the issue in the House. After that long discussion, normally it is decided that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a small Committee. Whenever such a Committee is constituted, normally it has eminent and intellectual persons. When such a Committee submits its report, a long discussion takes place on that. Two things come to light out of it. The first one is that a kind of personal enmity develops against the members of such Committees that whoever is accused thinks that the Committee has recommended something against him/her. According to him, due to this reason, next time they would have to search as to which are the people who could be picked for constituting the Committee.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is wrong to say such things.

Continuing, Principal N.R. Sharma said that the Committee submits its recommendation after a lot of deliberations. They are discussing the issue for about 2 hours. He suggested that the members could be asked whether they accept the report of the Committee or not. There is no need to have long discussion.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the President, PUTA has referred to a case of the year 2013. In that case a complaint was received from a teacher of GTB College, Dasuya because the services were terminated. In that case, it was not a particular case of sexual harassment. Probably, it was a complaint by teachers as their services were terminated.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Shri Jarnail Singh is mistaken; it was a case of sexual harassment.

On a point of order Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is a very debatable issue and why they have just to say 'yes' or 'no'. They should see as to what are the findings of the Committee. In the last three lines of its report, it is mentioned that "the Committee records its appreciation for the cooperation of complainant, respondent, Chairperson, Department of Public Administration and Chief of University Security, Panjab University, Chandigarh". He totally disagreed with what Principal N.R. Sharma has said as the Committee says that everybody was cooperative while the enquiry was conducted. On reply to Shri V.K. Sibal's opinion, he said that he has a difference of opinion on that part. One could not intervene into the investigation. Once the investigation is finally done and final report is submitted, even the body where it is brought or in any court of law where there are set procedures, the Committee or the Court could reject that the findings are faulty or could amend or approve it. So, just saying so, that once a Committee has given its findings is not debatable is not right. It is debatable.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not good to counter other issues by pointing out that while one has been punished while the other has not been punished and they should concentrate on the issue of PUCASH. As said by Shri Ashok Goyal that why the item was placed before the Syndicate why the names were recommended by it, according to him, it is a procedure that every matter to the Senate has to come through the Syndicate and in this case, that procedure has been completed. Moreover, it is just a recommendation. He is a party to the decision taken in the Syndicate and at that time he was also in favour that instead of harsher punishment, he could be given some lesser punishment (instead of hanging a person, imprisonment for life could be imposed). Today also, he is in favour that short of termination, any punishment could be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the first step is that do they accept the PUCASH report to which most of the members said 'yes'. He said that then PUCASH desires that a penalty has to be imposed and the offence is of a kind that a major penalty is to be imposed. There is some issue as if the Syndicate is trying to prejudice the Senate members, let them forget the recommendations of the Syndicate. Does anybody have a proposal of a major penalty? He told the members that efforts to rehabilitate the person have already been tried in which they failed. What Professor Rajat Sandhir said, he (Vice-Chancellor) was very offended and upset when this dragging of a woman student happened, that matter did not spread far and wide. If it had spread far and wide, it would have caused lot of harm to image of University and as they are all aware about what the University has gone through over the last three years, all the officials of the Vice-Chancellor are spending whole of their time just to save the University from the financial crisis and all kinds of onslaughts on the University by frivolous complaints, left, right and centre. So, if something did not happen if they ought to have happened, lot of reasons are that there are so many other pressing things. They did feel that they could rehabilitate this guy because they felt that they could rehabilitate the person. So, a path of posting

him in USOL was tried, but he did not comply. Somehow, his file was prepared, which did not come back to him. There is so much pressure. They come and attend the meeting for hours together and go back. To set up that meeting, there is so much of the work in which the entire office is involved. So much of the work is involved to prepare the minutes. Finally, he personally has to read literally every word, comma, dot that has been put in. Often, a huge amount of time is spent in pointing out mistakes, omissions and commissions that happen. It is a very difficult job and a complex thing. Thousands of pages that they read, humanly it is not possible for a given Vice-Chancellor or a given a Registrar to respond it. They are well aware that they are short of officers in the administrative building. It is a very difficult job. So, the lapses and delays have happened. And the delay amounts to not doing the things that the society expects them to do. But today they are at a stage and everything is before them. Do they still not do anything today because somebody would get a stay order? It is possible that Baba Ram Rahim would also get free 10 years down the line. But that should not deter them. Now everything is before them and they have unanimously accepted the report, they have to give a punishment. So, what should be that punishment? Let them not look at what the Syndicate has recommended. He gave 5 minutes to the members to give 5 suggestions.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that it would have been better if they had been provided the details about the date of joining, present position and the pay being drawn by the person.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to how it is relevant.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that any disciplinary authority has to have everything in front of it, supposing if they take a decision to bring the person to a lower stage.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa read out section 13.3(i) of the Act which says that "to take action for sexual harassment as a misconduct in accordance with the provisions of the service rules applicable to the respondent or where no such service rules have been made, in such manner as may be prescribed". Since they have prescribed rules, they must look those service rules. Without looking into/going through those service rules, they could not give the punishment.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, if the members wanted to look those service rules and come back to the matter in the December meeting, he is okay with it to which some of the members said 'no'.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they did not want to prolong the agony of the victim.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired whether they are going to decide the punishment to be given to the person today and now itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person is an Assistant Professor either at stage-2 or stage-3.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that without giving ample opportunity of hearing, how could they decide the quantum of punishment without giving.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the show cause notice has to be issued by the punishing authority.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they have to hear a person on the quantum of sentence.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this is a departmental action but not a court of law.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that such things happen in the departmental action.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that anybody who is not authorised to issue the show cause notice, that show cause notice is not effective.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that according to the Act, once the report is accepted, the penalty is to be given according to the service rules applicable to the person. The service rules applicable to the person are that if the Vice-Chancellor considers that the minor punishment is enough, then he could give any minor punishment without any further reason. If the Vice-Chancellor does not recommend minor punishment, then major punishment is to be given. If the major punishment is to be given, then they have to give a notice as to why such an action be not taken against him. After the receipt of the reply from the person, the final decision is taken. In that context, he suggested that they should ask the person as to why he should not be dismissed. Let him reply and depending on reply, they could reduce the punishment. If they give the lower punishment, then they could not enhance the higher punishment. Therefore, according to him, they should ask the person as to why he should not be dismissed. Let the person reply and they could consider that reply and then decide on the amount of punishment to be given.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether they place the person under suspension now.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that, “yes” they could place the person under suspension immediately.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with what Professor R.P. Bambah has said.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he also agrees with Professor R.P. Bambah. He said that a copy of proper service conduct rules for the teachers be provided so as to have a look as to what are the penalties listed in those rules and they have to choose the penalty to be imposed proportionate to the offence. The quantum of major penalty could also be decided through circulation.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the major penalties provided under the rules are: (i) reduction to a lower post or time scale; or to a lower stage in a time-scale; (ii) removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment; (iii) dismissal from service of the University.

Professor Chaman Lal said that large number of members of the House would be agreeable if the person is reduced to a lower scale to which members said, ‘no’. Then he suggested that the person should be sent on forced leave for two years, referred to PGIMER for psychiatric treatment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the suggestion given by Professor R.P. Bambah is that the person be placed under suspension and a show cause notice be served upon him as to why he should not be dismissed from service. Let the person plead whatever he wanted. If the person gives a suggestion that he would come back and be rehabilitated, let such a suggestion come from the person instead of forcing it on him. He requested the members whether they accept the suggestion of Professor R.P. Bambah to which some of the members said, ‘yes’.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the report of PUCASH dated 7.12.2015 submitted by Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Chairperson, PUCASH be accepted;

- (ii) Dr. Komal Singh, Department of Public Administration be placed under suspension;
- (iii) show cause notice be served on him as to why he be not dismissed from service of the University.

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

C-35. That

- (i) report dated 31.05.2017 of the Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) regarding complaint of student of B.Sc. 3rd year (Tourism Management), UIHTM, P.U. against faculty member of Department of Public Administration be accepted. As major penalty of removal from service of the same faculty member in another case of sexual harassment by the same faculty member was recommended by the Syndicate, the Syndicate reiterates its earlier decision of removal from service of the faculty member in present case also and recommends this case be tagged with the earlier case;
- (ii) the tone, the language and the intent of the letter written by Dr. Komal Singh, Department of Public Administration to the Chancellor be condemned; and
- (iii) notice for vacating the residential accommodation allotted on the campus be issued to Dr. Komal Singh, Department of Public Administration.

(Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 Para 5 & 30)

XXXVI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-36 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-36. That the recommendations dated 17.07.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as authorised by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 12.02.2017) on the issue relating to legal notice served through e-mail to the Chancellor, Panjab University by Professor V.K. Chopra, Department of Evening Studies-MDRRC, P.U. to frame a code of conduct for re-employed teachers to air their grievances, be approved and Regulation 17 be also added.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 5)

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are well aware of the conduct of one of their colleagues, namely Professor Vijay Chopra. All of them receive mails everyday from him. Lot of material has already been made available to them. His re-employment period stands curtailed but he continues to indulge in acts which are unacceptable. Now, what should apply to the retired Professors, what code of conduct should apply to the re-employed Professors Could they continue indulging in such acts which amount to causing grave anguish and inconvenience to all the members of the governing body, to the political leadership of the country, to the office of the Chancellor and so on. So, this is the issue before them. So, a Committee was appointed which was chaired by Professor Rajat Sandhir and they have resolved certain things. So, this is what has come before them. It

is Code of Professional Ethics as elaborated in the UGC Regulations on Minimum Qualifications for Appointment of Teachers and Other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education, 2010 and adopted by the University be made applicable in case of re-employed teachers. Whatever is applied to regular teachers, the same will be applied to re-employed teachers because if they are giving honour to the retired teachers, that they should come to the University and take part in academic activities and not indulge in things which amount to causing anguish to the academic affairs of the University. In the case of breach by such re-employed teachers, action may be taken by the competent authority under the existing provisions of Panjab University Calendar as applicable to the regular teachers of Panjab University, Chandigarh. If a teacher indulges in such things, they should do everything that is there in the rules. If there is a need to hold an enquiry, or there is a need to give a show cause notice, whatever is needed, they should initiate immediate proceedings.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired whether this rule would be applicable equally to all persons who are part of the University in whatever capacity, that anybody who directly writes to the Chancellor, he/she would be punished.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that it is not a question of writing to the Chancellor to which Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is, but the Vice-Chancellor clarified that it is a case of issuing legal notices.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the issue which has been resolved today in the Senate, e-mails on this issue have also been sent to the Chancellor whereas the same should not have been sent so that the matter could not be blown up like this. One of the Senate members met the newly appointed Chancellor and apprised him of the situation in which the University is passing through, what is the gravity of that situation. The issue whether a particular person is to be given the promotion or not was discussed with Chancellor & the same got published in the newspapers. On the one hand, if a teacher writes directly to the Chancellor, then they say that he/she would be punished and that the person should write to the Chancellor only through the Vice-Chancellor. On the other hand, a Senator meets the Chancellor directly and a very small issue gets discussed, there which could have been discussed in the Senate also. Similarly, the President, PUTA has also sent an e-mail which could have been discussed in the Senate. He enquired should rules be made applicable equally to all or not. What kind of image they are projecting before the new Chancellor?

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now they are to pass only **item C-36** and the matters arising out of that, they could take up later on.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-36 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXXVII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-37 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.–

C-37. That minutes dated 28.07.2017 of the Screening/Selection Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalize the promotional case of Programmers, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 15)

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

C-38. That the proposal of certain Syndics with regard to change in rule for extension/re-employment of Principal of aided/unaided Colleges, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 39)

Mrs. Surinder Kaur said that no extension should be given to the Principals because the eligible candidates are available in all the Colleges and they should be given a chance. They have received letters from teachers of about 120 Colleges who have written that the Principals should not be given the extension and have requested to transmit the same to the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that he agreed with Mrs. Surinder Kaur. This is a back door entry through this agenda item regarding giving the extension to the Principals which is unfair, unjust and anti-teachers. He said that he has no objection to the culture of re-employment prevalent in the University but it may not be extended to the affiliated Colleges. He has read the representation where two logics have been given for re-employment. The first logic is that the eligible candidates are neither available nor would be available in future. What kind of an astrological statement this is? Even it is also not clear whether the Principals who are asking for extension are themselves eligible or not. He has not read the names of the persons who have submitted the representation and those persons are their colleagues. He is talking in a rational manner. The logic given behind the extension being sought for is that the eligible candidates are neither available nor would be available in future. It is unfair, unjust. Another logic is being given is that the advertisements have to be issued time and again and it is a costly affair whereas the cost of the salary of the Principals given out of the funds of the Colleges is more than the cost of advertisement. Earlier, the Principals used to be a pious and academic link between the Colleges and the Managements but now they have just become puppets. By this, the system is delinking. The extension is against the rules of Punjab Government which has fixed the age of retirement at 60 years. It is also against the rules of the UGC which has fixed the tenure of the Principal as 5 years which could be extended by another 5 years subject to the maximum age of 60 years. He requested the House and the Chairman of House not to grant extension to the Principals.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Executive Body of Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union has decided that the extension formula adopted by the University from 60 years to 65 years for the private and aided Colleges is totally wrong. They have adopted the UGC Regulations, 2010 and the same are also intimated to the Punjab Government. In those guidelines, the term of the Principal has been fixed at 5 years which the Punjab Government has fixed at 10 years. Due to the proposed regulations of the University, the eligible College teachers are losing a chance for becoming the Principal. Secondly, due to this decision taken by the University, there are two Principals working in the Colleges because the Punjab Government is not accepting the Principal which has been given the extension by the University. No grant is released for such Principals. As pointed out by Dr. K.K. Sharma, the salary of such Principals is being paid out of the College funds. If the Punjab Government has not recognised such a Principal, the signature of the senior most teacher are being accepted by the Government, what kind of a paradox they have created. So many teachers of the Colleges have represented against it which has been sent to the Union as also to the Vice-Chancellor. It is a very wrong decision and it should be stopped in the larger interest of the teacher community. He strongly condemned it.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that a decision in this regard had been taken about 2½-3 years ago and the issue should not have been placed again before the Senate. There are about 200 Colleges and if they have a look on the data for the last 3-4 years, they would find that there are 6-7 Principals who have been given extension. When the advertisement is issued for the first time, that is an open advertisement in which anybody could apply. In about 40-50 Colleges, the posts of Principals are lying vacant and anybody could apply there. If they look at the history of the extension of the Principals, only those Principals have been given extension by the Managements who have made a contribution and have been able to get the grants for the Colleges. The Managements have to pay the salary from their own funds. Therefore, it is wrong to say that the rights of someone are being snatched. All the persons are getting the opportunity. Secondly, the extension is given only on the non-availability. The advertisement is given for the second time also. Whatever Shri Jagdeep Kumar has said is totally wrong as the DPI (Colleges) and the UGC accept the Principals who have been given the extension. The Principals are given a weightage of 3-4% by the Managements and everything is open. There are so many Colleges where the posts are lying vacant, anybody could apply there as it is open to all. Therefore, the rights of anyone are not being impinged upon. Therefore, the extension should be given. The vacant posts of the Colleges should be filled up where all the teachers could apply. A decision in this regard has already been taken about 2½ years back. They have changed the duration from 2+2+1 years to 3+2 years and there is no change in rule but it is just a change in the time by the Syndicate under this item. It is either 2+3 years or 3+2 years. He suggested that as the University is giving the re-employment for 5 years, the extension in the Colleges should also be at the same lines and why to put extra burden on the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that not much expenditure is involved in issuing an advertisement.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the Managements grant the extension only to suitable persons as the expenditure on this is met by the Managements out of their own funds. The signature of such Principals are accepted by the DPI (Colleges) and the UGC. The percentage of Principals getting the extension is about 3-4% which comes to about 6-7 Principals and all the other posts are open to all. If the Management is willing to bear the expenditure, then there should be no problem to anyone. He said that the age of retirement for Principals in Colleges should also be 65 to which the Vice Chancellor said that they should not mix up this with the University.

Shri H.S. Dua said that as regards the issue of Principals' extension, this issue has taken a horrible shape that in Ludhiana City, except 3-4 colleges, such Principals are continuing. If Vice-Chancellor permits then he could name these colleges. If they start counting from Ferozepur, Jalandhar and Chandigarh, these include the colleges like Atam Vallabh Jain College, Sri Aurobindo College, Kamla Lohtia College, Guru Nanak Girls College, Guru Nanak Khalsa College for Women. Only in the district of Ludhiana colleges, there are at least 600 Assistant Professors and Associate Professors in such colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why they are not applying when the advertisement appears.

Shri H.S. Dua said that they have been repeatedly asking for information about affiliation and Selection Committees. Whosoever has been delegated to do this work, he has to say with heavy heart also that they are facing problems. It is true that there is a total contract from the stage of searching people to making appointments and approvals. Everybody knows where the post is going to fall vacant, candidates come there and appointment is approved. For the post of Principal, Selection Committee panel is constituted and approved there. In the colleges where interview for the post of Principal was held and then rejected, almost the panel remains the same. Second time nobody

applies for the same. But if at all, somebody wants to apply for the post of Principal and come to fill up the form, he is told by the college Clerk that a person who is already working on the post, will continue. All Fellows who are sitting here know about that. He has nothing to do whether his name has been put on one Committee or the name of some other person has been put in more Committee. He informed that he went to the Dy. Registrar (Colleges) to see the list. He could not take these lists from the Dy. Registrar (Colleges) as, perhaps, the list were not properly prepared by him or he did not want to provide him the lists intentionally. If they have a look on the lists, it seems that these are not correct. If the Vice-Chancellor would see that these lists, he would feel that these lists are not correct. He pointed out that a person is appointed as DCDC nominee for one time only, whereas other person is appointed DCDC nominee for fifteen times to which the Vice Chancellor said that right now, this is not the issue.

Shri H.S. Dua said requested the Vice Chancellor to listen to him as they have been listening to him since morning. He further said if he would say something more, he would sit. He does not want to tell anything more, but, what he is saying is happening.

The Vice Chancellor said that a College is expected to advertise the post. After the advertisement there has to be a decision that there was no applicant for the post or they appointed somebody, but the person did not join. He has not come across many things like none found suitable. None found suitable means that applicants did come to attend the interview. To make the things more stringent, they can say that the advertisement would have to be given twice more in a given year. If they fail repeatedly only then the existing Principal will continue. The process of looking for a Principal must commence as soon as the Principal crosses the age of 59. The post will be advertised, if a person is found suitable then he/she will join when the present Principal reaches the age of 60. If suitable person is not found after the first advertisement, then the post will be advertised second time. A post must be advertised minimum twice till the Principal reaches the age of 60. Then in those circumstances if nobody is found, then the present Principal will continue for a period of one year.

Dr. K.K. Sharma asked, why not a senior most teacher be allowed to act as officiating Principal instead of extending the term of the present Principal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue relating to two Principal is already a disputed issue. They say that the D.P.I. Colleges, (Punjab) is not accepting it.

Shri H.S. Dua told that as he tried to say something about this last time but they should not take it as an aspersion on the officers who go to the Colleges. It has to be seen how they could break this nexus. He pointed out that the most important issue is that two Principals are being appointed in one college.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started to speak simultaneously without seeking approval of the Chair.

As order returned, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he does not want to say anything for and against it, but the information which is being given here that the D.P.I., Colleges, Punjab has been accepting the two Principals That is totally wrong. If they accept the Principal's signature beyond the age of 60, why the grant is not being released to these colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Panjab Government or the U.T. Government will not give salaries to the Colleges who are in a position of grant-in-aid Colleges, beyond the age of 60 years. He has talked to both governments and they have categorically stated this.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said, then why the Punjab Government will accept beyond the age of 60 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to accept or not to accept is a different thing, if the management decides to pay the Principals from their own funds.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that signatures of Principal who are working beyond the age of 60 years are not accepted in the office of the D.P.I. Cases sent for approval of grant-in-aid teachers or for seeking grants against these posts, the signatures of such Principals are not accepted in the D.P.I. office.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he does not want to speak, but it is a totally wrong statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could speak since he is a member of the Syndicate and the proposal has come from the Syndicate not from his side.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that his signatures are being accepted and grants released.

Principal B.C. Josan, while endorsing the view point of Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, said that grants are being released not only by D.H.E. but also by the MHRD and the University Grants Commission.

Shri H.S. Dua said that he wants to know whether any Principal continuing beyond the age of 60 years is getting the grants from the MHRD or DHE Punjab. The signature of such Principals are not accepted and the grant is not being released.

Principal B.C. Josan further added that he is also in favour that the college teachers should also be given reemployment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that two things should not be mixed. One is that the Principal is being de-recognised by the Government in the sense that correspondence by them is not being entertained. The Punjab Government may or may not agree to pay the salary.

Shri H.S. Dua further said that if some Principal has done some extraordinary work, the management may offer him some other position like Advisor etc. to make use of his services. Senior cadre teachers are being debarred to avail the chance to become Principal. It is very unfortunate that if somebody has salary motive, the University authorities seem to be hand in gloves with him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he refuses to accept this accusation unhesitatingly.

Shri H.S. Dua said that it is not an accusation, but a fact. The authorities are with them.

The Vice-Chancellor said, he is the authority in the university and he refutes this accusation. When that thing came to him for the first time, he said that the posts have to be advertised, it must be re-advertised. There are members of that House. Sh. Ashok Goyal was there. When for the first time this issue came up, did he not said it repeatedly that the posts should be advertised. He did not stop Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal's appointment, he asked them to advertise the post, again the post was re-advertised. As the first extension is for two years, if a persons is not available, the present Principal could be given extension for two years. Similarly, before the expiry of his two years term, the post should

be advertised twice and in case again no one is found suitable, extension could be granted and so on. The proposal is that instead of the present proposal, i.e., 2+2+1 years, it should be replaced by 3+2 years.

Shri H.S. Dua said that this proposal should be abolished. They cannot stop any senior teacher to become a Principal. If they accept this proposal, they will put a bar on the promotion of teachers. When an advertisement appears for the post of Principal, they could find many faculty members (at least 10) eligible for the post of Principal. But they do not apply.

The Vice-Chancellor said why they are not applying. How he is responsible for that. He requested Shri H.S. Dua to conclude.

Shri H.S. Dua said that he is not saying anything irrelevant and he has to say much on the issue.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that if extension is not granted, then the teachers will apply.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not taken that decision. He wanted to know if he (Shri Dua) wants the matter to go back to the Syndicate.

Shri H.S. Dua while saying 'no' to it, requested that voting should be done on that issue.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that extension in service for Principals was started with the pattern of 2+2+1 about three and half years ago. He had attended the first time the meeting of Senate and at that time it was discussed in the meeting of Senate of 2013 where many Fellows had said that this was not the Senate issue and could not be decided in the Senate. Since, it is a rule and thus can be decided in the Syndicate. Senate meeting proceeding could be checked and after that no Senate decision was taken. Finally, whatever was the decision of the Syndicate, that was implemented. That can be checked from the old Senate proceedings. They cannot take a decision today to replace the old decision.

Shri H.S. Dua said that he had earlier made a request to the University to send the lists of Vice-Chancellor's nominees and Selection Committees, Principals and College teachers in Chandigarh and Punjab to all the Fellows of the Senate, as has been done in the zero hour, so that all the Senate members could see as to how the things are being exploited. But they are not providing the record.

The Vice-Chancellor asked, who are not providing the lists.

Shri H.S. Dua said that he contacted Deputy Registrar (Colleges) two times for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor asked why these are not provided and said that record has been there with the branch and he could check the record there.

Shri H.S. Dua said that he went to Dy. Registrar (Colleges) and checked the record but it is not the correct record. He further said that the compiled record may be provided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that record has been compiled and he has checked the same himself.

Dr. Inder Pal Singh Sidhu said that Vice-Chancellor should order so that record is provided to them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has already been ordered and further stated that the orders will be sent again.

As desired by the Vice-Chancellor, the Registrar informed that a mail was sent to all those who had demanded. By recollecting his memory, he said the mail was sent to Shri Dua and Dr. Keshav Malhotra. All of them who had demanded were sent an email.

The Vice-Chancellor said email would go to everybody.

The Registrar further told that the entire record has been kept in the three cabinets in the Dy. Registrar (Colleges) office and had been segregated. Complete data has been compiled on the computer. The complete data for the whichever period they need, the Dy. Registrar (Colleges) would help in providing the same.

Shri. H.S. Dua said that he sent messages to Dy. Registrar (Colleges) yesterday and also on day before yesterday. He has sent an email to Dy. Registrar (Colleges) in response to which he got an email from Dy. Registrar (Colleges), containing the message "record is available with the Dy. Registrar (Colleges), go and see." He went to the Dy. Registrar (Colleges) Branch and he was told to see the required information from the heap of files.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the record has been segregated year-wise.

Shri H.S. Dua said that the Vice-Chancellor could check and see the files. The record is not complete. The record contains information regarding recommendations sent by them. They wanted record of Vice-Chancellor's nominees, subject experts being sent from the Vice Chancellor. They are being provided the wrong record and they are being misled.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has no record and all record is lying in the Colleges Branch.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra said Professor Rajesh Gill was provided record within 24 hours, but he has not been provided the record even after the lapse of three months.

The Vice-Chancellor said that was a matter arising out of discussion. They are discussing item No.C-38.

Shri H.S. Dua that this matter is related with the current item to which the Vice-Chancellor said, 'no', it is not so. He said that that Vice-Chancellor could not snub him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not snubbing him. But, they could not hold this House to ransom. Nobody would hold this House to ransom.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra said that he had written a letter on 8th June, 2017, but no response has been received.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had already made record available to him. The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not hold this House to ransom. Nobody would hold this House to ransom. He has not hidden any information from him (Sh. H.S. Dua) and asked not to accuse him.

Shri H.S. Dua said that he (Vice-Chancellor) does not know what is happening in the subordinate offices.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he cannot supervise everything himself.

Shri H.S.Dua said he could also not do anything in this regard, but they should at least be provided proper information.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have been running this system for the last two to three decades and he had just joined this University five years ago.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he received that information on September 1, 2017 on my email. But he had sent the letter on June 8th, 2017. No response was received. Then again he wrote a letter that reply should be given in the Senate. He had sought reply in the Senate so that the same is circulated in the Senate. He further said that in order to avoid, the reply has been sent to him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that after compiling the information, he could not circulate it quickly to all the Fellows as he had just too much of work to do. He had told the office to compile the record and they have compiled it.

The Vice-Chancellor said to look at item No. 38, which they were talking. This is not a zero hour.

However, Shri H.S. Dua said that he is talking on item No.C-38.

As Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri H.S. Dua started speaking together, the Vice-Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage.

When the meeting resumed the Vice-Chancellor said that let him be allowed to conduct the meeting. They were discussing item No.38. There was lot of information that is desired arising out of it which are *prima facie* no connection with it and but accusations are being levelled as if something is intentionally being hidden from them. Whatever information is required, collating that will take some time. Let him propose that by the time next Senate meets, all that information will be collated, not only the people who went into the Committees during his tenure, but also during the tenure of his predecessors. All that would be provided that he has proposed just now before he adjourned meeting because it is already 5'O'clock. He was conducting the meeting (Syndicate) till 7.30 p.m. yesterday. Tomorrow he has a meeting at 10.00 a.m. He has been asked by the Governor to report at 11.30 a.m. He has to present the Panjab University's case before the Governor where the representatives of U.T., Punjab and Haryana have been called. He needs time to prepare for that meeting. He also needs time to prepare for the meeting that he has been asked to attend as a member of the Governing Council of CSIR at the 75th year of CSIR at Vigyan Bhawan. On Wednesday he has to make a presentation before the Chancellor regarding the concerns of the Panjab University. So he needed time to prepare mentally and so on. He is extremely tired; he could not run the meeting, the way it was going on.

On a question by a member as to when the next meeting will held, the Vice- Chancellor said it will be informed to them.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Saturday, 16th December 2017 at 10.00 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Dr. Amit Joshi
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
6. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
7. Dr. Amar Singh
8. Professor Anita Kaushal
9. Ms. Anu Chatrath
10. Professor B.S. Ghuman
11. Dr. B.C. Josan
12. Professor Chaman Lal
13. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
14. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
15. Dr. Dalip Kumar
16. Shri Deepak Kaushik
17. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
18. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
19. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
20. Dr. Gurmit Singh
21. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
22. Shri H.S. Dua
23. Dr. Harsh Batra
24. Dr. Harjodh Singh
25. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
26. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
27. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
28. Professor J.K. Goswamy
29. Dr. Jagdish Chander
30. Shri Jarnail Singh
31. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
32. Dr. K.K. Sharma
33. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
34. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
35. Dr. N.R. Sharma
36. Dr. Neeru Malik
37. Professor Navdeep Goyal
38. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra
39. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
40. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
41. Shri Naresh Gaur
42. Dr. Parveen Goyal
43. Shri Prabhjit Singh
44. Professor Pam Rajput
45. Professor Rajat Sandhir
46. Professor Ronki Ram

47. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
48. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
49. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
50. Professor R.P. Bambah
51. Shri Raghbir Dyal
52. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
53. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
54. Dr. S.K. Sharma
55. Dr. S. S. Sangha
56. Dr. Subhash Sharma
57. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
58. Ms. Surinder Kaur
59. Shri Satya Pal Jain
60. Professor Shelly Walia
61. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
62. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
63. Shri Sandeep Kumar
64. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
65. Shri Varinder Singh
66. Shri V.K. Sibal
67. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Shri Amanpreet Singh
2. Dr. Ameer Sultana
3. Dr. Amod Gupta
4. Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary, Education Minister, Punjab
5. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
6. Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu
7. Dr. Baljinder Singh
8. Professor Deepak Pental
9. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
10. Justice Harbans Lal
11. Shri Harjit Singh, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
12. Smt. Kirron Kher
13. Shri Parimal Rai
14. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
15. Shri Parmod Kumar
16. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
17. Shri Punam Suri
18. Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal
19. Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, D.H.E., Punjab
20. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
21. Shri Sandeep Singh
22. Shri Sanjay Tandon
23. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
24. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
25. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang

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

- (i) Mrs. Veeran Devi, mother of Dr. Gurdip Sharma, Principal, G.G.D.S.D. College, Haryana, Hoshiarpur and Fellow, Panjab University, on 13th December, 2017,
- (ii) Sardarni Sukhwinder Kaur Sandhu, mother of Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu, Fellow, Panjab University, on 20th November, 2017,
- (iii) Dr. Pawan Kapur, former Director, C.S.I.O. (Oct. 2004 – Dec. 2012), Chandigarh, on 8th December 2017. He was a founder member of CRIKC. He hosted the first meeting of the Heads of CRIKC Institutions in July 2012,
- (iv) Mr. M.S. Kalyan, Former Rajya Sabha member and also a former fellow of the PU Senate from 1996-2000.

The Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Mrs. Veeran Devi, Sardarni Sukhwinder Kaur Sandhu, Dr. Pawan Kapur and Mr. M.S. Kalyan and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor welcomed Professor. J.K. Goswamy and other members who have come to attend the meeting for the first time.

I. The Vice Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the Hon'ble members of the Senate that –

- i) At the request of Hon'ble Governor of Punjab & Administrator, UT, Chandigarh, Shri V.P. Singh Badnore, Hon'ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu, Vice-President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University, presided over a meeting convened in his office at New Delhi. Hon'ble Governor of Punjab apprised the Chancellor about the financial concerns of Panjab University and its importance as a premier academic institution and its pivotal role in bringing together all academic institutions and national laboratories under the umbrella of CRIKC. The Vice Chancellor, PU, made a presentation during this meeting. The representatives from the UGC and MHRD were also invited to be present in the meeting.

Hon'ble Chancellor, PU, has very kindly accepted our request to visit PU as Chief Guest for its 67th Annual Convocation on Sunday, March 4, 2018.

- ii) A document containing proposal for grant of the status of 'Institution of Excellence' with respect to Panjab University, Chandigarh, has been submitted to the MHRD, on December 11, 2017.
- iii) 2nd Dr. Urmi Kessar Memorial Lecture/Oration has been awarded to a highly acclaimed novelist and poet Shri Vikram Seth. The event is

scheduled at 4.30 pm on January 8, 2018, in the University Auditorium. As per a revised provision in the Endowment for Dr. Urmi Kessar Memorial Lecture/Oration, an honorarium of Rs.5 lakhs is envisaged to be paid to the speaker. Prof. Rumina Sethi, Dept. of English and Cultural Studies shall be interlocutor during an interaction with Mr. Vikram Seth on January 8, 2018.

- iv) Prof. R.K. Kohli, former fellow and former Dean of University Instruction, PU and Vice Chancellor, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda, submitted a proposal to the Panjab University, Chandigarh, for establishing an Endowment Fund in the name of his revered father (Late) Shri Shiv Nath Rai Kohli for instituting an annual award comprising cash prize of Rs.1,00,000/-(one lakh only) and a plaque with citation. This proposal has been accepted by the Syndicate on 10.12.2017. This award would be open to researchers in the PU, Central University of Punjab and CRIC Institutions.
- v) 'Smt. Prem Lata and Prof. D.V.S. Jain Research Foundation' honoured Prof. O.P. Katare of University Inst. of Pharmaceutical Sciences with Smt. Prem Lata Jain Best Researcher Award (2016), a citation and cash prize of Rs.15,000 and Dr. Navneet Kaur, Associate Professor of the Dept. of Chemistry with Prof. D.V.S. Jain Best Researcher Award (2016), a citation and cash prize of Rs.30,000 at the 2nd Research Award Ceremony in the Department of Chemistry on 20th November 2017. The Foundation further felicitated Dr. Nishima Wangoo (UIET), Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma (Chemistry), Prof. B.S. Bhoop (UIPS), Prof. O.P. Katare (UIPS), Dr. Sonal Singhal (Chemistry) and Prof. Bimla Nehru (Biophysics) with Best Publication Award(s) and a cash prize of Rs.5000/- each.
- vi) Prof. Jai Prakash, former Chairperson, Department of Hindi, will be honoured with 'Sahitya Bhushan' along with cash prize of Rs. 2 lakhs and a memento for his lifelong services in the promotion of Hindi Sahitya for the year 2016 by the Uttar Pradesh Hindi Sansthan.
- vii) Smt. Krishna Sobti, noted writer of Hindi literature and an alumna of University of Panjab at Lahore has been selected to receive Jnanpith Award-2017 for her outstanding contributions in Indian literature.
- viii) Dr. Baljinder Singh, Fellow, Panjab University and Professor at Department of Nuclear Medicine, PGIMER, Chandigarh, has been elected as President of the Society of Nuclear Medicine-India.
- ix) Defence Research & Development Organization (DRDO) has awarded a research project to Dr Avenet Saini, Assistant Professor at the Department of Biophysics with a research grant of Rs. 60 lakh to carry out advanced research to design and validate novel peptides against pathogenic microbes. Prof. Praveen Rishi of the Dept. of Microbiology & Dean, Faculty of Sciences and Dr. Neha Singla, DST Inspire faculty in the Dept. of Biophysics are co-investigators in the project.
- x) PU Vice Chancellor and Dean Alumni Relations attended the Fourth Annual Reunion on an invitation from Panjab University Campus Students Alumni Association (Regd.) at Surrey, British Columbia, Canada on

October 22, 2017. They also visited University of British Columbia (UBC), Vancouver, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver and University of Fraser Valley, Abbotsford to further fortify relationship(s) of PU with them.

- xi) India Canada-IMPACTS (a conglomeration of Canadian universities and Canadian industries based at University of British Columbia, Canada) has signed a MoU with Panjab University, Chandigarh and CRIKC Institutions during DST-CII India-Canada Technology Summit in New Delhi on November 13 and 14, 2017. Three Canadian ministers were present during this event.
- xii) The University of Birmingham (UoB) has invited the Vice Chancellor and Dean Alumni Relations, PU, to participate in the Inauguration of UoB India Institute on January 29, 2018. The PU alumni in U.K. have proposed to host an event on January 28, 2018, to meet the PU Vice Chancellor. They had hosted a delegation led by the Vice Chancellor, PU and CRIKC Institutions in August 2014 as they visited Universities at Birmingham and at Nottingham. During his visit to UK, the Vice Chancellor will visit other Institutes and Universities at Nottingham on their invitation to further renew relationship with them. In order to sign collaborative documents with London School of Management Education (LSME) on behalf of Panjab University and Chandigarh Region Innovation and Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), the Vice Chancellor, PU, will visit London on Monday, February 5, 2018.
- xiii) Hon'ble Dr. Harsh Vardhan, Minister of Science & Technology, Minister of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and Minister of Earth Sciences, has appointed Prof. Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU, as Member of the CSIR-Recruitment and Assessment Board (RAB) w.e.f. 13th October, 2017, for a period of three years in his capacity as Vice-President, CSIR. The Prime Minister of India as President of CSIR had earlier made him a member of the Governing Council of CSIR.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh informed that Mrs. Krishna Sobti had received Jnanpith Award and she is a living legend. In spite being her from Punjab and she has contributed a lot in Hindi literature. He also mentioned about Dr. Gurdial Singh who has also written many Punjabi Novels and he also contributed a lot in Punjabi literature and Panjab University had also invited him for the Panjab University Foundation Day lecture. Since Mrs. Sobti is not keeping well they could felicitate her by organising a big event in Panjab University in which the Department could also help. She also holds a great place in giving direction to the women discourse.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the Dean Alumni Relations is already working in this direction.

Professor Chaman Lal said that since Mrs. Sobti is not keeping well and if she expresses her inability to come to Chandigarh, they could think of honouring her in Delhi.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would follow it. There is a possibility of it and they could do it in the Institute of Punjab Studies at Delhi.

RESOLVED: That:

- (2) felicitation of the Senate be conveyed to –

- (i) Prof. R.K. Kohli, former fellow and former Dean of University Instruction, PU and Vice Chancellor, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda, for establishing an Endowment Fund in the name of his revered father (Late) Shri Shiv Nath Rai Kohli for instituting an annual award comprising cash prize of Rs.1,00,000/- (one lakh only) and a plaque with citation;
- (ii)
 - (a) Prof. O.P. Katare of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences on having been honoured with Smt. Prem Lata Jain Best Researcher Award (2016)
 - (b) Dr. Navneet Kaur, Associate Professor of the Dept. of Chemistry on having been honoured with Prof. D.V.S. Jain Best Researcher Award (2016)
 - (c) Dr. Nishima Wangoo (UIET), Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma (Chemistry), Prof. B.S. Bhoop (UIPS), Prof. O.P. Katare (UIPS), Dr. Sonal Singhal (Chemistry) and Prof. Bimla Nehru (Biophysics) on having been conferred with Best Publication Award(s) by 'Smt. Prem Lata and Professor D.V.S. Jain Research Foundation'
- (iii) Prof. Jai Prakash, former Chairperson, Department of Hindi, on being selected by the Uttar Pradesh Hindi Sansthan for 'Sahitya Bhushan 2016' award
- (iv) Smt. Krishna Sobti, noted writer of Hindi literature and an alumna of University of Panjab at Lahore on having been selected to receive Jnanpith Award-2017 for her outstanding contributions in Indian literature.
- (v) Dr. Baljinder Singh, Fellow, Panjab University and Professor at Department of Nuclear Medicine, PGIMER, Chandigarh, on having been elected as President of the Society of Nuclear Medicine-India.
- (vi) Dr. Aveneet Saini, Assistant Professor, Department of Biophysics on having been sanctioned a research grant of Rs. 60 lakh to carry out advanced research to design and validate novel peptides against pathogenic microbes by Defence Research & Development Organization (DRDO)
- (vii) Prof. Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU, on having been appointed as Member of the CSIR-Recruitment and Assessment Board (RAB) w.e.f. 13th October, 2017, for a period of three years in his capacity as Vice-President, CSIR by Hon'ble Dr. Harsh Vardhan, Minister of Science & Technology, Minister of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and Minister of Earth Sciences.

- (2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (i), (ii), (iii), (x), (xi) and (xii) be noted.

After the Vice-Chancellor's statement, the Vice-Chancellor said that let they resume the meeting from **Item No.C-39**, Dr. K.K. Sharma said that he would like to discuss the **Item C-38** which has been mentioned to be withdrawn and thereafter the discussion continued.

II.

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

- C-38.** That the proposal of certain Syndics with regard to change in rule for extension/re-employment of Principal of aided/unaided Colleges, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 39)

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that this item is concerned with the teachers' community and instead of taking it seriously, this extraordinary item has already been withdrawn. So this is snubbing of the voice of the teacher community across the Panjab University affiliated Colleges in Punjab. So, on behalf of the teacher community and Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers' Union, he recorded his dissent against the withdrawal of this item.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the last meeting of the Senate was adjourned because he had asked for the record of Affiliation Committees and Inspection Committees and the Vice-Chancellor had stated that the office would provide the record before the next meeting and only then the next meeting would be held. He pointed out that since October till date, that record has not been made available and instead the item which needed to be focussed and deliberated in detail, has been withdrawn. This issue has become a burning issue in affiliated Colleges to Panjab University which are about 190 in number as to why in spite of the persons being qualified and eligible for becoming Principal the issue of extension of Principals is being allowed again and again. Why the issue of extension of the Principals, first from one year to two years, then two to three years and then from three years to two years, is being placed again and again and why the teachers (Associate Professors) are being discouraged and are deprived in spite of fulfilling the criteria for the post of Principal. He had earlier also said that, whether it is known to the Vice-Chancellor or not, there is a need to see how the Inspection and Selection Committees work. He had requested that the record be not only provided to him but also be checked by the Vice-Chancellor and seen as to what is happening. Instead of discussing the issue on which the Senate was adjourned, the item has been withdrawn. It is also an issue related with about 2.25 lacs students studying in the affiliated Colleges. Do they come to discuss only the items related with the promotions of teachers or CAS promotions? On the one hand, they are demanding that a special Senate meeting be held to discuss the issues related with the Colleges, but the major issue has been withdrawn. The issue was adjourned in last meeting and the same been withdrawn from this meeting, then what was the need to hold the meeting. They have come specially to discuss that issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they adjourned the meeting on an issue which was not related to Item C-38. Most of the discussion on Item C-38 was already over and it was pointed out at that stage that this issue actually was in the Senate meeting inadvertently.

This was an issue which should have been closed at the Syndicate meeting itself because earlier this was the practice. The item came to the Senate inadvertently. The Syndicate at one time had said that the Principals' position would be advertised and if none is found, then the existing Principals could continue with some algorithm which was 2+2+1 years and that algorithm was to be chanced and the Syndicate had to take a call that instead of 2+2+1 years it would be 3+2 years. There was nothing more in that item at that stage. There was a kind of add-on discussion which was unrelated to it but said that as if the data on who goes on the Inspection Committees and the Selection Committees, etc. is hidden by the University. There is no intent on behalf of the University to hide anything. Anybody is welcome and to get all the data. But if there is a need to have a special meeting on the issues of the Colleges, as they had many special meetings, he is open to have a special meeting on the issue of the Colleges. The Colleges are in a serious state of difficulty in terms of variety of things not just who goes to the Inspection Committee, who gives them approval, for which College to be given permanent or temporary affiliation. There are so many issues which are related to the Colleges which need attention. More severe thing in which the Colleges need attention is that the regular staff in the Colleges is continuously decreasing, the salaries being paid to the College staff is going down. After a long time, if the Punjab Government commenced the process of filling up the grant-in-aid positions, there was no rhyme or reason that the grant-in-aid positions should remain frozen for a long time. But the Government commenced the process with a starting salary which was such a low starting salary that would attract poor quality of teachers in the Colleges. Lesser competition would be there if the salaries are low. So, if the teachers are inducted with a lesser competition, the best quality teachers would not be available. The salary structure as envisaged by the UGC is good and the career profile given by the UGC is also good and it should attract the best people in the teaching profession in the country. But if the starting point is made unattractive, then ultimately the quality would suffer because once a teacher is employed and confirmed, he/she remains in service for 30 years. So, somehow they are not doing the things in a right way. In the background of the fact that the 7th Pay Commission is going to be implemented, whether the pay revision would get implemented in the States or not, there is no clarity. But the issues of the Colleges are indeed very-very serious. The number of students who pass through the Colleges is about 15-20 times of the students that pass through the University campuses of India. Large number of people are to receive higher education on behalf of the Colleges and lesser number on behalf of the universities of India. So, there is a need to pay very serious attention how to attract and retain the teaching talent in the Colleges. He is fine with it. They could have a special session on concerns of the Colleges. The members are free to send him some notes only devoted to the Colleges in the background of evolving situation. There is a very serious situation as more than half of the Engineering Colleges have closed down. Similar is the status of the Education Colleges when there is a dire need of good school teachers. They are not able to withstand the competition with China when it comes to manufacturing and they are closing down the Engineering Colleges due to which the manufacturing is down. They created so much of infrastructure for having Engineering Colleges and that infrastructure is all waste which is being converted into shopping malls in the villages where the Chinese goods would be preferred, Indian goods would further go down. So, these are very serious issues and he is prepared to have special session on Colleges on behalf of the premier University of the country. He requested the members to send him note(s) which he could collate and have a meaningful discussion.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that the emoluments paid to an Assistant Professor in the Colleges in Punjab and Chandigarh is Rs.15,000/- whereas the lowest salary of a non-teaching staff is Rs.18,000/-. The salary is so less that in this amount even a person could not take a house on rent.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is what he is saying. They would have a special session and requested the members to send him the suggestions. He would get it convened at least before his term expires. There would be no more discussion on item C-38.

Shri Naresh Gaur recorded his dissent against the withdrawal of Item C-38. It could not be a case that as and when the Vice-Chancellor wishes, he withdraws an item. It is like taking a u-turn on his own decision as when he was in the Syndicate the Vice-Chancellor had said that the information relating to the applicants would be uploaded on the website. But now the Vice-Chancellor is taking a u-turn and the item is withdrawn thinking that it would not be approved. He wanted to discuss on the issue. He wanted to know as to under what circumstances the item has been withdrawn.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua also wanted to know as to under what circumstances the item has been withdrawn.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has explained his position and suggested that they move on to Item C-39.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Vice-Chancellor has not explained as to why the item has been withdrawn but has explained that the last meeting was adjourned because the discussion happened on the other issue. He wanted to know as to under what circumstances and reasons the item has been withdrawn.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that could they justify that a Principal could continue up to the age of 65 or 70 years. What was the situation under which they had discussed the issue in the last meeting but in this meeting the Vice-Chancellor is saying that there is no need to discuss the issue.

Shri Naresh Gaur wanted to know the reasons for the withdrawal of the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already explained everything and said that they move on to Item C-39.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said no to it and said that since Item No. C-38 is an important item, it should be discussed. The House could also be asked as to whether Item No.C-38 needs to be discussed or not.

The Vice-Chancellor repeated that the Item No.C-38 amounted to changing an algorithm which the Syndicate had once decided as 2+2+1 years. In case after advertisement, nobody is found suitable, then the existing Principal could continue and the Managements have to pay the salary. The Syndicate had decided it to be 2+2+1 years and then the Syndicate changed it to 3+2 years and it was the prerogative of the Syndicate as it was a kind of a rule which normally should not have come to the Senate. Last time also when it came, it was under the same circumstances that this item should have not come as it was within the purview of the Syndicate. If the members wanted to propose another resolution for consideration by the Syndicate, they could give it to him and he would take it back to the Syndicate and bring back to the Senate. Any modifications that are needed in this, as a Senate member, they could send him a resolution which would be put up to the Syndicate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he wanted permission to speak on the algorithm which has been changed by the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not changed the algorithm, it has been done by the Syndicate and it was not at his suggestion. He requested Shri Harpreet Singh Dua to give another resolution to be considered by the Syndicate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired with the Punjab Government accepts the thing which they have discussed. He said that this is not accepted by the Punjab Government. With these new rules being framed different classifications are being prepared which are contrary to the rules of Punjab Government.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these are not new rules as these are going on since 2014.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said these are new rules as whenever a new Syndicate is elected, it changes the rules as per its whims contrary to the rules of the Punjab Government. The present Syndicate has also done similarly. He wanted to discuss this item and he be allowed to discuss the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment he was not permitting any more discussion on Item No. C-38.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that last time the discussion on Item No. C-38 was allowed and it was discussed due to which the Vice-Chancellor had adjourned the meeting. Now this item needs to be discussed in the beginning of the meeting. Since it is a main issue of the Colleges, without discussing this item, they would not move forward.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed to move on to Item No.C-39. He requested Shri Harpreet Singh Dua to give him a resolution which would be placed before the next Syndicate which they are going to elect. All matters pertaining to the extension of Principals which have been placed before all the previous Syndicates at least for the period since he joined as Vice-Chancellor in July 2012, he would collate all the discussions and every input that has been put, it would be placed before the new Syndicate in the background of whatever Shri Harpreet Singh Dua would propose and he could also access all the minutes of the Syndicate and Senate over the last 5-10 years, prepare a note summarising everything and submit to him (Vice-Chancellor) which he would place before the next Syndicate. This note could also be put to the special meeting of the Senate when they are going to discuss the special issues of the Colleges. There are various options that the viewpoints of Shri Harpreet Singh Dua could be discussed and debated. It has never been his personal proposition that the Principals' positions should not be advertised. They could go and look up the discussion that at every stage he had said that the Principals' positions should be advertised, repeatedly advertised and if there are no eligible candidates or whatever the circumstances. Only under those circumstances, again it is not his proposition, it is a proposition passed by the Syndicate that the existing Principal could continue. It is not something that he had suggested at any stage. This is done by the Syndicates of this University, which are not elected by the Vice-Chancellor. There are only two ex-officio members in the Syndicate, i.e., the DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Director, Higher Education (DHE), U.T. Chandigarh. It is the duty of the DPI (Colleges) and DHE to articulate their concerns on behalf of the respective governments. It has never been a suggestion or an endorsement by him personally that an alternative to that, that the senior-most Associate Professor be designated as Principal. He has personally never said that any other alternative to that be thought of. But he does not control the Syndicates of this University. The Syndicates of this University are elected by this House in a manner that is well known to the members. The Syndicates of the University are elected on behalf of the Faculties but not on behalf of the Colleges and the University. Who would form the Faculties was determined long ago in 1904 when there

were no teachers appointed on behalf of the University. At that time, the Faculties of the University comprised only the Senators who were asked to become members of the Faculties. It is in that background that the notion of added members was put in and most of the added members used to be from the Colleges. So, it is in this sense that the Syndicate members had representative from Senate members which came from the Colleges because out of the 70 members that the then Central Government was nominating, a large fraction of them was from the Colleges. When the year 1947 came, some changes that occurred in the 1904 Act were that the three Faculties that a member could choose became four and the 70 members that the Government was nominating amongst the civil society, academia and so on, were divided into two parts that 36 out of them were added to the elected part of the Senate instead of Chancellor nominating senior teachers, Principals of the Colleges. If the Syndicates are evolving and if the members feel that the Syndicates are not presenting the interests of the Colleges, in that he has no role. If there are changes needed because the members feel that the way the Syndicates are elected are not articulating the interests of the College teachers that there has to be some other way of doing things, the governance reforms is already an agenda which they are already discussing in parallel and the Syndicate, Senate, the Government or the Vice-Chancellor whosoever takes over from him, they have to continue that otherwise when the NAAC review happens next time, it would ask as to what the University has done on something that they had pointed out. So, the things would happen and could happen and they have to wait for these things to go in a systematic way. This was all what he had to say. With this he sought the permission of the House that they move on to Item C-39.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that his viewpoint with regard to this is that this amounts to extension of employment whether it is 2+2+1 years or 3+2 years or 5+5 years or 10+10 years. As long as they keep giving the extension, they would not be able to find a suitable person for the chair of the Principals. So, his point is that they should stop it at the age of 60 years and whosoever reaches the age of 60 years, should be relieved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not having a discussion on this item now and requested not to disrupt and proposed to move on to Item No.C-39.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, had there been any inadvertent error in bringing this item, the Vice-Chancellor could have told this on 24th September itself when the issue was allowed to be debated and the discussion was already on, the Vice-Chancellor adjourned the meeting. Once the issue has been debated, the Vice-Chancellor could not say that the item is withdrawn. For the information of the House and the Vice-Chancellor, he fails to understand that whether it is an adjourned meeting or a statutory meeting as provided in the Calendar. To his understanding the meeting of the Senate which is held in the month of December is to discuss the recommendations of the Board of Finance along with the other agenda and that meeting has not been convened as yet. When he wrote a letter, he just wanted to inform the House that he never takes up any issue in the House unless he has taken up the same with the Vice-Chancellor. He sent an e-mail to the Vice-Chancellor last month that since the meeting was adjourned on 24th September, 2017, this, in fact, could have been adjourned to a particular date and time. But it is for everybody to know as to under what circumstances and under what hurried and haphazard manner, the meeting was adjourned on an issue sensing the mood of the House on that item so much so that they did not have the patience to wait for the national anthem to start on the device. After he wrote that e-mail, he has yet to receive reply to that. Then he got a notice for the statutory meeting of the Senate which was supposed to be held today, i.e., 16.12.2017. He sent another e-mail that he has got a notice for the meeting of the Senate, should he presume that the adjourned meeting is not to be reconvened. If it is so, he should be briefed about the reasons thereof. He has yet to

receive the reply to that e-mail. He is thankful that after almost 25 days, he got a notice, the revised notice for the meeting of the Senate thereby converting a statutory meeting into an adjourned meeting. If they are convening an adjourned meeting which says that they would start from the item where they ended in the adjourned meeting, what is the occasion for the Vice-Chancellor to say now that this item was brought to the Syndicate inadvertently. Even if for a moment, though it is wrong, it is presumed that the item was brought inadvertently, the history which the Vice-Chancellor has explained about the validity of the Syndicate, he did not want to specifically touch any issue, but he just wanted to remind the Vice-Chancellor that there are so many issues which were, in fact, within the purview of the Syndicate and were never brought for consideration of the Senate. Is it not the precedent even in the era of the present Vice-Chancellor that this Senate has undone whatever has been done by the Syndicate. So much so that the Vice-Chancellor has not once but so many times in the Syndicate has stated that if the Syndicate is doing something wrong, it is very well within the powers of the Senate to undo it even if it is not taken up as an agenda item. That is why, the proceedings of all the Syndicate meetings are sent to the members of the Senate also. He is not expressing his opinion on this item but simply saying that if the Vice-Chancellor is so well aware about the history as to how the regulations came into existence, how the constitution of the Syndicate and Senate came into existence, Faculties and Board of Studies and so on, the Vice-Chancellor is requested to take care of the sanctity of the Act of the University, regulations of the University and the rules of the University also. He got another notice that the adjourned meeting would continue and some additional urgent items would be added in the agenda. He wondered could any additional item be added to an adjourned meeting when the regulations specifically say that the adjourned meeting would be convened to a specified date and time to conduct only unfinished agenda and not to include any other item. But they have made the practice that they keep on adding to the agenda, items after item, and the most important item, i.e., about the Board of Finance has been received just day before yesterday. The framers of the statute expected the issue to be discussed in a threadbare manner and expected that at least 10 days before the meeting of the Senate, the agenda is to be circulated amongst the Senate members. But they expect that such an important issue is also to be discussed and thereafter they have introduced the system of even placing some items on the table also. He just want to remind that there is a provision in the Syndicate that they can bring additional items also, but there is no such provision in the Senate. He wonders that if under the garb of the proposals where it is written that proposals brought by the Syndicate even if not included in the agenda, can also be discussed in the meeting of the Senate. Can he take Board of Finance recommendations to be a proposal or a considered item by the Board of Finance and the Syndicate to be debated and approved. So, let them not send a signal that under the influence of two people, though he is not alleging that he (Vice Chancellor) is doing under influence, but at the same time, he is concerned what message goes out and he is not concerned as to what the intentions are, he is concerned what message goes to the society. So, he feels that that this item should be discussed and the reason should be given as to why they are afraid of the governing body to be silent to deliberate on some decision which has been taken by the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that as far as he remembers, the meeting had to be adjourned, because they are discussing other than the Principals' appointment. They were discussing something which related to the information on Committees that go to the colleges, the Selection Committees, whether that information is hidden. The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, who was intervening to say something, that he is not permitting any more discussion as he has already told him that all these things can be brought.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have not come here to listen his (Vice Chancellor) orders. They have come here to discuss the agenda. Every time he adjourns the meeting and sends them back as per his will and say that he will take back the item. What for they have come here. Do the Vice Chancellor wants them that if he says yes, they should say yes or if he says no, they should say no. He said that they would discuss this items as per the serial number of the item.

Professor Chaman Lal said that everybody come from far off places and such a huge social time gets wasted. He suggested just to resolve the issue in a via media way. Since large number of Senators wish to discuss Item C-38, he does not say that they should discuss it just now, to accept the plea that they will discuss, they can discuss more urgent matters, but he can fix up a time, may be today afternoon or may be some time to discuss and let us complete some other urgent items first so that peoples' voice could be respected by Professor Grover. If the people want to discuss, let them discuss it. They can discuss it later or they can have another meeting also.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already suggested two ways of doing this. One is to collate everything related to it, send the matter back to the Syndicate. There would be a new Syndicate. Syndicates are evolving. New Syndicate take a call on everything related to this aspect that has happened over last 15 years or so whenever a change was made. The other alternative is that they should give him a note, they can have a meeting exclusively on the colleges and get it discussed. He said that he has already given two alternatives.

Professor Chaman Lal said that they can start discussion on Item No. C-39 and requested the other members not to insist to discuss C-38 immediately. They should start discussion on C-39 and the prestige of the Chairman should also be respected. With this wishes of the members would also fulfilled. They can discuss item No. C-38 a little later, may be in the afternoon.

The Vice Chancellor, however, said that it cannot be discussed today and no further comments and announced Item No.C-39.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not come here just for formality. They are keeping their patience intact. The way he (Vice-Chancellor) passes the orders, it is the stakeholders who are affected by such decisions.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is creating a new class against the decision of the government. He said that he is saying this to him again and again to discuss this issue. The situation in the colleges is getting very strange as two Principals are becoming in the colleges. There is different Principal both for Punjab Government and Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor asked if they should move to item No. C-39 to which divergent voices were raised.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua , Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur objected to it.

The Vice Chancellor further said that voice vote is to move to item No. C-39.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he (Vice Chancellor) intentionally want to expose the persons to show who are in his favour. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur insisted to discuss Item No. C-38. Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Vice Chancellor is misusing his authority.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in that Syndicate itself where Shri Naresh Gaur, Shri Ashok Goyal, D.R. (General) and he himself were present, the issue was really important. The issue was not that one Syndicate approve that and the other Syndicate would disapprove that. The issue should not be that on this issue the Senate should continue or should not continue. They are here for resolving the issues. Any issue at any time is important. They can bring the issue and they also take the issue later on. But he said that they were facing the problems. At one point of time, a problem was that they were not getting Principals with 400 API score.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not discussing the merits and demerits of Item No. C-38 and said that they would move to Item No. C-39.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur while objecting to it insisted to discuss Item No. C-38

The Vice Chancellor again said that the voice vote was to discuss Item No. C-39 and said that it is not the way to run the premier University of the country.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Naresh Gaur objected to it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Vice Chancellor is instigating them.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to behave as a neutral person.

Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that a date should be fixed for holding the meeting to consider the college issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur objected to it and said that the issue should be discussed today itself.

Professor Keshav Malhotra that there is no guarantee, the Syndicate could again extend their age of retirement for five years.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that this item should be discussed and it should not be withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that there could be no discussion on Item No. C-38.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to tell that he had raised another issue in the last meeting of the Senate about the CMJ University.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not permitting any such discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he may not permit, but it is the question of the prestige of the University. They will not allow the Syndicate or the Vice Chancellor to play with the prestige of the University.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage and the Vice Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that the meeting cannot be held tomorrow as there are municipality elections in Punjab. The earliest date could be 6th January, 2018.

This was agreed to by some of the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal, however, did not agree to it. He asked, why the item cannot be discussed today itself. He said a note is there, writ petition is there, everything is there in the agenda papers. There is no stay. During the pendency of the writ petition, they are taking decisions in continuity. He said whatever has come to the Syndicate, Senate has the right to discuss. At one time Ambassador I.S. Chadha had said since it is a very sensitive issue, he would not name that issue and if something, after having been discussed in the Syndicate, is in front of the Senate, the Senate can discuss it.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that since there is no stay, so to his mind, it is not necessary to discuss this issue as it is a sub-judice matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that discussion would be done on both the issues i.e. the issue relating to degrees and this issue. He said that the importance of the issue is that even if some decision has been taken, though right or wrong, without going into the merits of the decision, can any such decision be implemented retrospectively, but they have implemented.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that they would discuss that issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, what to do with the continued illegality.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said, they cannot do things against the provisions of the Government and this issue could be discussed on 6th of January and requested Shri Ashok Goyal to let the things proceed further as everybody has cooperated with him and everybody has respected his views. He said that they have accepted 6th January for the next meeting and he should also respect the Chair. They could discuss this item and any other item with the permission of the Chair on that day.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that they have wasted enough time on this issue.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua objected to the word 'wasted' used by Ambassador I.S. Chadha and said that he does not want to listen to this person. He is wasting time for the last four years.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he withdraws those words.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot hold the meeting if personal accusations are made by the members.

Shri Harpreet Singh said that firstly it was done by Mr. Chadha only.

The Vice Chancellor adjourned the meeting at this stage and said that he cannot run such unruly meeting.

When the meeting resumed, Ambassador I.S. Chadha said to Shri Ashok Goyal that he has misunderstood him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not misunderstand, but he did object to it. His word 'time wasted' was in fact were wrong. He would have sent that they have spent enough time on this item.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said, okay, if he did not like those words, he withdraws those words. The point is that they have spent a long time and they seem to in an impasse. Many suggestions have been made and they have to resolve, they have to find a via media and they have to get out of it to start their business. He suggested that they should start discussion on Item No. C-39 now and during the lunch break, all of them should get together i.e. all those who have opposite points of view and try to find an acceptable way of resolving this. There are valid concerns being raised by some section of the house. There are those who feel that if there are different views, how to discuss that. Those views aberrantly, they cannot resolve with the kind of discussion that they have been having. So, he suggested that they should start discussion Item No. C-39 now and during the lunch break, they, those who have opposite view should get together and try to find a way and when they come back, they can take this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to make one request through him (Ambassador I.S. Chadha) to the Vice Chancellor that, please do not misunderstand anybody. He further requested to respect the voice of agreement and dissent equally. That is what he wants to say.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said 6th January is okay and requested that in the colleges where they have sent inspection and selection committees, a list of all such inspection and selection committees be provided to all the members of the Senate. He wanted to tell, how the eligible candidates in the colleges are made ineligible. This would come out from this information. He again requested to make available this information by 6th of January, 2018 to the members of the Senate.

RESOLVED: That a special meeting of the Senate be convened to consider the Item C-38 threadbare and other issues related with the Colleges, if any.

III.

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

C-39. That the minutes dated 03.04.2017 and 26.4.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 16) to correct the existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines, 2014 in accordance with the U.G.C. minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree Regulations 2016 published on 05.07.2016, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 35)

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that in the Ph.D. guidelines, it has been written that as per the UGC minimum standards (he is having a copy of the UGC guidelines as well as a copy of the guidelines which have been framed by the Committee constituted by the University). He did not say that they should accept the UGC guidelines word by word. But if they say that these are as per the UGC minimum standards, then he would like to draw their attention about the major deviations, because when the UGC raises some objection, they are put into a great difficulty. Then they say that they would not abide by the UGC or they say that the UGC is dictating them and infringing their autonomy. He would not talk about all those things and he would like to give some suggestions on some of them so that they could amend it. Some of his other colleagues have also requested to make this amendments. In the Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines, 2017, point number 6.2, they are writing that, the regular teacher includes re-employed teachers/Professor Emeritus of Panjab University. But nowhere this is written in the UGC guidelines. He is not against it that Professor Emeritus or University teachers may not become the Guide

and he is also of the opinion that since the students do not get Guides, so they should become Guides. But they should write in point number 6.2 that in the interest of students, they may also be allowed to Supervise. But if they write that the regular teacher includes re-employed teachers/Professor Emeritus, he thinks they are committing a very big mistake. When they write regular teachers, he said that even in the High Court order, it has been written that they (teachers) will continue as re-employed teachers. There is no clarity as to whether they would be made the members of R.D.C/BO.C. or not. On the one hand they are re-employed teacher and on the other hand they have got the stay from court. There should be a clarity on this point. Secondly, it is not like that, if they changed the UGC guidelines, they have done everything wrong. For example, in clause 9.9. The UGC says that they would hold viva in 180 days whereas, the University guidelines say that they will hold the viva in 120 days. Whether it is held or not, it is a separate issue, but they have included in the rules, it is good. Similarly, 8.4 is completely a new one as it is not there in the UGC guidelines. The other things is about the seats. They immediately change the guidelines of UGC where it suits them. If they have to enhance the re-employment age from three to five years, they will immediately change it, but in the case of students, there they say that UGC do not permit it. For example, in 6.5, where the seats of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor has decreased. Think about those departments, where there is only one Assistant Professor, one Associate Professor and one Professor, in such departments, only with one shake up, six seats have decreased. In some of the departments, there is problem of Supervisors. If they can deviate at other places, he suggested that they should add one para here, In case of JRF, if some student did get fellowship, so in the departments where there is problem of supervisors, the Assistant Professors and Associate Professors, may be allowed to supervise provided that number of students may not increase from eight. He is having copy of both the guidelines and many changes have been made in these guidelines. He is not against it if a college teacher supervises a student. He does not say that the University teacher is more competent than the college teachers. He is of the opinion that there should be more research centres so that the students may not face any problem. When the research for Hindi was made at Ludhiana, he was the one, who has openly said by going against the University Professors, that they have no problem if a research centre is opened at Ludhiana. But when the UGC has written that the department would allocate the research scholars, but in the guidelines made by the University, it is written that in case of approved research centres, the allocation of research scholars will be at the level of concerned research centre. He has no problem, if the University does it. He said that if a fellowship holder comes in the department, he does not get supervisor. Secondly, they are committing a mistake by writing that regular teachers include re-employed teachers. They should write that in the interest of the students they may be allowed to supervise considering their experience. It cannot be said that regular teacher includes re-employed teacher or Professor Emeritus. As he has already told that there are many deviations, when the UGC points out the deviations, it creates a problem. They have made rules under Para 36 but when they ask about it in the General Branch, there is nobody to tell about this. It is written in the Court Order that the re-employed teachers would continue as re-employed teacher, then how can they say that they are regular teachers or they can be members of any Board/Committee. When the Vice Chancellor joined, he enhanced the re-employment from three years to five years, but he did not want to go to that. It is said that they cannot be members of the Committees, but they would not have voting rights. When they cannot be allowed to hold any administrative positions, then they have to make the things clear in such matters. If they have been kept for teaching, then there should not be any problem for them and for those teachers. In the budget documents, they have been placed in the category of 'other'. Somewhere, it has been written, teachers 4 and other 1, total 5. So, they have to keep clarity in all these things. Therefore, he has two suggestions, one is regarding the JRF or any other fellowship holder. If there is a problem in any department, they Assistant Professors and Associate Professor may be

allowed to supervise provided the number of students does not increase beyond eight. Secondly, they should not call the re-employed teachers as regular teachers. Rather they have to say that in the interest of the students they may be allowed to supervise.

The Vice Chancellor said that he agrees to the suggestions made by Dr. Gurmeet Singh in making a distinction in term of number of research scholars. On the basis of designation, it is not correct thing that UGC should have dictated. But the UGC has dictated they cannot go against it.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that they should then abide by the UGC in other things also. The UGC has said that only regular teachers can supervise, but they have added Professor Emeritus in it. He has to say about many deviations where full paras have been changed which are not there in the UGC guidelines. They should not write that these guidelines are in accordance with the UGC guidelines, rather they should write that these are the guidelines of Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a question of scoring points etc. Lots of things are done, which, one can go and convince UGC. There are things in which one cannot convince UGC. This re-employment scheme is a very special scheme that the Panjab University came in with, because the UGC said to enhance it to 65 years. They are not in a position to do it to 65 years. Before he joined, the re-employment was given upto 63 years of age, but he just enhanced it to 65 years. He has not introduced anything new. They cannot induct teachers and the Government does not permit them to do so because of shortage of money etc. They are not recruiting new teachers and the teachers to whom they are asking to continue, if they are not taking full academic output from them, who is at loss, he asked. Most of the things said by him (Dr. Gurmeet Singh) are well said. They should make changes in the semantics and language of this, but they should remain restricted to it and nothing more than this. He also agrees that no scholarship holder should be refused in the University. They should permit, wherever necessary, more people can be permitted via the instrument of letting the Assistant Professors go from four to eight. It is well said and he is personally okay with it.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that he has two issues relating to these guidelines.. One is that they talk to promote interdisciplinary research. Earlier, half seat was counted to the co-guide in the number of students being supervised by him, but in the new guidelines, a full seat is being considered for co-guide.

The Vice Chancellor said that these all are small things and the UGC has imposed it.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta and Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the UGC is silent on this point. Many of the Universities in other parts of the country are accepting it.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that J.N.U. and Punjabi University are counting it as half seat.

The Vice Chancellor said, then why they are doing it. He has not done it and he has not proposed it. It has come up from the Committees which have been made by them.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that it must be considered as half seat.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is okay with it, but he has not proposed it. He further said that do it via an informed committee, process it through the governing bodies, so that any Vice Chancellor is competent to go and defend it.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that otherwise the interdisciplinary research and students are suffering. to which the Vice Chancellor said that he is not against it. Dr. Mehta further pointed out that the promotion process of teachers in colleges is a very delaying process.. He said that his promotion is due since 2014, but it was done in 2018. If an Assistant Professor is eligible for promotion and has also completed the number of years, he should be allowed to supervise because such teachers are not allowed to become Supervisor as they could not get a tag for Associate Professor.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will form a Committee under the Chairmanship of Dean University Instruction and consisting of other members i.e. Dean College Development Council and D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab and DHE, U.T. Chandigarh.

Dr. Neeru Malik pointed out that promotion has been given only to the Government College teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are delayed, they are doing this discrimination, but they would work with the D.P.I. and they would impress upon them. The Director Higher Education, U.T. is more willing to listen to them.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that recently the research course work, particularly in science departments, has been increased from six months to one year, but there is nothing about it in the UGC guidelines. In point No. 7.3 of the guidelines, it has been mentioned that, all courses prescribed for M.Phil and Ph.D. course work shall be in conformity with the credit hour instructional requirement and shall specify content instructional and assessment methods. They shall be duly approved by the authorized academic bodies. It is clarified that the course work will spread over a minimum of one semester and will comprise of at least 8 hours per week of teaching /contact hours. Here, they are talking about six months. It has been increased to one year in the departments of Mathematics and Physics. Particularly, the college teachers are suffering because they have to take leave for one year. The course work syllabus is the same as it was earlier, but he cannot understand why the duration has been increased to one year.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that there was a notice from the D.U.I. office before she joined that those departments which want to have course work for one year, for example, University Business School, she thinks since 1985, they had a course work of one year. Now, before she joined, there was a letter from the D.U.I. to the departments that those departments who want to have course work for one year may apply. There were about eight departments and Mathematics Department, as Dr. Mehta said, was one of those who showed their interest that they want to have course work for more than six months. They called a meeting, which was Chaired by the Vice Chancellor. In that meeting they told the Chairperson that in case they are to do it in the next six months, they can do thesis reviewing and write papers, but it depends upon the Chairperson and some of the Chairperson have shown interest that the course work should be for one year and Mathematics Department was one of those departments.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that the college teachers are suffering a lot on this account.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University cannot be run for one specific category.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that by doing so, they are promoting inefficiency.

The Vice Chancellor asked him, not to do this accusation, the course work has to be taken seriously.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra informed that this issue was discussed in the meeting of the Chairpersons. It was discussed and decided there that the students who could complete his/course work in six months, he/she could do so.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta, however, said that the issue which was discussed in the Chairpersons meeting was for increasing the workload of senior teachers. That was the main point.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra informed that in the previous meeting of the Chairpersons, it has been asked to the students that in case any students wants to do the course work in more than six months, he/she could do so. He/she would be given full credits.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that that it is well placed in all regulations that it should be spread over in one semester. The question is, while issuing the certificate in the pre-Ph.D. course work, there would be a hitch on the part of the University that a particular student had course work for one year, when it is placed on record that it should be spread over for 105 hours in one semester and it has been clearly mentioned

The Vice Chancellor said that they have permitted colleges to have this done over one year.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said, why there is no uniformity in the University. The Course work is for one year in two departments whereas in other departments it is for six months.

The Vice Chancellor said that this much of freedom and flexibility has to be there.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that they should think of the students, research scholars and the college teachers who are doing Ph.D. as they have to come after getting leave from their college.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a rigorous way and if somebody wants to do in a rigorous way, he should be given a chance. This framework is not for the enrolment of college teachers. The teachers are supposed to join the colleges for Ph.D.

Dr. Jagdish Chanader Mehta requested to include this issue also for consideration by the Committee which has been formed to look into the guidelines.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he fully agrees to the view point of Dr. Gurmeet Singh and Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta. But, they face the technical problem later on. Even today about 150-200 teachers are facing this problem when it is checked whether one has done Ph.D. strictly according to the UGC guidelines or not. They at their own level make some changes and amendments and they cannot not review it at a later stage. He, therefore, requested that either they should strictly follow the UGC guidelines or they should find out the way out by which they might stop those people who put such kind of objections, which may create trouble in future. It may be kept in mind that if a candidate does his/her Ph.D. as per the guidelines framed by the University, he/she should not face any problem, because when they faces a problem, the University does not stand by them. Such candidates suffer a lot. Due to this reason, the persons who have done Ph.D. since 2008 till today, they are not being given Ph.D. increments, because a letter was issued from the D.U.I. Office, where some conditions were put and it is said that those who fulfil

these conditions, they are free to do Ph.D. without pre-Ph.D. course work. Believing on that, they did not do the course work and the R.A.O. has put objections on it. So, the increments have not been granted to them till today. He, therefore, requested that they should not take any such action which may create problems for the teachers in future.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they talk of only about the teachers, but there are two more stakeholders i.e one those who are doing Ph.D. and the other is IQAC to whom they give data about the number of Ph.Ds. They get advantage of those Ph.Ds. So, he requested that they should not make their own clauses which would affect the degree of Ph.D. of the students. UGC guidelines are there and if they want to give advantage to someone, they should not make such changes which are in contradiction of the UGC guidelines.

Professor Rajesh Gill while referring to the Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines at page 692 of the agenda papers, she pointed out that point No. 1.1, the only word 'Panjab' is written and the word 'University' is missing which may be corrected. She said that there is a contradiction between provisions 3.2 and 3.3. While referring to point 3.2 appearing at page 693 of the agenda, she said that it is mentioned that "candidates who have cleared the M.Phil. course work with at least 55% marks in aggregate or its equivalent grade 'B' in the UGC 7-point scale (or an equivalent grade in a point scale wherever grading system is followed) and successfully completing the M.Phil. Degree of Panjab University shall be eligible to proceed to do research work leading to the Ph.D. Degree". While 3.3 says "a person whose M.Phil. dissertation submitted to Panjab University has been evaluated and the viva voce is pending may be admitted to the Ph.D. programme". So, there is a contradiction between these two points. There is a need to examine these provisions. If it has to be 55% marks, then they could admit a student directly whose viva has not been held. Secondly at page 694, point 4.3 in the last line it is mentioned "it is clarified that however, this fee will not be charged from the women candidates and from the persons with disability (more than 40% disability)". She requested that the category of transgender be also added to this. Similarly, at point no. 4.4, in the first sentence, the category of transgender be also added and relevant relaxation be given. Referring to point 5.1 last line, she said that it is mentioned "however, such candidates have to qualify for the interview" which means that there have to be qualifying marks in the interview. This is very important in the light of the modifications in the Ph.D. guidelines which have been incorporated recently in the last admissions. She wanted to know whether those modifications have also been incorporated or not because the current agenda relates to the meeting of 10th September. She felt that the guidelines needed to be referred to the Sub-Committee so that these things could be taken care of because the agenda is old one and thereafter new circulars were issued. While referring to point 5.3 at page 695, she said that it is written "it is stipulated that each department of Panjab University including regional centres will devise their own admission criteria based on the candidate's profile". This would mean that every department would be having its own norms which they found that the matter was very chaotic in the last admission to Ph.D. Therefore, this also needed to be modified.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra clarified that, that is why they had to prepare a template.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the points raised by Professor Rajesh Gill have to be well taken and the matter has to be referred to the Sub-Committee under the Chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction and it be ensured that all these things are incorporated and the same would be circulated to the members of the Senate. Even if in principle, they are approving it in the sense that all the suggestions would be incorporated and circulated.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that time and again they are saying that the numbers matter which actually matter. It is being said that all the scholarship holders should be taken. According to her, some balance has to be created between quality and quantity and they could not compromise. For instance, when they include students, a student having 90% marks might be having little research aptitude. Therefore, some balance has to be there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now it is a temporary measure because the scholarship holders doing Ph.D. in the University is very low.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the long run, they have to devise some method whereby the screening of the students is must.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let them look how the numbers grow during the next 3-4 years and they could have a relook on it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that finally she agreed with Dr. Ajay Ranga also that they have to follow the UGC in toto and they could not tinker with the provisions here and there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the course work is changed from six months to one year the way the University Business School has done it, the UGC is not going to object to it because it has been made more stringent.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she was not talking about that but there should be clarity that either the course work should be of 6 months or one year.

Dr. Parveen Goyal while referring to point no. 7.6 on page 698 said that it is mentioned "candidates already holding M.Phil. degree and admitted to the Ph.D. programme, or those who have already completed the course work in M.Phil. and have been permitted to proceed to the Ph.D. in integrated course, may be exempted by the Department from the Ph.D. course work". This interpretation should be applied to 2009 regulations. In the 2009 regulations it is mentioned that it is written that if one has done course work in M.Phil./Ph.D. but in this interpretation if one has done course work in M.Phil., then there is no need of course work in Ph.D. and one could get the Ph.D. increments. This interpretation should be applied to the 2009 regulations. A teacher who has completed his/her Ph.D. in 2010 would also get the Ph.D. increments from the year 2010 if this line is applied to the 2009 regulations also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the persons who have done the course work in M.Phil. and done the Ph.D. in 2010, they should get this exemption.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the audit raises objection that it has been written as 'oblique'(/). But in point 7.6 it is clear that there is no need to do the course work if it is through M.Phil. So, it should be applied to the 2009 regulations also.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that since the suggestions have come from several members of the House, he requested that all these matters be referred to a new Committee so that all the suggestions are taken care of by the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Dean of University Instruction would chair the Committee. The members who have given the concrete suggestions would also be made part of the Committee. They have to do the things in a way that the suggestions of all the members are taken care of.

Professor Chaman Lal said that during the last 10 years, there is unnecessary intervention of the UGC. Instead of focussing on academic excellence, they have put the universities into technicalities. Instead of improving the academic, they have made it the worst. He supported what the Vice-Chancellor had said that those students who have done the JRF are in such a bad shape all over India that they are running from University to University and they do not get the seat. That is a sort of torture to the students. So, the Panjab University take the steps that whenever a JRF comes, that student should be accommodated. Secondly, for technicality whenever a student is given a certificate, it should be clearly worded. They have to see the spirit of whatever has been done by the UGC but not the words. The Universities must assert their academic freedom. The UGC Act of 1955 does not allow the UGC to interfere in the universities like that and the universities must take initiative to resist that. So, the University people could know what is academically better and not the Clerks sitting in the UGC. The UGC is a body of Clerks which is dictating the Professors and those Clerks should be resisted by the Professors. The Professors should have some dignity. The way the UGC dictates, that is an insult to the whole University. They must deviate from the UGC guidelines in the interest of academic excellence.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the point made by Professor Chaman Lal is well received. But at the same time have they not to look into the fact that whatever they might be wanting, is it within their discretion to deviate from UGC. If yes, then let they take a decision today itself that they are not going to follow the diktat of the UGC. He is really surprised that the Senate is considering something in the absence of basic documents provided to the members of the Senate based on which the recommendations of the Committee are being placed. What they are discussing. The item under consideration says that the minutes of the Committee for award of Ph.D. degree Regulation 2016 published on 5th July 2016 be approved. What are those guidelines published on 5th July 2016? There is no mention of that and no document has been attached. Unless and until they have that basic document before them, how they would be able to deliberate as to how much they have deviated to maintain academic excellence in the University, how far they would be able to defend before UGC that they are above it. As he understood that the Regulations which have been published in the Government of India gazette on 5th July, 2016 as has been mentioned, he is sure that it must have been written there that these would be effective from with immediate effect. Is it within their discretion to implement the regulations from a date which they decide or to be implemented from the date which is published in the gazette of Government of India? Secondly, has the UGC given them the leverage to define as Dr. Gurmeet Singh has said that what is the definition of a regular teacher. If the UGC has not given any leverage, then as Dr. Ajay Ranga has pointed out particularly it is the future of the students who would be doing Ph.D. from Panjab University would be at stake. At that stage even if the University is able to defend its stand, the UGC might come up with a counter argument that it would have agreed to the argument of the University had it sought the permission in advance to deviate from the regulations. He suggested that let they go through the notification as notified in the Government of India gazette and see how far they could deviate. But if they could deviate in the interest of academic excellence as suggested by Professor Chaman Lal, then let they deviate and if they could not deviate and at the same time they are not ready to follow the diktat of the UGC, let they take a conscious decision here that they do not bother for the UGC. But to follow the UGC and criticising also, according to him, they are working at cross purposes. As an academic body, they should not be afraid of taking such a decision if they feel that the UGC consisting of Clerks has no business to do anything to what academicians like Professor Chaman Lal says. Let they take a conscious decision. But if they could not, because of obvious reasons if they have to follow the Government, the UGC, then let they see within that narrow margin which might have been given in the regulations. They see what best they had done for the

excellence of the University and also for the best interest of the students who would be doing Ph.D.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the UGC is always chaired by a former Vice-Chancellor. The UGC as an administrative unit would have very small number of teachers. In the Dewan Anand Kumar Administrative Hall of Panjab University, occasionally there might be a Professor who is the Registrar. But the staff of Dewan Anand Kumar Hall is not a teaching staff. So, they have to be careful while making strong statements and such things. One uses strong words because unless one uses strong words, the emphasis on what one wanted to say does not get conveyed. But they should also realise the limitations of those strong words. The strong words in a House stated and everyone understands something different. When the strong words get written, all that is not reflected as to who is present, who is nodding and who is not, sometimes it causes problems. So, his only plea to the colleagues is that as often one has to convey the emotions, they could convey the emotions but should have some limitations.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what about the document.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would do it. The Dean of University Instruction would take care of it. It would be revised and the revised part would be circulated to all the members. If necessary, it could be brought back. He is not saying that they are approving it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the absence of the documents whatever decision is to be taken today, should be it be treated that the decision is taken and the circulation would be done afterwards.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the decision is not taken until the members have given a feedback.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to from which date the decision would be effective.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that it would be specified by the Dean of University Instruction in the revised document.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it is mentioned in the gazette notification that the regulations would have immediate effect, then what would be the date. Why he is saying is that because so many decisions are taken, he requested the Vice-Chancellor not to take it another offence, that in the last meeting the Vice-Chancellor had said that by tomorrow it would be done when they were discussing the formation of the PUCASH and had said that the bio-data of all the members would be sent but the same has not been sent.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to mix up the things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he could do and where he could point out.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could point out these things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not going to make any impact on the Vice-Chancellor as he has not been able to follow his own statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that one could find inconsistencies, non-compliances, etc. and make it a general issue and indulge in innuendo that the man chairing the session is doing things in a manner which amounts to doing something intentionally. He requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to indulge in such things. They are discussing this particular item and it is better that they focus on this particular item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor could have asked the office why the documents have not been sent as far as particular candidates are concerned instead of asking him to behave properly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not said so.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was a member of this Committee when the guidelines were drafted finally. Initially, it was drafted by some Committee but they never framed the guidelines but gave some suggestions. This Committee has taken the original guidelines as such and whatever was to be done by the University has been done. In the guidelines itself, it has been mentioned that the concerned institute would make some rules, the rules have been prepared. As Shri Ashok Goyal was saying, of course, those should have been part of it. Only then this House could see to it. Then they could reach to a particular conclusion. About 90% of the guidelines are the same as that of the UGC and one line regarding its effective date, that has been taken from the gazette notification which means that it is effective from the date of gazette notification. But the document should have been provided to the members and only then they could discuss it and see whether there is some deviation or not. As has now been suggested by the Vice-Chancellor, the Committee could look into it and they could come back to the whole thing.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that at page 701 of the agenda, it is mentioned that the meeting of the Research Degree Committee be held quarterly. The student has to submit the synopsis within a period of 1½ years. This also includes the course work. After the course work, sometimes in some of the Departments, the meeting is not held for 8-9 months and in the meantime, the extension time also gets over. He suggested that the months should be earmarked for holding the meeting of RDC, i.e., March, June, September and December.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh clarified that when a student submits the synopsis in the Department, that date is considered and not the date of the meeting of the RDC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the suggestion by Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha is well taken.

Professor Shelley Walia said that when they put parenthesis in the title of the guidelines, that looks as these are guidelines of Panjab 2017 because usually one does not read the parenthesis. He suggested that it should be put as Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines, 2017.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has already been pointed out.

Professor Shelley Walia said that when they read point 5.1 along with 5.5.1. The point 5.1 says that there is a common entrance for M.Phil. and Ph.D. whereas 5.5.1 says that the candidate possesses the competence for the proposed research. When they look at the competence of the proposed research, it is only the Committee which could come to some kind of conclusion whether a candidate has the competence to do Ph.D. or not. Therefore, it should be left to the Committee to decide whether a candidate would take up the M.Phil. or Ph.D. because it is a common examination. He is saying this because when they have a common examination, everyone who gets in opts for Ph.D. With the result that the M.Phil. is slowly dying. He emphasised on the fact that M.Phil. is a far more robust programme. In one year, one has to do a lot of course work, term papers, seminars, etc. Therefore, if the Academic Committee sitting in the Department decides that a candidate has the competence to do Ph.D., he/she is channelized into Ph.D. and if the Committee decides that the candidate does not have the competence, the candidate could be advised to do M.Phil. and then come to the Ph.D. Since the M.Phil. has the course work etc., therefore the candidate would not be raw. Now what is happening is that there are raw candidates who have suddenly done Ph.D. after M.A. but the candidate

has no competence, no idea of the projects, does not know what he/she is doing. Therefore, the significance of the M.Phil. is missing which should be looked into by the House. He has talked about it, thought about it and discussed it and seen in many other universities where the candidate is channelized by looking at the competence. If they are going to ignore the competence clause completely, then he could say that let the students go in and do Ph.D. This the point which he feels that the Committee should look into and then it should be left to the Administrative Committee of the Department which consists of the senior Professors who could decide on the competence.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Professor Shalley Walia is right that the M.Phil is more robust. It is robust if it is run in letter and spirit. For instance, it is one year course, extendable to two years. But, what is happening is that it is being considered as two years course. There were times when dissertations were being submitted even beyond two years or two and half years or three years. as if it was Ph.D. They need to do something about the M.Phil. They have to religiously follow the deadlines. She said that she knows that there is so much work in the D.U.I. office, but she requested the D.U.I. that they have to do something about as the people are doing it in three years or three and half years.

Professor Shelley Walia said that this is point and he has to come on this after this. He said that when he was doing M.Phil, he joined the first batch when it was started in the country. He said that he remembers that the 2nd semester in their University and all other Universities, there was only one course and otherwise in the first semester there were four courses. The reason that the University Grants Commission prescribed one course in the 2nd semester was that for the rest of the time, the candidate will spend time for writing of the dissertation which was about 70-80 pages. He was getting complete six months to do one course, attend only one class a day and then write his dissertation. Therefore, let they be not give an extension to the M. Phil students beyond a year because that is a one year course. If they do this, then, he (Vice Chancellor) would be surprised, that Dean Student Welfare has to look into it that the number of M.Phil students taking the hostels beyond one year is tremendous. Either they should make a rule that beyond one year the M.Phil students would in the PGs (Paying Guests) outside in Sector-15 like it is done in many other Universities. But they cannot have M.Phil Programme going into 2 ½ years and the candidate going beyond one year.

The Dean University Instruction said that there is so much of diversity of views here. On one side they do not want to extend the course work to a year, like Dr. Mehta said, and here they are saying that they should motivate the students because M.Phil is not in every department. It is there in only few departments. Now the courses where they do not have M.Phil, their students after their post-graduation go directly to the pre-Ph.D. Programme of Ph.D. So this House should guide the D.U.I. Office to which side they have to go whether they have to go by the longer route i.e. to motivate the students to go via M.Phil to the Ph.D or they have to make them go via six months course work, she is confused here.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Item C-39 is with reference to 26th April, 2017 and it was done then, but now enough changes have taken place. A meeting was held on 4.10.2017 under the Chairmanship of the D.U.I and in that circular there was a mention that it is in anticipation of the Syndicate. That circular was issued in September. The item C-11 which was placed in the Syndicate of 10th December, that was admission guidelines for M.Phil and Ph.D., that is totally different. So C-11 item should have due consideration with respect to C-39, otherwise there would be mismatch. It is very important because they are just discussing everything with reference to 26th April, 2017, but they are having a new concept of the guidelines with reference to 4th October, 2017 discussions. He said that it is very important to club all these things so that they can arrive at a final conclusion on this.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Dr. Dalip Kumar has summarized all the things. Professor Shelley Walia was saying that they should have M.Phil, it is argued because the students are raw. He thinks that it is not entirely true across all the subjects. In science, their M.Sc. students do dissertation in final year So they are already research oriented students. If they have cleared NET or CSIR , it is fair enough to induct them into Ph.D. programme. Again asking them to go for M.Phil, it is just a waste of their time and nothing more. That is what he has to add. In science subjects, they are already research oriented.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that there is discussion on M.Phil and Ph.D. course. If there is joint test, then there should be a joint admission form because the M.Phil students apply on an admission form whereas Pre-Ph.D. Course, they do not apply for admission. As the way Professor Walia has suggested that if it is a joint test, they fill a joint admission form, then the Committee will decide on the basis of merit and preference and make joint admission and M.Phil if limited to one year, then even meritorious students will come for M.Phil as well as continuation in Ph.D. because they will get two degrees in the same period because M.Phil student is exempted from pre-Ph.D course. If they can strictly follow one year norms, no extension under no circumstances to hold a hostel, then he thinks M.Phil and Ph.D can be treated as integrated course for research work. This they can adopt in the departments where M.Phil and Ph.D are co-existing. He informed in the department of History, no student is admitted in Ph.D. without doing M.Phil. The M.Phil and Ph.D. are integrated courses. In most of the departments.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the admission to Ph.D. programme should be more transparent. Secondly, they should promote the M.Phil Course because this is becoming a dying course. It would be good if they promote it as a pre-Ph.D. course in the form of M.Phil as said by Professor B.S. Ghuman that they should go for an M.Phil and P.h.D. integrated course. This is also being done in many of the foreign Universities as well. As regards the course work, specially for the teachers who have been working in different colleges, they should set up regional centres or constituent colleges or create a college of the University so that they need not to take long leave for taking up the courses at the nearby places.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he would just like to make general remarks. One should realize that different subjects have different requirements. For example, there is something called research methodology. In social sciences, probably they need it, but promotion of this methodology will have no meaning in Calculus Physics or in Mathematics. Then there is a question of rigidity. He thinks they tend to make rules too rigid. So, there should be certain amount of flexibility and not rigidity, because rigidity rules come in the way of excellence. He said that he knows people who got third classes, they do better in research. He knows of people like Dr. Karam Singh Gill who got third class in M.A., was a best economists in Punjab School of Economics. So, there should be a certain amount of flexibility where a person is not prevented from doing what he can do. Unfortunately, the UGC is making things too rigid and counter-productive, because Dr. Amartya Sen could not be appointed Professor in this University if they go by all the things. He does not think that Manjul Bhargava has better academic profile than his own. He further said that there should be certain amount of discretion. Given the departments and the supervisors, they can take students. Eventually, a student would get degree if he produces research work. When making these rules, they should allow some flexibility and some discretion and also understand that different subject has different requirements. He is very much disturbed, the way the UGC is trying to impose things that are against excellence and that prevent excellence.

The Vice Chancellor said that UGC is maintaining minimum standards and because of this maintenance of minimum standards, the UGC make things for B-class institutions and not for A-class institutions. UGC is not making things for the

Universities like Panjab University which are supposed to be agglomeration of Centres of Advanced Studies and Special Assistance Programme or so. It cannot make a distinction between a research University by concept and a University which still struggling to be counted as a University.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that innovation is not encouraged and they should take some sort of action, whatever is possible, they should exercise their discretion to exercise their knowledge.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that he fully agreed with Professor Bambah. In most of the U.S. and European Universities, they start doing Ph.D. after graduation and if the student is not doing well, he/she is advised to take a Master's Degree. Their system is working very well. So, they have to make the system flexible so that any student who has potential can go further and any student who does not have the potential may be given a lesser degree and he/she should be allowed to proceed. So, they have to make it flexible that when they can do Ph.D. after graduation, why can't their student do after M.A. or M.Sc. Why M.Phil degree is so essential.

Professor Ronki Ram said he agrees on this proposal of foreign university, but the problem is this, as Professor B.S. Ghuman said, they have M.Phil -Ph.D. Programme, then they should make that after one year M.Phil and they should not allow hostels. The person who comes through JRF or through NET, either with Fellowship or without Fellowship If they are taking him in the University for Ph.D. programme, that programme is an integrated programme. So, if in any case, he or she is not able to complete the dissertation after one year, it would be difficult for them to say 'no' to him to stay in the hostel because they have admitted the student for integrated programme. The M.Phil programme at point of time was a programme when many universities won't have a pre-Ph.D Programme. But if they have 105 hours course work to train the students who have come through after clearing test of UGC , then he does not think M.Phil has any value at this stage. They must follow the excellent university of the world as Professor D.V.S. Jain has rightly said that after graduation, if they are so good, they should take them for Ph.D.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he does not agree to it to which the Vice Chancellor said okay.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the biggest problem to the quality of research is that until they make one external examiner from abroad compulsory, which used to be there in earlier times, their quality of research will not improve.

The Vice Chancellor said that any external examiners from abroad is not directed to be superintendent of any internal examiner. Just being external examiner from abroad is justified. In most subjects in India today, the India academia has evolved and it has adequately high quality that they should not suggest a simplistic interventions.

Professor Chaman Lal said that in the subject of Hindi in Panjab University, there are researchers luminaries from abroad.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there is a reason for this because their Ph.D. is not granted to a student, but to the supervisor because most of the examiners are either class-fellows or friends or something like that. So, there is a lot of problem over here and it is good if they are able to get a neutral examiner from India. He has been the Chairman of the Committee, the Ph.D. rules were made by that Committee that one examiner should 250 Km away from here or the class-fellows or students should not be Ph.D Guides. To his mind, there is lot of problem and he is not trying to denigrate the people as they are much better people than abroad The basis question is that they pat the back of each other and it affects their research programme. So, he requested that they should consider this aspect.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra thanked the Vice Chancellor for giving them Ph.D. programme. They received forty applications for nine vacancies. The issue, as Professor Bambah has raised needs to be considered. What is the criterion for this Committee? For example, they have the students coming for presentation. If first class M.A. was found unfit for Ph.D., how it would be found because it is not one interview or one presentation, it has interactive session. It is through an interaction with the students and not once or twice it may be thrice because it says something with requires attention and special consideration. He thinks that one point which Professor Bambah has made is important. They should be certain autonomy and flexibility to this Committee and some broad outlines and some criterion must be kept in view so that they can have only the right kind of students and not others.

The Vice Chancellor said that while making this, pay attention to the fact that those departments which are Centres of Advanced Studies, particularly in the Science Departments, they may need a different kind of flexibility than others. They are now research centres which are there in national laboratories or the other nationally established institutions and then the college research centres. So, there is mix of all these things. He requested to take into account all this and pages of preamble or old report which is they are modifying and attach a preamble to it, capture the discussion and views which are expressed here, so that if they are to take this document to the UGC, the UGC should be able to appreciate the circumstances in which the Panjab University is adopting certain things. They should not be able to trash it. If it is to be trashed, let it be trashed at the level of Chairman, UGC, Vice Chairman of UGC or the other Professor level attached to the UGC. He requested to capture the spirit of all the things. They will do it and he will work with them. He informed that the he did not work with this committee with the entire degree of closeness but he offers to work with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to attach the documents to which the Vice Chancellor said 'okay'.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee under the Chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction which would besides others consist of Dean College Development Council, DPI (Colleges), Punjab, DHE, U.T. Chandigarh and Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta to correct the existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines, 2014 in accordance with the U.G.C. minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree Regulations 2016 published on 05.07.2016.

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

C-40. That the minutes of Hostel Committee dated 26.4.2017 regarding revision of rates of the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girls' Hostel, PU Regional Centre, Ludhiana for the session 2017-18, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 Para 36)

V. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-41 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-41. That minutes dated 09.05.2017 of the Interest Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the rate of interest on Contributory Provident Fund and General Provident Fund to be paid to the employees for the period 01.04.2016 to 31.03.2017, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 Para 8)

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

C-42. That the following recommendations of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 5)

1. to 2 xxx xxx xxx
3. Postgraduate Diploma in Women's Studies (Semester System) regular course be reintroduced in the Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies and Development from the academic session 2017-18.
4. the Regulations/Rules for the above said Postgraduate Diploma be the same as at page 178 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.
5. number of seats be 15
6. xxx xxx xxx

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 2)

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that this item is regarding re-introduction of Postgraduate Diploma in Women's Studies. He wanted to know the changed circumstances where they are planning to re-introduce this Diploma. Are the marketability of this course has increased or something special has happened that want to re-introduced it after a long time.

The Vice Chancellor said that this has come as a recommendation from the Arts Faculty to which Women Studies falls and it has numerous people from the Senate through which it has come.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that normally such a proposal is submitted by the department. A proposal has come from the department that they are running 2-3 courses. Earlier, they started small short duration courses and graduate to M.A., M.Phil and Ph.D. Now in some NGOs and in social sector, some students may find jobs with these short duration courses rather than full years courses in Women Studies. This is justified by the department in that sense.

Professor J.K. Goswamy wanted to know whether they have placements in other postgraduate courses which have been undertaken in this department. That data has to be there to strengthen this claim.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that in Arts, Social Science and Languages departments, employability is not always could be assured. In that case lot of many courses have been closed, if they judge the courses on the basis of employability. The University's job is prepare the students for market and to generate knowledge. They are preparing for increasing the knowledge base of the society and economy. There are few courses, but he would not like to name those courses, which they are running those courses not on the basis of job in the market

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since she has been associated with the Department of Women Studies and there are many good Master's Courses. But there is a problem in placement. Government College for Girls, Sector-11, Chandigarh is running one course at undergraduate level in which they have not been provided a person from the Woman Studies. A person from Sociology, Political Science etc. Would be teaching that course. She said that they should need to do something at the University level to improve the placement of students passing out from Women Studies. In view of the UGC guidelines issued from time to time, they want Women Studies course only to remain Women Studies as an isolated course, but they want it to be merged into the other streams, especially with sciences and engineering etc. Therefore, she requested that they should do something and suggested if a sub-committee could be constituted to look for avenues as to how the placements can be improved because so far the situation is not a that much right. She further requested that they need to do something and that would be good for the department also.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the only practical thing coming to his mind that rather than making it a day course, it could be made an evening course where the students of Sociology, Political Science etc. could take it as a diploma course. They are able to take it as a diploma course which adds to their job ability also, so this should be approved.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that Master in Women Studies is already running in the department. But there also the seats are not filled completely. Perhaps everybody know it that the students who join this course, they join it just to avail hostel facility. They are not actually interested in studying this course. So, to his mind this diploma is not needed. In case they wanted to do it, todays there is more consideration of feminism. Until they study the gender in a neutral form, till then the purpose of gender sensitization would not be solved. Though he is against the introduction of this course because M.A. course is already running there, when the M.A. students are not being placed, then how the students with diploma could think of their placement. Further, the title of the Course is Diploma in Women Studies, why not it is diploma in Gender Studies. He requested to replace it with Diploma in Gender Studies.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there are some M.A. courses, but they cannot say that if M.A. is not running properly, then the diploma course would also be a failure. In the case of Computer, they are already having M.Sc. (IT) and MCA and still they run Postgraduate Diploma in Computer Applications (PGDCA), which is very well taken among the students. So, he was of the opinion that it is independent domain of the department. If they want to start it, let them start for one or two years and then they can always have a discussion. He thinks that this much autonomy the department deserves. If they want to start it, let them start.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta again said that it should be renamed as Diploma in Gender Studies.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not mooted by the Dean of Arts Studies but he is also heading another University.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are some of the courses which are not merely for employment. This is the sensitization and more the students who are exposed to this type of course content, better it is, that is why she said that it has to go to the stream of sciences, engineering and the basic sciences. So the only worry that the students who are passing out in Masters in Women Studies and clearing UGC NET, they must get placed.

The colleges must seek affiliation to Women Studies and for that the University needs to do something.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they should leave it to the department because if it is the need of the department, the department would be in a better position to decide about this thing. So, they can only supplement it and they can give them more administrative support there. If it is okay with them and if they have sufficient staff and expertise, they should go in for that because if they value for the other subjects also besides a regular degree programme and masters, they are promoting add on courses and many other programmes like that. If they think that the employability increased by introducing Diploma in Women Studies, he was of the opinion, they should go in for that.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that regarding this particular programme, he thinks it is the complete autonomy of the concerned department. Further when they introduce a new programme it is not that hundred percent that they are looking every aspect that whether they are placing those students or not. Even in sciences also they do not have this type of things. He requested that they should go for this.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there is substance what Professor Gill is saying There is a huge amount of employability on the gender issue, such as gender in energy, gender in environment. Most of the UN agencies want the people like this and they are not available. He was of the opinion that this course could have a great employability if the suggestion as mentioned by him is accepted. If they do that, he said they would be doing a good service.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in India when they started the Course of Women Studies there was a lot of hue and cry. It took time for the Department of Women Studies to establish. So, now if the women studies, as a subject, has come up, if they are going to start the postgraduate diploma, it gives more credit and added advantage to the Women Studies. Rather they should encourage that.

Professor Pam Rajput said that first of all she absolutely subscribe to the opinion that if the department thinks to start this course, it should be started as it is their autonomy. It has been approved by the faculty and she requested all the members of the Senate to approve this. Secondly, coming to the question of placement, she said that placement is a concern for every department and as stated by Professor Rajesh Gill that they should think about that it is introduced at the undergraduate level but the colleges are still not starting it and they should encourage them to start this course. Once they start this course, naturally, there will be a place for faculty in the colleges. Thirdly, they also have to make an attempt, like there are department when they ask for specialisation i.e. social work, psychology, and they are making an attempt to see that Women Studies is also included so that their students are benefited and get placement. He also endorsed the view point expressed by Professor S.K. Sharma that there are areas, whether it is environment technology and there are other courses that are really catering to that also. When they talk on Women and technology, poverty is taken care of. In fact one of the students has finished her work and that was on Feminization of Rural Poverty in India for Ph.D. Thesis which Professor Ghuman has really appreciated because he was on the board. So they are looking at that issue. She also wanted to tell that this is another dimension of sensitization. She thinks that it is a part of guidelines of UGC that they have to conscientize the student community as well as the teaching community and that the way the Centre for Women Studies is doing its role. She said that theirs is the only University where more than 50% of the students are boys and not girls alone which is appreciated by everybody. This is not the only department in the University, but there are many department in the University where the students join the University for hostel. So

let this department be not singled out. She said that this perhaps the trend in most of the Arts Departments. Finally, about the questions which Dr. Mehta has raised about the gender and Women Studies. They have been continuously debating this issue all the times, of course the western countries are on the top of the agenda. Still they have to study about the status of women to bring them at par and then they will study. They should take the issue of gender a later, but for the time being, let they should continue it. In defence of the introduction of the Postgraduate Diploma, she said that they started with Postgraduate Diploma and M.Phil Courses and they want to restart it for those who do not want to go in for specialization. There are UN agencies and NGO which required persons with such qualification and a lot of research is going on.

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

VII.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-43 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-43. That recommendations dated 08.06.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, (to frame modalities/guidelines to create and utilize 'P.U. Reserve Fund') that a separate Budget Head/Account, be created to receive all general donations and voluntary contributions, be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 Para 20)

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there was a Committee which has prepared the utilisation guidelines. She pointed out that at the bottom of page 727 of the agenda, there are some observations made by the Vice-Chancellor. These observations also came to her mind. For instance, is the name suitable and who would manage the accounts, who would monitor and the things like that. If they look at the proceedings of the Syndicate at page 725, during the discussion, there is hardly any discussion on this especially the issues raised by the Vice-Chancellor. The discussion has centred around other things. The issues raised by the Vice-Chancellor remain unaddressed. The guidelines are very vague, too generalised that the fund could be used for anything, for any purpose and so on. Who is going to control and in whose name the account is to be run, there is nothing about it. It would be better if it is sent back so that the issues raised by the Vice-Chancellor are addressed and only then it could be placed before the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that all these observations are by Professor A.K. Bhandari and not by him.

Professor Rajesh Gill read out the utilisation guidelines which are "to create/maintain the facilities/projects for the general welfare of students and research scholars, contribution towards general welfare projects of the University, preservation of P.U. specific biodiversity and heritage". Since it is a financial better, according to her, it would be better if they could be more specific about it. In whose name the account is to be opened, who is going to control and who is going to monitor these funds?

The Vice-Chancellor said that all this is to be done by the University as per rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about reserve fund, the accounts are always in the name of the Registrar. Anyone who is going to donate in the fund, would get the benefit under the Income Tax Act.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the persons could donate for some specific purposes.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that while donating the money, the person must be having some specific purpose for which one is donating.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the specific purpose for which one is donating, that has also to be accepted by the University.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that such kind of a fund is called Endowment Fund and not reserve fund.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that what Professor Navdeep Goyal is saying is being implied, that is making it implicit. She suggested that specific guidelines should be prepared.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could prepare the specific guidelines.

Professor Pam Rajput said that a Committee could be formed to prepare the guidelines.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could approve only the creation of the reserve fund and for preparing the guidelines, a Committee could be formed.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that the utilisation guidelines are too broad based. If they are considering the reserve fund, then they should be very specific in using it because if they see Sr.No.1 and 2 of the utilisation guidelines, it nearly covers every affair of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the notion of the reserve fund was that they could use the fund for salary and electricity and water charges.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the reserve fund should not be used for payment of salary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, okay, it would not be used for salary.

Professor Pam Rajput said that a Committee be formed to frame the guidelines for utilisation of the reserve fund.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that actually it is Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund. If donor puts some specific purpose, then it becomes Endowment Fund. That fund is already there. The Contributory Fund is a fund where the donor donates the money to be utilised at the discretion of the University. The Committee has gone into it and prescribed that Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund should be constituted. All other development and endowment funds are being monitored by the University through the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate. In the same manner, this fund could also be monitored by the governing bodies of the University. They could explicitly that clause also. It should not be considered as a separate fund. It is going to be the University fund for all intents and purpose. If they make the guidelines so rigid, they could not foresee the requirement of future. These are for the welfare of the students, research scholars, University projects. So, these are general guidelines. If they specify each and every item, then it becomes rigid and

sometimes they might face difficulty in utilising the grant and again they would have to approach the governing bodies. That could also be done as per the wisdom of the hon'ble members.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that the reserve fund has some limitations. It is a good idea that they should have some reserve fund on the lines of Prime Minister's Relief Fund and there are guidelines for its utilisation. For reserve fund, they are specific conditions. Whether income tax exemption for reserve fund is allowed or not but for the endowment and voluntary fund, income tax exemption is allowed under section 80G and 135C. So, they have to decided whether they want this fund to be called Panjab University Voluntary Donation Fund or Reserve Fund as there is a distinction between the two/

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a voluntary fund.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the title says that it is Panjab University Reserve Fund. There are two poles – absolutely rigid and absolutely flexible and they move between the two. Anything 100% rigid is bad and 100% fluid is equally bad.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra suggested that it should be a fund for the voluntary contributions given to the University and there should be broad guidelines so that there are no problems to the donor as well as to the University on the issue of income tax. The fund should be in accordance with the Income Tax Act so that the donor gets the exemption under section 80G and 135C. So it should be a voluntary contribution fund. As suggested by Professor Rajesh Gill, they should prepare broad guidelines for the purpose for which the fund could be utilised.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Shri Deepak Kaushik had announced the donation to this fund and the idea was that it should be left to the discretion of the University how to utilise funds. The idea of voluntary donation is that the University should be able to use it in anyway where it finds necessary. It is very bad to make rigid regulation. Professor T.N. Kapur had started the Higher Education Fund.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that there is a corpus under this fund and they are only utilising the interest of the corpus for general development purpose as per the guidelines framed in this regard.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that if the alumni or the friends of the University might want to help the University, then why they should put any constraints and that should be left to the discretion of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the sense is that they approve it and clarify the points raised by Shri Rashpal Malhotra and Professor R.P. Bambah. They should go back and look at Higher Education Fund as to what has been specified in it and then to supplement to whatever is there to see that this has a right kind of flexibility. While incorporating these things, they should not lose sight of the fact the income tax exemption is given.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that they could also get the contribution from the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The University is the right institution to get maximum money from the industries to carry on many things. That should also be considered and the requirement of conditions and the services being offered could also be

looked into. He congratulated the University for getting money under this fund. They should see the notification of the CSR where 5-6 areas are specified.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that they have already taken up steps under this scheme and have received a sum of Rs. 12 lacs so that they could purchase 200 bicycles for the University. It was also informed that for some institutions the deduction is 50% while for others it is 100%. Panjab University is given 100% deduction under section 80G of the Income Tax Act.

Shri Satya Pal Jain suggested that after the clarifications given by the Finance and Development Officer, they should not go into complicating the guidelines of the reserve fund. There should be no reservation in the mind of the contributor. The money so received in the account would be managed by the governing bodies of the University, i.e., Board of Finance, Syndicate and the Senate. They should also take care of the concern shown by Shri Rashpal Malhotra that the exemption under the Income Tax Act is available to the donor. Therefore, they should not complicate the issue by framing large-scale guidelines. The people donate the money to the University which is to be utilised by the Board of Finance, Syndicate and the Senate for the welfare of the University. If they impose more restrictions, then the donor would think whether the fund is to be utilised for higher education, sports or for aid to poor students. The University could utilise the funds as it wanted. Therefore, they should not complicate it otherwise it would create problems for the donors.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the donor could also think how the fund would be utilised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now they approve it as a Voluntary Contribution Fund.

RESOLVED: That the nomenclature of the fund be changed to 'Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund' with provision for exemption under section 80 G of the Income Tax Act and the modalities/guidelines be revised accordingly.

VIII.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-44 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.-

C-44. That

- (1) the recommendations (Item No.11 & 36) of Executive Committee of PUSC dated 14.3.2017 be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 11)

- (2) minutes dated 02.05.2017, of the Executive Committee of PUSC, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 10)

- (3) recommendation (No.5) of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 30.05.2017, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 14)

- (4) recommendation (No.22, 23, 24 & 25) dated 11.07.2017 of the Executive Committee of PUSC, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 27)

Item C-45 had been withdrawn.

IX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-46 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-46. That minutes dated 16.06.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor and as per decision of the Standing Committee (dated 09.05.2017) with regard to task of roster preparation for the post of Assistant Professors, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 Para 28))

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was discussed in the Syndicate and it has to go back to the Committee. So it should be deferred.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the item about which Professor Navdeep Goyal is talking about is C-47 and not C-46. As Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Syndicate has referred back. The Committee was formed to prepare the roster as per rules and regulations. They should see the annexure. On the basis of that, the roster for Professor and Associate Professor has been prepared. Whatever objections had been raised on the roster of Assistant Professor, those have been checked. Perhaps the Syndicate has again sent back to check the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has been approved by the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-46 on the agenda**, be approved.

X. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-47 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-47. That minutes dated 16.08.2017 along with annexure-I, II and III of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, as per decision of the Standing Committee dated 09.05.2017, regarding task of roster preparation for the post of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, be uploaded on website.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 35))

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that they have taken care of the different opinions received. She did not know as to why the Syndicate has referred it back.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that someone had objection that the roster is not as per the DoPT guidelines. In the guidelines of the DoPT, a table has been attached where the category of OBC is also mentioned and that is why it varied. The DoPT has also prepared a table without the OBC category and that has not been followed. That is why, it has to be referred back.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that whatever roster has been followed, that is as per the DoPT guidelines. Instead of showing the DoPT guidelines, a circular had been provided.

The Committee, headed by the Dean of University Instruction in which Professor Anil Kumar was also present, has reviewed the same and the roster has been prepared as per the DoPT guidelines.

Professor Ronki Ram said that as pointed out by Professor Navdeep Goyal, it was without the OBC.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if the OBC formula is adopted, the point of roster changes but it is not the case without OBC.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that they could have a re-look.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the **Item C-47 on the agenda** be deferred.

XI.

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

C-48. That proposal dated 20.07.2017 of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Syndic, regarding fee-structure that the guidelines for Foreign Nationals/NRI students seeking admission to Post Graduate/Undergraduate Courses for 2017-2018, will be the same as that of the year 2016-2017, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 Para 34))

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired that if the Senate did not pass these guidelines, the recommendations of the Syndicate, what would happen. It has already been implemented. So, is it not *fait accompli* what has been done. When the academic session started in the year 2016-17 and this had been put before the Syndicate on 23rd July 2017, the proposal made by Professor Navdeep Goyal is dated 20th July. They could have taken such a decision much earlier. For the session 2016-17, they are approving the same as was applicable for the last year. Whatever has been done is done, of course, it could not be undone. But according to him, they have every right to be wiser for future. Could there be any reservation of NRI seats. The word which is used in the first line is that there would be reservation of 10% over and above the sanctioned strength. The reservation, in fact, creates confusion. It is always additional seats over and above the sanctioned strength for NRIs. The word 'reservation' should not be used because the moment they use the word 'reservation', that means that the seats are bound to be put in general category if the seats in reserved category are not filled, though it is specifically mentioned that if the seats are not filled, these would not be converted into general category. What is the need of putting the word 'reservation' of 10% over and above exclusively for the NRI category? Secondly, point 10(4) on page 789 of the agenda says that "candidates who are the children/wards/spouses of non-resident Indians, i.e., those who are settled overseas for purposes of employment, etc." Here the children/wards/spouses are specifically mentioned, so the spouses are already included. But on the next page in para 5, it is mentioned that "the word 'children' includes sons/daughters and grand-sons/grand-daughters and the word 'ward' may include spouse, etc." Why is there so much confusion while they have included the 'spouse' in the preceding para while they are defining the ward to be spouse only. Again in para 11 on page 790, it is mentioned that 10% seats over and above the total number of regular seats in each course are reserved for the foreign nationals/NRI candidates. Again it is mentioned that all the candidates would compete amongst themselves by way of an entrance test but those who are not in India at the time

of entrance test would not be required to appear in the entrance test. That means that first they have been exempted from entrance test since they are not in India. Secondly, if one is an applicant and knows that the entrance test is going to be held on such and such date, one goes abroad for 15 days. Should such a candidate be exempted from entrance test? So, to say that those who are not in India would be exempted and they would be entitled to be admitted as per the inter se merit amongst those who have not appeared in the entrance test. Though it is not specifically mentioned, but he presumed and be corrected if wrong, that even those who are not in India, they would also be treated in the same manner with those who are in India but have not appeared in the entrance test. As far as those who are in India but have not appeared in the entrance test, for them it is specifically mentioned that they would be considered as per inter se merit provided the seats are left vacant. But at the same time, for the course of Physical Education, it is must that the candidates must undergo the physical test. No such exemption has been given to those who are not in India. So, these things need to be looked into. But these are the guidelines which they approve and according to him, most of the members are aware of the fact that the High Court and Supreme Court of India had come heavily on various universities including Panjab University as far as admitting NRI candidates is concerned. If somebody who is not covered under the category even if they take a liberal approach, he has been given to understand that those who could not get admission in general category and got a certificate or undertaking from anyone that one gives one's consent to be the guardian and ready to undertake all the expenses for the study, that certificate is submitted and the candidate is given admission under the NRI category. That probably might create problem for the University simply because their guidelines are paradoxical and contradictory to each other. His submission is that since the year 2016-17 is gone, but for 2017-18, they should make foolproof guidelines so that no meritorious NRI is deprived of an opportunity of studying in the University and no other person who is not an NRI is able to take undue advantage of this category. He did not know, of course this is for the legal fraternity to guide, under para 10 on page 789, 4 categories have been made. It should be clear whether all of them are equally placed and are to compete with each other or it is in the sequence of preference that the first category would be given the first preference and so on. If that is so, of course it needs to be clarified and he does not believe that it could be that way, because in that way they would be giving the preference only to foreign nationals who are not from Indian origin, second is foreign citizens but are from Indian origin. That probably was never the intention of creating such seats. In view of this, he felt that it should be relooked into keeping in mind that at least by March, 2018, they are ready with the fresh guidelines as far as admission of NRI students is concerned so that there is no ambiguity.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this matter was discussed in the meeting of the Committee held on 20th July, 2017 which was constituted for fee structure guidelines. There it was pointed out by some of the members that the guidelines which are there for the year 2017-18 are such that hardly any admission under NRI category could be allowed and at that time somebody suggested that there were guidelines for the year 2016-17 which were duly approved by the Syndicate and the Senate and if they follow those guidelines, then probably some admissions could be made and in that meeting he was given the responsibility to submit a proposal. If they look at this proposal, it is nothing but the Handbook of Information which has duly been approved by the governing bodies for the year 2016-17. The proposal was that the guidelines already approved for the year 2016-17 be approved for the year 2017-18. But as Shri Ashok Goyal is pointing out, it is right that when they have to make the admissions for the year 2018-19, the guidelines should be looked into carefully. Since it was already July and it was not possible to deliberate on the guidelines and then make the admissions. So, it was suggested that they adopt the already guidelines approved for the year 2016-17. When they talk about the admissions for the year 2016-17, there was no legal hitch and they have followed the same guidelines for the year 2017-18 which have been followed earlier.

Of course, now they could look into these guidelines carefully and frame the guidelines for the year 2018-19.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since Shri Ashok Goyal has pointed out some weaknesses, these need to be looked into.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that not only, he also appreciated the anxiety of the University to make admissions under this category. He said that under the zeal to do it, let them not forget the legal position also as laid down by the Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court so that they do not get trapped by anybody. As far as saying that there was no legal hitch in following the guidelines for 2016-17, the Vice-Chancellor must be remembering that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had written a letter. Thankfully, nobody went to the Court. But otherwise they should know that they have made so many illegal admissions contrary to what has been laid down by the SC. Since nobody has challenged it, let them cover it and at least be wiser while framing the guidelines for the year 2018-19.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that according to him, they should make the SAT examination compulsory for preparing the merit because the dual criteria that one has to appear in the test while the other one not. All over the world, the SAT examination is considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be too restrictive.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that these admissions are only for professional departments.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal that the people who are coming from abroad, it be figured out as to how many have taken the admission.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that people who want to study abroad, they all appear in the SAT examination.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that there are certain Government notifications regarding NRIs and they should also take into consideration all those. The Baba Farid University of Health Sciences has referred to a notification of the Punjab Government in this regard for admission to MBBS course. So, they could see if there is any notification from the Central Government or the State Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to complete the job in a fast way and it should not be delayed. Since they have to approve the guidelines in the March meeting of the Senate, so whatever has to be done that has to be done within the next 30 days otherwise they would be in the same jam and requested Professor Meenakshi Malhotra to take care of it.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that his suggestion should also be taken care of while framing the guidelines.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that the similar problem is being faced in the engineering courses also as he had conducted the counselling this year. Many students who are appearing for JEE, the CBSE has not listed them and their results were not declared. When they talk about foreign nationals, they could have two categories – one for those who appear in India and the other for those who come through SAT. As Professor S.K. Sharma said, it is correct that they should prefer the candidates through SAT

because 3-4 candidates who had appeared here were actually studying from class 3rd or 4th in India only. They are facing a situation where there have been so many RTIs from the parents also and problems occurred, but it could not be solved. If they create two categories, then either the preference has to be made or the seats have to be divided among the candidates.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Meenakshi Malhotra to include the points suggested and requested to include Professor J.K. Goswamy and representatives from the Law subjects, Dental Institute, UIAMS etc. on the Committee.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that so far as the Bar Council of India, the governing body for law courses is concerned, it has made it very clear that if the reservation is to be done or additional seats for NRIs have to be provided, that has to be within the sanctioned strength and not beyond.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all should be looked into.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee under the Chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction including the representatives from the Departments like University Institute of Engineering & Technology (Professor J.K. Goswamy), Laws, University Institute of Legal Studies, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, etc. be constituted to prepare fee-structure and frame guidelines for Foreign Nationals/NRI students seeking admission to Post Graduate/Undergraduate Courses for the year 2018-19.

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

C-49. That the minutes of the Student's Aid Fund Administration Committee dated 15.02.2017 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider the applications of eligible students of teaching departments and U.S.O.L for financial assistance out of Student's Aid Fund for the session 2016-17, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 Para 16))

XIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-50 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-50. That recommendations dated 11.07.2017 along with example of the Committee constituted to look into the matter of P.U. employees claiming medical reimbursement from insurance as well as from Panjab University, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 16))

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he feels handicapped due to inadequacy of the information provided in the agenda. A meeting of the Committee is held and it talks of the audit objection (enclosed) but it is not enclosed with the agenda. It talks about two notifications – one by the Central Government and the other by Punjab Government on the issue but the notifications are not attached with the agenda. Normally, when there are two sources of benefit, these are options but not additions. This is a very unheard thing. So, he has a very serious objection to the principle that the person first goes to the insurance. So, administratively it is unsound.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he was a member of the Committee. It has been done because of the Central Government and Punjab Government and they have adopted the rules. Supposing a person has insurance of Rs.10 lacs and a reimbursement of Rs.8 lacs has been given as per the rules, the balance Rs.2 lacs would be reimbursed as per rules.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that the related documents should have been attached with the item. Any decision should not be made effective retrospectively.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even if they are adopting the rules today but these would be applicable from the date when the same were adopted by the Punjab Government.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is some communication gap. In the year 2015-16, the Punjab Government had tied up with the insurance companies and the insurance companies were to pay the 100% claim on medical expenses. Since the expenditure on claims was too much, the insurance company backed out from the agreement. After completion of one year, the Punjab Government withdrew that agreement. He enquired as to from where the University would get the funds for this purpose.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the medical reimbursement is to be made as per the rates prescribed by the PGIMER. The reimbursement would be made by the insurance company and the balance would be reimbursed by the University on PGI rates.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Government has empanelled some hospitals from where the employees could get the treatment and the reimbursement is done on the rates at par with the AIIMS, PGIMER.

Professor Keshav Malhotra clarified that there is no financial burden on the University in the reimbursement. The audit says that those employees would have got the medical insurance, they should claim the amount from the insurance company.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two examples quoted in the item. In one case, the claim for reimbursement was Rs.5.5 lacs and the insurance company paid an amount of Rs.3 lacs. The rest of the amount was of Rs.2.5 lacs and the University has paid an amount of Rs.2.2 lacs as per the approved rates. In the other case, a person had a claim for Rs.3.5 lacs and the insurance company paid Rs.3 lacs and the rest amount of Rs.50,000/- would be paid by the University even if the package rate is Rs.2.2 lacs. If a person has got the medical insurance, he/she would claim the reimbursement from the company and the balance amount or the upper limit would be paid by the University as per rules.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired that then what was the objection raised by the audit.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the audit wanted the University to adopt these rules of Punjab Government.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that these rules be adopted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is for the benefit of the employee and it should be adopted as there is no burden on the University.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that the related papers should have been provided.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to provide a copy of the rules to Shri Sibal to which he agreed.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that there is a time limit for submission of claim for medical reimbursement. If they adopt the rules, then that period would already have lapsed.

Later on, Professor Keshav Malhotra made available the related documents.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-50 on the agenda**, be approved.

XIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-51 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-51. That the recommendations of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016 (Item 14), that the following addition be made in Regulation 1 at page 184 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 with regard to admission to M.Phil. Course in Public Administration with effect from the academic session 2017-18.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1. A candidate for the degree of Master of Philosophy in the Faculties of Arts, Languages, Education, Science, Design & Fine Arts and Business Management & Commerce should have passed the master examination from the Panjab University or any examination which has been recognized as equivalent thereto, by this University in the first or second division (50% marks in the subject concerned). For M.Phil. in Gandhian Studies, Master's degree in the subjects will be determined by the Board of Control (with the approval of the Dean of University Instruction). For M.Phil. in Guru Granth Sahib Studies, the candidate should have obtained a Master's degree in any Faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate from the Panjab University or from any other University examination of which has been recognized as equivalent to the corresponding examination of this University. For M.Phil. in Sociology, a candidate should have obtained</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No Change</p>

<p>Master's degree in the subject of Sociology or Anthropology (Social Anthropology) with 50% marks.</p> <p>O T E : T h e</p>	<p>For M.Phil. Course in Public Administration, a candidate should have obtained Master's Degree in Public Administration or Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology with at least 55% marks.</p>
--	--

Vice-Chan

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council and Regulations Committee has approved the recommendation (No.14) of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 10)

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the item it is mentioned that for admission to M.Phil. Course in Public Administration, a candidate should have obtained Master's Degree in Public Administration or Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology with at least 55% marks. She pointed out that in the meeting of the Faculty of Arts, an objection has been raised as to why only these subjects have been included for the admission and why not the other subjects be also included. It was said that the matter be discussed in the Board of Control. But no discussion was held in the Board of Control and the item in the same form has been placed before the Senate. What is the logic of having these subjects? Why not the subject of women studies be also included. It is very strange that the subject of Police Administration has not been included which is a part of Public Administration.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the inclusion of subjects be broadened that a candidate who qualifies the entrance be allowed to take the admission even if he/she belongs to science subjects. Only the allied subjects have been added. Let it be open for all subjects.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this issue was raised in the meeting of the Faculty of Arts but it was not taken up at any other level of Board of Control. Therefore, it should be referred back to the Faculty of Arts.

RESOLVED: That the **Item C-51 on the agenda** be referred back to the Faculty of Arts to look into the possibility of inclusion of other social sciences subjects in the proposed regulations.

XV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-52 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-52. That minutes dated 26.05.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as per authorization given by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) and recommendation dated

05.07.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 27), with regard to frame Rules & Regulations for migration cases of other departments, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 20)

Shri V.K. Sibal said that on page 815 of the agenda, there is a case of migration of M.Sc. student which has already been allowed. But there is a mention of Panjab University Calendar which says that “no migration shall be allowed in the postgraduate course”. He enquired then how it has been done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that many of these things were written at a time when the Government of India was not encouraging students moving from one place to the other. But in today's India, the Government is encouraging people to move from one place to another and even it is said that half of the course be done from one University and the other half from the other University. It would take a long time before these memoranda are prepared. But the spirit of this is not to come in the way of the people to complete their education by combining courses provided the minimum standards are maintained. So, it is in that spirit that these exceptions get made.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that first the rules should be amended so that there is consistency between what they do and what is provided in the rules.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that in this migration case they have not gone through the equivalent process to see whether what the candidate has done is in conformity with what the candidate is to do. It might be that the candidate would have to repeat some courses and there might be a gap what the candidate has done and what the candidate has to do.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that finally it was recommended by the Department.

Professor J.K. Goswamy and Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Department has not recommended it as is clearly mentioned at Note 2 appearing on page 815 of the agenda as it is not admissible as per migration rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even if they see the minutes of the Committee, it is said that there are no regulations but these have to be framed. After that the case was sent to the Department.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that the process for preparing the regulations has not been started.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the Committee it was discussed that the regulations be prepared. Then the case was sent to the Department. The letter of the Department dated 12th July 2017 is there but the proceedings of the Committee are not attached.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to in which semester the candidate is presently studying.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the candidate is finishing the 3rd semester.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that now they are examining whether the migration was genuine or not. She also pointed out at this juncture about the migration of students from the Regional Centres to the Department of Laws and UILS when on a visit to Muktsar and Hoshiarpur it was told by the teachers by the 3rd, 4th, 5th semester, there are

no more students. Only a few students remain there. Why are they allowing the migrations? The teachers are sitting idle as they have no students to teach.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that to run the law courses at Regional Centre is not viable as out of the total 60 admissions made there, only about 20 students remain by the time they get promoted to 3rd semester.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that let them make the Regional Centres so attractive that the students do not migrate from there.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra added that even 41 seats have fallen vacant in the 3rd semester in the Department of Laws itself at the campus.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he did not agree with Professor J.K. Goswamy on the issue that the law course in the Regional Centre is not practically feasible. He would like to inform for the information of Professor Goswamy that the Regional Centre of Muktsar has contributed in terms of providing good Judges and Lawyers to the country. He pointed out that in the Regional Centre at Muktsar where the law course is going on for the last 5-6 years, there is only one teacher to teach the subject of law. He had also earlier raised the issue that since the University has filled about 100 vacancies of teachers in the campus, the vacant posts be filled up at Regional Centres also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the posts, which had been advertised whether these were for the campus or the Regional Centres, have been filled up.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that perhaps the posts for Regional Centre at Muktsar have not been advertised. He requested that it be got checked. He pointed out that even two teachers from the Regional Centre at Kauni have been transferred. Earlier, the fee for migration from the Regional Centre to the campus was Rs.30,000/- which has now been abolished. It meant that they have reduced their sources of revenue on their own. He did not know as to for which drawing room politics, those Regional Centres have been left to die on their own. The law course running at the Regional Centre has produced good Judges and Lawyers.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is a need to restrain such migrations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he fully agreed with Professor Rajesh Gill on this issue but the migration in genuine cases should be permitted.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there should be total transparency.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Standing Committee could be formed on migration issues for a given academic year across the departments and the faculties instead of leaving the decision to the Vice-Chancellor and the Dean of University Instruction doing things at the spur of the moment. Let them resolve today that there would be a Standing Committee on migration issues chaired by Dean of University Instruction and comprising of, in addition to representative of PUTA, representatives of those Departments where there is a huge rush for migration and one representative of Honours School all put together, one representative from Arts Departments where there is a possibility of migration. The Committee would evaluate the things case by case in an objective manner without any pressure from any quarter.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they should distinguish between the migration within the departments and from the Regional Centres to the University as these are altogether different.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the same Standing Committee would look into all migration cases.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that but they should have an attitude to save the Regional Centres.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Regional Centres should be developed as campus of Panjab University at Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur and Muktsar. This should be the dream. Panjab University, Lahore has 5 campuses but somehow somewhere they (Panjab University, Chandigarh) have abandoned that concept. Ludhiana has no University like a traditional University. He has taken up with the senior political leaders of Punjab Government as well as the senior administrators of Punjab Government that the two Government Colleges of Ludhiana and the Regional Centre of Panjab University should synergise their activities so that the quality education could be given there in a collective manner both for the postgraduate as well as for the popular courses like Law, and Management where people are wanting to have that. So, they should do it and some input is needed for it. He is trying to impress upon the Punjab Government that they should accept to do some innovative thinking that the Government College, Ludhiana and the Regional Centre should work together. Similarly, the Government College, Hoshiarpur and the Panjab University Regional Centre at Hoshirpur should work together. The postgraduate classes are being run on the Panjab University Regional Centre at Muktsar and also at the Government College, Muktsar, though on paper.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is not paper but the classes are actually running.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the number of teachers are very less.

Shri Raghbir Dyal clarified that the teachers are available as per the sanctioned strength but that is a separate matter that they are not having sufficient number of regular teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that some of the teachers are being paid the salary while others are not. Some of the Colleges must be having infrastructure while the others not. There is a PG College in proximity to the Regional Centre, Muktsar run by the SGPC. But there is no synergy between the postgraduate classes of Government College, Muktsar, Panjab University Regional Centre, Muktsar and the College run by SGPC. So, they have to think a little innovative. If the postgraduate classes could be run with the cooperation of Colleges in University appointed Professors in Lahore, why could they not just repeat that experiment and provide quality education to the people in proper environment. But the Government has to come forward and the Senate members and the elected representatives of that area have to have a tripartite dialogue otherwise it would not happen.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the Regional Centre of Muktsar must stay at Muktsar itself and all the efforts to shift it must be rejected and a target be fixed to complete the building in the newly allotted land. The Regional Centre at Muktsar is very good as he has visited there and it should be promoted as the Government and the political leaders are trying to shift it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should not be allowed to lie but the way it is running is not good. He could show as to how much improvement is there and what is the reality what it ought to be.

Professor S.K. Sharma supported what the Vice-Chancellor had said. All the universities in Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Punjab came out of the regional centres of Panjab University like the universities at Shimla and Rohtak.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there 3 Libraries were established and one of these was at Ludhiana, the second one at Madurai and the third one at Udaipur. Now Udaipur and Madurai have universities. But the Panjab University Regional Centre at Ludhiana has been just limited to a Library in 1-2 acres. Only some professional courses have been started. There are no facilities and it is overcrowded. If some placement agency goes there for placement, and see the environment in which the graduates are passing. So, they have to group together. The two Government Colleges in Ludhiana put together have a land of about 160-180 acres. They are also getting some money from the Punjab Government. The salaries have to be paid as is paid by the Panjab University and the infrastructure has to be the way the Government Colleges are supposed to have. The governing system should be of a little innovative type and not the way that Panjab University is having. They need to have a Local Advisory Committee and should have the involvement of the local political leaders as well as local administration otherwise the things would not be possible. It has to be taken as a part of development agenda of these three places. He had talked to the Deputy Commissioner of Hoshiarpur who was very enthusiastic that the Government College, Hoshiarpur be attached with the Panjab University Regional Centre. The matter of Regional Centre at Muktsar is now in public focus and in some sense it is good that everyone is paying attention that there is a Regional Centre in Muktsar which is in need of help. To fulfil these needs, somebody has to contribute by way of bit decision making, somebody has to put in money and somebody has to come forward and see that they manage it properly. So, the local Senators of that region should exert their influence with the local administration and political leaders that quality service should be provided on behalf of a public institution.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that a Standing Committee be formed for the Regional Centres.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with it and they would form a Standing Committee to proceed with this agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the question raised by Shri V.K. Sibal is very pertinent. He appreciated the concern of the Vice-Chancellor vis-a-vis the age-old regulations when they were discussing the migration. But in the modern era, they are allowing so many things. But the question which needs to be addressed is that without changing the regulations to that effect whether it is within the purview of anybody, the Vice-Chancellor, Syndicate or the Senate to do anything in violation of the regulations. It is very good that while considering one individual case, it is also being decided that let the rules and regulations, he did not know what the rules and regulations mean because in the University rules and regulations are different things and the regulations are to be effected with the approval of the Government of India. First of all, they have to decide whether they have to frame the rules or the regulations. In the item, it is written as rules and regulations. Thereafter they would face a situation where to put in. The only thing is that in once case, they have done it without any provision in the regulations. He is not questioning that. But there are some people who go through the regulations and find that it is not allowed. So, such persons do not come forward with the request and some who have got access to the University through Shri Ashok Goyal come and get it done. So,

what is needed is that they should try to make their best efforts to make a uniform policy for all. As far as the Standing Committee is concerned which the Vice-Chancellor has suggested, a very progressive step, but should this decision be taken that Standing Committee would take decision notwithstanding what is contained in the regulations. The Standing Committee which would consider all the requests for migration, could that recommend anything which is contrary to what is provided in the regulations. Probably, the Vice-Chancellor does not mean that. He suggested that a Committee be constituted to frame regulations to this effect where some leverage is given to the Syndicate or Senate or the Vice-Chancellor or to a Committee in the former regulations and also incorporating as they have been incorporating that all academic regulations are effective in anticipation of approval from the Government of India as basically these are academic regulations. So, they have to find a way out so that everybody is placed at par and they, as the Vice-Chancellor has said, are able to take care of the need of the emerging society.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if they want to allow the migration, then why not before that they should frame the rules. The migration issue has only surfaced in the case of Law course. At the very first step itself it should be made clear that the admissions are being made in particular for Panjab University campus, Regional Centres at Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur and Muktsar and thereafter no migration be allowed as is the case with the IITs where once admission is made on the basis of GATE score, no migration is allowed thereafter. They could also adopt the same procedure. If any seat falls vacant at the Regional Centres, the seat could be offered to the next candidate from the waiting list only that Centre. If a seat falls vacant at Panjab University, then the candidates from the Regional Centres should not be allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are going to form a Committee which would evaluate all these things.

At this stage, the documents related with Item No.C-50 regarding medical reimbursement were made available to Shri V.K. Sibal.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that in the Panjab University Calendar there is no rule for migration from one College to another.

Shri Ashok Goyal brought it to the knowledge of Vice-Chancellor though it relates to only one department as Professor Ronki Ram has touched the subject of Law. He was discussing with Mrs. Anu Chatrath also that this year in spite of the provision being there, the migrations have not taken place in the Department of Laws only on the ground that the re-evaluation results of some of the students are awaited and only after the declaration of the re-evaluation results, the Department would be able to know exactly as to how many seats would be available. Had the Department not by way of a public notice not announced the number of seats available for filling up. He felt so small that people applied from different institutions, most of them were from private institutions, which do not give NOC. For getting the NOC, these institutions say that if a student vacates his seat, they would be incurring huge financial loss. Some of the students paid them the whole amount which they were supposed to pay and got the NOC. The University gave them the time that those who would be submitting NOC by a particular date and time would be considered for migration but after completing all these formalities by the students, it was announced that the counselling has been postponed. Next time again, when the students, the counselling was postponed, according to his knowledge if it is right, the migration has not taken place till date though the regulations provide for that till the result of re-evaluation is declared, the candidate's original result is valid for all purposes including promotion and admission. He wondered if they could keep anything in abeyance awaiting the result which ultimately might remain the same. But at the cost of those who were awaiting for the migration. Secondly, they have another regulation that if after re-evaluation somebody is entitled to get admission in higher class, he/she would

be adjusted over and above the sanctioned strength. Probably, it has happened for the first time in the Department of Laws that migrations have not been effected awaiting the re-evaluation result. It is just for introspection that what is the fault of those students. Now, Mrs. Anu Chatrath has told him that the counselling was postponed because someone had given a representation. At the most the students who could be affected were those whose re-evaluation results had not been declared. Those students, of course, could not be denied the admission. They are not the aggrieved party till favourable result comes and they are told that they could not be admitted because the seats are already filled up. He wondered who represented that the counselling be postponed. Is the authority of the University in the knowhow of this thing that the migrations have not taken place.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra clarified that the Chairperson of the Department of Laws said that sometimes when the students get their result re-evaluated, they do not leave the programme. So the Committee decided that they should not let the seats remain vacant. Last year, there was a case when they declared a seat vacant which was later on filled up. But when the candidate who had got re-evaluation done was declared pass, then they had to adjust that candidate. That is why the Department did not declare the seats as vacant until they are sure. Then a pressure was built on the Controller of Examinations that the re-evaluation results should be declared quickly. On 29th November, 2017, the re-evaluation process was completed and the Department has informed her a day before yesterday that 41 seats are lying vacant after the result of re-evaluation. So, before the onset of the next semester, i.e., 4th semester, these students would be migrated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the process they would be violating another regulation wherein it is said that the migration would take place only in 3rd and 5th semester.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that once the matter came to her notice, she talked to the Chairperson of the Department that once they had displayed it on the notice board and after that the word 'postponed' was used. By taking the support of another provision as now the even semester has started to which she said that in the even semester, they could not allow migration because the process was already started in the odd semester. So, they have to continue. When this matter came to her notice, she told the Chairperson of the Department of Laws that since now the re-evaluation results have been declared, they should write to the Dean of University Instruction to permit them to continue the process of migration. There were lot of litigations as one of the candidates had approached the Court that the Department had displayed the list on the notice board and called the candidates for counselling. The Court directed the University to examine the case and, according to her, directions have been issued to the Chairperson of the Department of Laws to examine the case. The Chairperson discussed the matter with her and she said that another regulation of the University bars them to allow migration in the even semester. Once the process was already in vogue, she told the Chairperson that the other regulation for migration in even semester is not applicable. In view of that, the matter has been sent to the Dean of University Instruction which was subsequently sent to the Vice-Chancellor. The moment they receive the file, the migration process would be over.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had no option but to accept that.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Dean of University Instruction that this also be examined as to how the migrations have been taking place in the earlier years even when the results of re-evaluation were awaited. He enquired whether this has been faced for the first time in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is the responsibility of the Academic Committee of the Department to take a decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether the Academic Committee could change the decision year after year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not change it.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to look into it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all this responsibility is put on the Chairperson and after sometime when the Chairperson changes, then it is said that such a decision was taken under the Chairpersonship of particular person. It is not a correct thing to undo. The Chairpersons are supposed to take the academic decisions collectively. But it does not happen. During the last week, he had spent much time to impress upon the faculties of major departments that the academics of a given department is their collective responsibility and this should not depend upon as to who is the present Chairperson. All the decisions must be taken collectively and circulated to all because today in the University every faculty member after a service of 1-2 years is a permanent faculty member of the University. In view of that when it comes to taking academic decisions, no credit should be given to a person's rank. Once a person is confirmed, he/she would remain in service for a long time as nobody in today's India leaves one University for another because one is entitled to career progressions. In the IITs, they do not distinguish between Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor when it comes to academic responsibility and their participation in the academic decision making. They need to adopt such practices which their peer institutions have recognised and they should be doing such things so that there are lesser hiccups in their system.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that the Faculty of Law generally says that the migration is not a matter of right and the University is just facilitating the students to take admission and it is a matter of facilitation that they allow migration. That is the kind of mindset of the Faculty of Law and say that until they are sure whether is vacant or not, they could not allow migration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to take corrective measures and form a Standing Committee.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra informed that they have already sent the matter to the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is a specific case but he is talking about for the next year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not only a case of re-evaluation. Sometimes after re-evaluation one gets more than 15% marks and in that case it is referred to the third examiner. Could it be accepted that till that time they could not fill up the seat. Secondly, the leave is also not a matter of right as that of migration. Then could they take a decision that it is only facilitation to grant leave. Migration is allowed as per the regulation and these have to read along with other regulations where it is clearly mentioned that the original result would be applicable for all intents and purposes including admission and promotion. So, the day the result is declared, whatever number of seats is vacant, they have to declare. The other regulation is that it is possible that if the result is declared just two days before the examination of the next semester and the student is eligible to be promoted to the next semester and to appear for the examination,

they allow this as it is permitted in the regulations. It is considered that the evaluation of the process of the University is faulty and ultimately the student who has been declared pass, he/she should not be put to disadvantage. They should also keep in mind that for any number of students who have applied for re-evaluation, they must ensure that the others who are desirous of migration, should also not be put to disadvantage just because that migration is not a matter of right.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out that the details of the student who has been allowed the migration have not provided as to what the candidate has studied in the first and second semester. They do not know as to what subjects she has studied. Why all this information has not been provided.

Principal I.S. Sandhu while agreed with the viewpoint of Shri Ashok Goyal said that the migration should be allowed on the basis of original result. But there could be another problem that if a candidate who obtains more marks than the last admitted candidate after re-evaluation, he/she would have to be admitted, lest he/she would go the Court and they would have to abide by the directions of the Court. So, they should amend the regulations by forming a Committee. As Shri Sibal had said, the migration should not have been allowed. He pointed out that about 40-50 students of the Regional Centres are appearing in the examination at Chandigarh on the basis of medical grounds or so. When they allow migration, the number of students at Regional Centres starts decreasing. He stressed that the migration should be allowed only on the basis of original result, however, the problem would still persist in a few cases.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the only solution to this problem is that the declaration of results of re-evaluation at the earliest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that sometimes the teachers do not evaluate the answer sheet in time.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it should be made time-bound.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is a provision to declare the results within a specified period but that is not being followed.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that spot-marking should be done in the case of re-evaluation of answer sheets.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that the re-evaluation should be got done first in the cases of migration.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the re-evaluation is got done only from the teachers residing at Chandigarh. He suggested that teachers from Punjab colleges should also be called for so that the evaluation work could be finished at the earliest.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that normally they blame the Controller of Examinations for not getting the re-evaluation done in time, but he has observed that the teachers at the University campus return the answer-sheet even after two months and that too without re-evaluating them. The Vice Chancellor can confirm this from the teachers sitting here.

The Vice Chancellor said that as far as the nation is concerned, the examination duty is a part of duty.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said if it is a part of salary, then why the results are not being declared in time. It means they are not doing their duty properly and because of this the students are suffering.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the University teachers used to ask to send the answer sheets at their residence, but the college teachers have to come to the University to marks the papers.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not want to make this issue as Colleges Vs University and let they be not differentiate between College Vs University. If the University survives, it is the branding of the University. The University teachers would get salary if the colleges would contribute to it. Unless they work in cooperation, the University would suffer.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that they should not also differentiate between the Chandigarh college teachers and Punjab College teachers. All affiliated college teachers should evaluate or re-evaluate the answer sheets.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua requested that the re-evaluation should be done on the pattern of spot evaluation.

Principal R.S. Jhanji informed about a case of re-evaluation in which the result was declared very late as compared to the examination which was held later on. In this case, out of the 8 missing answer sheets only 5 could be traced and 3 still remain untraced. He did not know what happened to it.

After the lunch when the meeting resumed, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha informed that date for the next hearing in the Court case (regarding the issue under Item C-38) is fixed for 16th January, 2018 and that should be kept in mind while fixing the next date for the meeting of the Syndicate wherein the University is also a party.

Dr. Dalip Kumar also said that the meeting of the Syndicate be scheduled keeping in mind the date of hearing.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is not sub-judice. There is no stay that they could not discuss the issue. They could discuss the matter on 6th January, 2018.

Professor Pam Rajput and Professor Emanuel Nahar requested to take up the item of Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now let they go through the items and wherever they feel that it could lead to more discussion, they would take up those items on 6th January, 2018.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-52 on the agenda**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Standing Committee under the Chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction, having one representative each of PUTA, Departments under the Faculty of Arts, Departments under the Honours School System and Departments where there is huge rush for migration to evaluate things case by case in an objective manner.

XVI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-53 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

- C-53.** That recommendations dated 25.07.2017 of the Committee, with regard to carry out major repairs of the roof of the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, which is in dilapidated condition, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 Para 22))

The Vice-Chancellor said that the roof had fallen down and the classes have to be run there and there is no other option. So, they visited there and it was agreed and a plan was made that as long as the classes have to be run from the present premises, some money should be allocated and while they do whatever they need to do this process should go on so that the classes are held regularly. So, the money sought has been sanctioned by the Board of Finance and the XEN has told him that if the Senate approves it, the work would be started immediately.

Shri Raghbir Dyal appreciated what has been discussed about the Regional Centre before the lunch. But he has observed that during the last 5 years, they have not accorded that priority to the Regional Centre. So many issues have earlier been raised. He has prepared a chronology of the events. As the Vice-Chancellor has pointed out that the roof had collapsed, it happened in the beginning of the year 2017. In this regard, a meeting was held on 7th February, 2017 which was attended by the Dean of University Instruction, himself, Professor Mukesh Arora, Principal R.S. Jhanji, Dr. Harjodh Singh; Director, Regional Centre and the XEN. At that time it was decided that since the present building was irreparable, an alternative place could be looked for where the classes could be held. It was also decided that the drawings for the new building of the Regional Centre be prepared and the work should be taken up in phases. In the first phase, the classrooms could be constructed and the library, auditorium, etc. could be constructed in the second phase and so on. This decision was taken in the month of February, but it is not in his knowledge whether any drawings have been prepared and placed before the Syndicate. The Registrar had also visited there and the plan to purchase the land or to hire the building could not materialise. They had talked with the management of Desh Bhagat institutions and many others also. The Registrar visited the Regional Centre on 12.6.2017 and the repair estimate made was to the tune of Rs.56 lacs. It is mentioned that the renovation work should be started during the vacation period. But it was pointed out that since a lot of formalities like approval of the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate would be required, it would take at least 2-3 months. A Committee had been formed on this issue and when he opened the agenda papers, he was surprised to know that in spite of his being a member of the Committee, he was never informed about it. This Committee was formed in the month of June, 2017 by another Committee. He felt disappointed over the working that a Committee has further appointed a Committee. When this issue came up in the Syndicate, Principal I.S. Sandhu and Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang raised the issue that some other alternative could be thought of. Both of them were assigned the duty and they visited Muktsar and also contacted him but he was in Chandigarh on that day. It was transpired that the estimate of Rs.56 lacs could now swell to about Rs.70 lacs. According to him, it would be better if they undertake some minor repairs by spending an amount of Rs.10-15 lacs which would help them to run the classes for the time being because there is no use of spending Rs.80-90 lacs on a building which is in a very dilapidated condition. The XEN office was also of the view that this building could not be repaired. After that, the Vice-Chancellor had also visited Muktsar in the month of July though he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) could not meet him owing to illness. He is thankful for that. Thereafter, a proposal for overhauling was prepared and there was no discussion on the proposal submitted by Principal I.S. Sandhu and Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang. Thereafter, another issue cropped up in the newspapers that both the Centres at Kauni and Muktsar be merged and unnecessarily it became a political issue. So, they are in the same situation as they were in the month of January, 2018. As the Vice-Chancellor

had said that with this issue of shifting, the people of the area have become aware, he agrees with the Vice-Chancellor on it. As far as his knowledge is concerned, a *Regional Centre Bachao Manch* was formed when this controversy erupted. It also became a political issue and there after it was converted into a *Regional Centre Banao Manch* with a motive as to how the University could be helped in the matter. They have sanctioned an amount of Rs.2 crore for the Regional Centre out of which about Rs.20 lacs has been spent for its boundary wall. So, they are having a balance of about Rs.1.75 crores in their coffers. If he gets a nod from the University, he could mobilise the people of the area and to begin with, could collect an amount of about Rs.20-25 lacs. In the first phase, they could build as much classrooms as are required. As they have increased the charges for sports development, auditoria, etc. in the University, similarly they could create a Development Fund and a nominal charge of Rs.25/- per student could be levied. In this way, they could collect an amount of Rs.1 crore from about 2 lac students of the affiliated Colleges. They are already having about Rs.1.75 crores for the purpose. So, in all they would be having about Rs. 3 crores with which the work for the first phase could be started. They are not to construct a very big building but just about 15-20 classrooms. The auditorium, etc. could be constructed later on. He requested that they should not spend Rs.80-90 lacs on the repair work of an old building which would not be a good proposition. They are having a piece of 5 acre land and he requested the Vice-Chancellor to give a direction to the people of the area to collect money and they would try to collect the money so that the work could be started. It might not happen that they collect the money but the work is not started and it would become difficult for them to face the people.

The Vice Chancellor said that till the time would run there, the place has to be liveable. They should let the repair work continue as it would not be possible to construct the building in such a short time. The way, the work is being done in the Universities; it would take at least three years. The money which they are spending on the repair work would allow them time to hold the classes there at least for three years. So, until they have alternative arrangement, things have to continue at the present premises. In order to continue the classes at the present premises for two/three years, they have to spend this money. Their attempt to hire a building has failed. Their attempt to get it repaired at a smaller cost has also failed. Mr. Vipul Narang, a Senators has said that he has a contractor who could do this work, but he does not fulfil the norms of the Government. If he does not fulfil the government norms, then they cannot spend even a single penny. The current arrangement is only to tide over the situation so that the classes could continue there. What they are suggesting is very fine. They should take the amount of Rs. 1.75 Crore, collect rest of the amount. and simultaneously start construction on the 5 acres land available with them. They have not to construct such a building on which a lot of money would be spent, but at the same time the building should live for a long time. They are making a building on behalf of the University so it should somewhat reflect the character of the University. The rooms should not be small. Since they have to spend the money, they should do the work with some planning and there should not be any hurry, let the work run smoothly. The Vice Chancellor said that he is ready to make an appeal to the public to donate the money for construction of building. If they want him to come to Muktsar to make a public announcement for funds, he is ready to do that also.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that it would be nice if the work is started at the earliest to which the Vice Chancellor said that he is ready to give the amount of Rs. 1.75 Crore available with the University. Shri Raghbir Dyal further said that it would be better if the drawings of the building are made available to them as some of the respected members of the area are willing to construct a block. which meets the norms of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that let this be gone through and also take the remaining money available with them. On being asked by Shri Raghbir Dyal whether this money is over and above the amount of Rs. 1.75 Crores, the Vice Chancellor clarified that it is over and above that amount. and this is add on amount. The Vice Chancellor informed that he has discussed this with the students at Muktsar.

This proposal was agreed to by the members.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested to levy some infrastructural fund to collect some more funds.

The Vice Chancellor asked them to go through these things, but first they should start the work.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let they should first send a signal they would like to extend it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there apprehension is that if they collect an amount of 30-40 lacs, but could not be able to start the work, then it becomes difficult to answer the public.

The Vice Chancellor said,, that is why he is saying to first spend Rs. 1.00 crores and then to add the collected amount in it and suggested that they should at least start the work of Phase-1.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that instead of spending money on the renovation of old building, they could also explore the possibility of hiring some building.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has tried everything, but all his efforts have failed.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-53 on the agenda**, be approved.

XVII

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-54 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.-

C-54. That the following Fellows be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against their names:

1.	Shri Amarinder Singh Chief Minister of Punjab Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Law 3. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture 4. Design & Fine Arts
2.	Shri Deepak Kaushik H. No. C-10 Sector-14 P.U. Chandigarh	1. Languages 2. Medical Sciences 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Business Management & Commerce
(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 13)		

3.	Ms. Aruna Chaudhary Minister of Higher Education, Punjab, Chandigarh H.No. 951 Minister Complex, Sector-39 A Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts
(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 14)		
1.	Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, PCS Director Higher Education Chandigarh	1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Education
(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 37)		
2.	Professor Meenakshi Malhotra Dean of University Instruction Panjab University Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 6)		

XVIII

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-55 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.-

- C-55.** That the minutes of the Committee dated 15.03.2017 to decide the fee structure of Hostels at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur for the session 2017-18, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 Para 17))

XIX.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-56 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

- C-56.** That letter No. BCI: D: 1765:2016 (LE/Evening) dated 30.11.2016, be adopted and the classes for the LL.B. course in the Department of Laws may be conducted in two shifts between 8.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m.

(Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 Para 25))

The Vice Chancellor said that they have no option at the moment as the next year is the last time for the evening shift.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to accept it and asked, is he (Vice Chancellor) sure that the classes would end up at 7.00 p.m.

Shri V.K.Sibal said that he has read a paragraph from the letter of B.C.I. and they have asked for the explanation. He enquired whether the reply has been sent or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a very important issue and asked as to how they would run the classes till 7.00 p.m.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that some problem was experienced and after that, perhaps, the decision was changed. It was earlier decided to hold the classes in two shifts i.e. morning and evening, but the department said that it is not possible. He informed that the old system is running as it was already running. But the present decision which is under consideration has been reversed and now only one shift is running. It was asked in respect of the new system whether the two shifts are possible or not, but the department people resisted. He was of the opinion, perhaps, the complete item has not been brought in.

The Vice Chancellor said okay, they can defer it or withdraw it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thinks that the Bar Council does not allow evening classes to which the Vice Chancellor clarified that the evening classes have been stopped by the Bar Council of India. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether it would be applicable to existing classes.

The Vice Chancellor said that that the existing classes would continue, but there would not be new admission for evening classes.

Shri Ashok Goyal further asked about the law classes running at P.U.R.C. Ludhiana. Let they should do introspection. He informed that the Bar Council of India has never given its sanction for running the evening law classes running at P.U.R.C., Ludhiana.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal informed that earlier the evening law classes were running at P.U.R.C., Ludhana, but now there are no evening classes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, it is alright if the evening classes are not running there. If after they have received a letter in 2017-18, are they running morning there? He, then asked about those who were admitted in 2016-17. How they are running, as there is no permission for them. Have they taken the permission for P.U.R.C., Ludhiana also to allow the existing evening classes?

The Vice Chancellor said that they cannot allow for the evening classes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was asking for the existing classes i.e. those who were admitted in 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. They will complete their degree as per the LL.B. instructions. Now from this year, as he has been told, they have been only morning classes. But those who are now in the 2nd year, are they be allowed by the Bar Council of India to continue in evening studies.

The Vice Chancellor said the permission for that has not been taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when they have not taken the permission, what they would do.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will look into it.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that in view of the Bar Council conditions, they are supposed to shift the total evening classes as they have been in the morning session, but because of the infrastructure deficiency, they would face problems UIIS, Department of as well as PURC, Ludhiana. At PURC, Ludiana, they do not have sufficient parking space, rooms.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Law School at the PURC Ludhiana would be shifted to Government College premises where sufficient land is available. In the long run it is the solution that he is proposing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are having land, but they are not having rooms.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can appeal to some Ludhiana industrialists and get that done.

Shri H.S. Dua said they should also explore the possibility at private colleges also along with the government colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that when they can get money in the name of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge, can they not get it in the name of Shri Munjal or Shri M.M. Mittal of M.M. Autos. They can see how much money they give for school education and higher education in Punjab. He is the biggest manufacturer of Maruti parts. If they go to them with a good proposal, in the name of his mother, he is willing to spend tens of crores of rupees.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is a good proposal.

The Vice Chancellor informed that Professor Mukesh Arora has introduced him with him. That man is very generous, but they never went to him with a proposal. The Vice informed that before giving him a proposal, he has to consult the Punjab Government.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the Scouts and Guides has occupied land in front of the Law Department. She asked if they can get that land vacated.

The Vice Chancellor said that that he would talk to Shri V.P. Badnore, Governor, Punjab and Administrator, U.T., Chandigarh.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the land adjoining to UILS could be given to UILS because it is a self-financing department which is contributing a lot. She said that she meet him (Vice Chancellor) regarding this as both the departments are really facing difficulties.

The Vice Chancellor said that she has contacts in the Punjab Government and requested to use those contacts.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath further said that the land adjoining to UILS belongs to the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that this could be considered in the meeting of 6th January.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-56 on the agenda**, be approved.

XX.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-57 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

C-57. That sanction of rough cost estimate of Rs. 1097.43 lac to furnish and make functional the front portion along with the Banquet Hall at the lower ground level of the multipurpose Auditorium Building at P.U. South Campus, Sector 25, Chandigarh, utilization of an amount of 2.00 crore out of the Budget head “Central Placement cell Fund” and allocation of the balance amount out of UIAMS Exams Fund Account, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 Para 24))

RESOLVED: That the consideration of **Item C-57 on the agenda** be deferred.

XXI The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-58 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.-

C-58. That circular No. 3/21/16-3 VPPT/ 866490/1 dated 26.10.2016 of Under Secretary Finance, Department of Finance, Government of Punjab, regarding grant of Dearness Allowance and Medical allowance, to the pensioners/family pensioner, residing abroad after getting permanent citizenship, be adopted.

(Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 Para 10))

XXII The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-59 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.-

C-59. That circular No. 2/7/2017-2 VPPT/356 dated 23.02.2017 of Under Secretary Finance, Department of Finance (Finance Pension Policy and Coordination Branch), Government of Punjab, regarding not to grant travel concession to the retired employees/officers against whom any departmental or judicial inquiry is pending and provisional pension is being paid to them, be adopted.

(Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 Para 11))

Item C-60 had been withdrawn.

XXIII The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-61 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.-

C-61. That proposal dated 25.05.2017 of the Finance and Development Officer with regard to budget estimates of P.U. Constituent College, Dharamkot and Ferozepur, for an amount of Rs. 1.16 crore, for the year 2017-18, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 Para 33))

XXIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-62 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-62. That minutes dated 02.05.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.03.2017 (Para 8) regarding revision of rent of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues of P.U. in sector-14 & South Campus of Sector-25 and also framing of guidelines for booking etc., be approved.

(Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 Para 21))

Dr. Gurmeet said that he has no objection if rents for some other venues are increased, but the rent for Auditoria for academic functions might not be increased as every department is not having its own auditorium. For example, the evening department has its own auditorium. If the department itself want to hold any academic function, it is free for them, but if some adjoining department wants to hold a function, there are charges for that department, which they are further increasing.

The Vice Chancellor said that they did not charge any money from the University department to which Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the rent is charged from them.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh informed that if there is a function in some college, where there is usually one auditorium, they do not charge any money from the different departments of the college. He requested the Vice Chancellor to assure that no charges for academic function would be taken from the departments where there is no auditorium.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that GST is also imposed on the rent of the auditorium.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh suggested to attach the adjoining Department with the auditorium. He agreed that the responsibility of cleanliness of the auditorium should also be put on the department using it. He requested to find out some way-out to solve this problem.

The Vice Chancellor made it clear that no money is charged for holding the lecture or academic functions of the University departments.

Professor Pam Rajput said that they should make at least some provision for the electricity bill etc. because the electricity bill has to be borne by the department to whom the auditorium belongs to.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that if the colleges can permit their departments for using the auditorium without any charges, then why not the University. Air conditioners are also used in the College auditorium. If they want to promote academic activities, then they should allow the departments to use the auditorium. If they start charging electricity bill, say, of rupees ten thousands from the department, it would not give any relief to them. He requested that rather they should support and encourage those departments who are not having their own auditoria and they should not put burden on them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is a Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Pam Rajput to decide about the rates. There was a representation from whose point of view they are looking at the things. One point of view is that of a person who is hiring for that function and the other is from the perspective of the Chairperson in whose custody that auditorium lies and who is responsible for its maintenance etc. and the third is the University which is the stakeholder. There was a representation from the Chairperson of the English Department wherein the Chairperson stated that many a time the auditorium has been frequently rented out to the outside agencies free of cost. So, they use the discretion here. They are charging from their own departments, but they are renting out the auditorium free of cost to the outside agencies. When they fix the rates, they fix less charges for University departments and more charges for outside agencies. But when they give the auditorium free of charge to the outsiders, it puts a burden on their own exchequer. They decided that there should be a Committee to decide whether the auditorium should be given free of charge or not. The Chairperson of English has also specified that nine air conditioner remain operative while the auditorium is in use and they have also to pay the cleaning charges. So, who is responsible for that, if for days together, the auditorium is given free of charge? Since the University is already facing a financial crunch, so they should take a decision in this regard here and now. If they have fixed the rates for the outside agencies, they should charge those rates from them. While making the budget of English Department, it was noticed that there was huge electricity bill. The department pointed out that a huge chunk of electricity bill is spent on the Auditorium.

The Vice Chancellor said that there should be an inter-departmental committee for the two auditoria i.e. P.L. Anand Auditorium and Mulkh Raj Anand Auditorium. There should be a separate Committee for the Law Auditorium.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that Chairperson of the respective department to which the auditorium belongs to, should be a member of that Committee.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the issue could not be solved with the formation of Committees. He has no objection if charges are taken from the outside agencies. He suggested that a department could be allowed to use the auditorium at least two times in a year free of cost.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should decide among themselves as to what are the essential functions of each department. There are some functions such as alumni meet, oration, welcome function, farewell function which are usually held. So, the departmental committee should look into it.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that if a department has caused some damage to the auditorium, he would be answerable for that. If they make it so complicated, it would not be good for the promotion of academic activities. If departments own the responsibility for its cleanliness and also for any damage done to the auditorium, the department should be allowed to use the auditorium. But if they have the attitude to charge four thousand or five thousand from the departments, then he did not think it would be a step to promote the academic activities.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is a revenue model and he cannot take a call on these things. Somebody has to work out a revenue model keeping in view the University as a whole. So, let there be a Committee to look into it. At the moment, the present rates are for all. It is well taken that for the academic functions of the University, the University should be seen to be facilitating, but concurrently, they have also to have a revenue model of a kind to take care of the maintenance, upkeep, repair etc. of the auditoria. Some resource can be put in by the University, but some resource has to be added to it by continuous income. For that, somebody has to work for this and some Committee has to be formed, otherwise it cannot be done. They have to use the University auditoria in an integrated way.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa suggested that the entry to the upper hall of the College Bhawan should be visible and it should be from the front side.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they can go with the unrevised rates.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not going to do anything, they would go just by the rates, in case there is a problem, they would address the problem. Problem always needs to be attended to.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-62 on the agenda**, be approved except for rent of auditoria.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to form separate Committee for each of the auditoria with the Chairperson of the Department concerned as a member of the Committee to look into the issue of concessional rent for academic purposes of the University Departments and determining higher rent from outside agencies.

XXV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-63 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-63. That the minutes of the Committee dated 05.06.2017 constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.03.2017, relating to deferred Item No.9 of the Syndicate meeting dated 20.03.2017, with regard to the request of contractual Lecturers working at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 Para 25))

The Vice Chancellor while briefing the members about the item said that this has been approved by the Board of Finance. There are those people who are appointed against one kind of position; they have to be transferred to the other kind of position. All that has been done, so this problem has been taken care of. This problem was continuing for a long time

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-63 on the agenda**, be approved.

XXVI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-64 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-64. That minutes dated 15.6.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 30.4.2017 (Para 18), regarding revision of Room Rent, Mess Charges & Washing of linen charges of Main Guest House/Golden Jubilee Guest House/Faculty House/Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla & Revision of rates of University residential accommodation, be approved and the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to include the left out categories.

NOTE: The matter regarding revision of rates of College Bhawan be placed before the College Development Council.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 32)

Shri Prabhjit Singh said the only point is that the rates for outsiders and the local Fellows should be the same and there should not be any differentiation between the Fellows.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out the Ph.D. examiners have to pay Rs. 710/- for room rent as per the revised rates whereas they are paid Rs. 160/- only as D.A. which is not practical for any examiner to come to the Panjab University. The examiner should be put in category A, and requested to exempt the Ph.D. examiners from paying room rent.

This was agreed to.

Some of the members requested to defer the item and suggested it could be discussed on 6th January meeting.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they cannot defer it as they have already issued a notification in this regard and it has been made applicable also.

The Vice Chancellor said it would not make much difference, it is not a question of prestige.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if it has already been notified, then there is no question of bringing the item for consideration.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the examiners would not like to come to the Panjab University if they would have this kind of riders.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is no problem in the item. The item is passed. The only point is that the local Fellows should be treated at par with those Fellows coming from outside.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the local Fellows have to come and stay in Guest House, why do they come and stay in the Guest House.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said why the local Senators should come and stay in the Guest House.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that during three days closure in Panchkula due to an agitation by followers of Gurmeet Ram Rahim Singh, he had to stay in the Guest House.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the local persons are not entitled for Guest House accommodation as per the P.U. Calendar. The Vice Chancellor had also an objection to it. The University Professors are getting the Guest House booked in their name whereas they themselves are not entitled for this. Even the DAV faculty get the accommodation booked in the Guest house The local Fellows get the Guest House booked in their name, but the accommodation is used by their guests.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can sit across at lunch time and decide. This is not a matter for which this much of time of the Senate should be spent as they have many other urgent matters. This is the third sitting of the Senate to consider this agenda. The Vice Chancellor said that its applicability cannot be reversed. The changes are deferred and the system which is in vogue would continue. There are lots of the things that they do in anticipation of the Senate. The deletion could be done and they should wait for five days and he would get it done. They are not sending a good advertisement of what they are doing or trying to just protect this small privilege for themselves. What is it on which they are spending time?

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that due to the disturbance by the followers of Baba Gurmeet Ram Rahim Singh, the city remained paralysed for three-four days.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was an occasional incident.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are certain other occasions.

The Vice Chancellor said if there is a certain occasion, then that occasion would be seen, but they should not frame rules for rarest of the rarest occasions.

Dr. I.P.S. Sidhu said that local Fellows would also stay in the Guest House on the rarest of the rarest occasions to which the Vice Chancellor requested the members not to use rarest of the rarest occasions. They have their own houses, but Guest House would

be booked only if there is any problem. He informed that some days back Principal Gurdip Sharma did avail the facility for 2-3 days by paying full rent.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that his local house is away, so sometimes he has to stay in the Guest House.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University Guest House has not been constructed for such purpose and requested them to understand this.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the local Fellows should be allowed to book the Guest House in case there is an emergency.

The Vice Chancellor again said that the University Guest House has not been constructed for such purposes. These things are not correct and they are not sending a good advertisement of their own response and behaviour. Otherwise the society would accuse them as that of the M.P.s for getting subsidized canteen items for themselves. They should understand that they are paid well.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta requested that the items should be deferred to be discussed in the next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that deferred means that any changes that have to be introduced, those are deferred and they would come back to it, but before that, he requested them to have discussion among themselves and come with some consensus solutions which can be put to rest of them.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the College Bhawan had been constructed with the college fund, but the teachers coming from the affiliated colleges of Punjab are not given accommodation. He requested that at least ten rooms should be reserved for the college teachers. Though it has been named as College Bhawan, but the college teachers are not given reservation as the College Bhawan always remains booked for some functions. He informed that the Attendant who has been deputed there always keeps his mobile switched off.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu also endorsed the view point expressed by Dr. K.K. Sharma. The faculty house is also reserved for the guests and room is not given to the teachers.

Shri Shaminder Singh Sandhu also said that the accommodation is not made available to the teachers neither in the College Bhawan nor in the faculty house.

The Vice Chancellor said that some rooms would be absolutely reserved for the college teachers in the College Bhawan. Quota for college teachers would also be created like that of Vice Chancellor's quota.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the grant for faculty house has been given only to provide accommodation to the college teachers and they are talking about the quota. They can check from the record, even five rooms are not available to the teachers whereas twenty five rooms could be reserved for guests. They should not talk about fixing the quota for teachers, rather that accommodation is only for the teachers. If they want to fix quota, then they should fix it for the guests as the accommodation is totally for teachers.

The Vice Chancellor requested that they should tell him what they want after devising their own method.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the accommodation is not being provided to those for whom it was made, but the other people are enjoying it. He said that due to generation gap, the children do not want to share accommodation with them if some guest comes. So fifty percent rooms are booked for the guests whereas the accommodation is not for them. However, it was decided in the meeting that the accommodation to the guests of Vice Chancellor and the Registrar could be provided there. A person who has come from Abohar or Ferozepur or from Muktsar, he did not get the accommodation. Accommodation is not given to every Fellow, but fifty percent rooms are booked for the Professors of the University in spite of the fact that they have their own accommodation in the city. He said that the whole University Professors may turn against him, but he would say it that they are not entitled for reserving accommodation.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not true, it is completely wrong. He has the data to see as to which room was occupied by whom and for whose guests. It would embarrass all of them if the matter is made public.

Dr. K.K. Sharma again requested the Vice Chancellor to reserve 10 rooms for the teachers and depute some sensible person there who could attend the teachers properly as the person who has been deputed there keeps him phone switched off and they have to communicate their message on whatsapp.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta pointed out that repair of Guest House at Shimla is running for the last one year. However, it was informed that the work has been completed. He requested that the status report may be given to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that the status report would be provided to him and asked him (Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta) to go to Shimla Guest House tomorrow and stay there for a while to see what has been done there

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-64 on the agenda**, be approved but no room rent be charged from the examiners visiting the University for conducting the Ph.D. viva-voce.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That some rooms be reserved for College teachers in the Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan.

Item No. C-65 to C-71 could not be taken up for consideration.

XXVII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-72 on the agenda** was read out, viz.-

C-72. That the *Honoris Causa* Degrees be conferred on the following persons as mentioned against each in the Convocation to be held in 2018:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Smt. Sumitra Mahajan
20, Akbar Road
New Delhi-110001
Email: s_mahajan@nic.in | Doctor of Laws
(<i>Honoris Causa</i>) |
|--|--|

XXVIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-73 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.-

C-73. That Khel Rattan, Gian Rattan and Udyog Rattan awards, be conferred on the following persons in the Convocation to be held in 2018.

- | | | |
|----|---|--------------|
| 1. | Shri Milkha Singh
725, Sector-8/B
Chandigarh | Khel Rattan |
| 2. | Professor B.N. Goswamy
Professor Emeritus
171, Sector-19/A
Chandigarh
Email: bngoswamy@gmail.com | Gian Rattan |
| 3. | Shri Sunil Kant Munjal
Chancellor
BML Munjal University
<u>Corporate Office:</u>
BML Munjal University
12 nd Floor Tower-2, NBCC Plaza
Sector-5, Pushp Vihar
New Delhi-110017 | Udyog Rattan |

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 4)

XXIX. Considered the following **Item C-74** on the agenda and unanimously approved, i.e.-

C-74. To elect (by simple majority vote) Two Fellows (Non-Syndics) as members of Board of Finance for a term of one year i.e. from 1.2.2018 to 31.1.2019, under Regulation 1.1(iv) at page 37 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. The following valid nominations duly proposed and seconded, have been received:

1. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
IFS (Retd.)
H.No. 1104, Sector 36-C
Chandigarh
2. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
Principal
A.S. College
Khanna Ludhiana

2. The candidature of the above persons is provisional subject to their being **not** elected as members of the Syndicate in the ensuing election on 17.12.2017.

XXX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-75 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

C-75. To elect (by single transferable vote) Five Fellows to Academic Council for the term 1st February 2018 to 31st January 2020 under Regulation 1.1(1) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: The following valid nomination duly proposed and seconded, have been received:

1. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
Assistant Professor
Khalsa College, Garhdiwala
2. Dr. K.K. Sharma
Associate Professor
A.S. College, Khanna (Ludhiana)
3. Dr. Mukesh Arora
M.A. (Gold Medalist), M.Phil. Ph.D.
Professor
S.C. D. Government College
Ludhiana
4. Dr. Parveen Goyal
Assistant Professor
University Institute of Engineering &
Technology

Professor Chaman Lal said that there are only four nominations for the Academic Council whereas five names were required. If the House agreed, he was ready to provide his services as a member of Academic Council.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-75 on the agenda**, be approved and the name of Professor Chaman Lal be added as the fifth member.

Item No. C-76 to C-78 could not be taken up for consideration.

Agenda Item C-79 be treated as information item I-134 instead of consideration.

XXXI. Considered the recommendations of the Board of Finance (**Items C-80 on the agenda**) contained in meeting dated 28.11.2017 (Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 (Para 2):

Item 1

That the Budget Estimates 2018-19, as per **Appendix – I & II** (Budget Estimate Part – I & II appended herewith as two separate documents) be approved. The summary of Revenue Budget is as under:

NOTE: (i) There is an uncovered deficit of Rs.1793.51 lacs relating to previous financial years. As per the directive of MHRD dated

19.06.2017, such uncovered deficit is to be met by the Govt. of Punjab, for which the University has already represented to Govt. of Punjab for release of additional grant to meet such uncovered deficit.

- (ii) It includes the provision for filling up of nearly 70 teaching positions (Assistant Professors) which got vacated in the last 3-4 years on attaining the age of 65 years by the teachers and also on account of resigning from University Service as well as the provision for vacant essential Administrative Officers such as Chief of University Security Officer, Dean College Development Council, direct quota posts of Deputy Registrars and Medical Officers.

With respect to Non-Teaching Staff and Pensioners the University follows pay-scale and pension rules of Govt. of Punjab. The tentative liability for implementation of pay revision of Non-Teaching Staff & Pensioners is expected to be Rs. 21.73 crore per annum, the provision of which has not been included in the BE 2018-19 as the Govt. of Punjab is yet to notify the revised scales.

- (iii) The above estimates have been recommended by the budget estimate committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.
- (iv) University shall seek concurrence of MHRD/UGC while creating new academic/Non-academic posts or filling up of vacant post.

Item 2

That the Panjab University should implement the recommendation of 7th pay commission only after the same is notified and implemented by the Punjab Government.

NOTE:1) In the light of various provisions of the pay revision notification of MHRD dated 2nd November, 2017, the University has calculated estimated additional liability on account of implementation of 7th CPC pay revision for teachers and other staff in UGC scale. Such estimated liability has been worked out after taking a representative case for each category, namely Professors & equivalent, Associate Professors & equivalent, Assistant Professors & equivalent. As per

such calculations, the additional liability on account of the implementation of 7th CPC pay revision comes out to be Rs. 100.12 crores (i.e. Rs. 66.61 crores for payment of arrears for the period from 1.1.2016 to 31.3.2018 and Rs. 33.51 crores for payment of enhanced salary from 1.4.2018 to 31.3.2019). The calculation sheet regarding additional estimated liability for implementation of 7th CPC pay revision for teachers and other staff in UGC scale is attached as **Appendix – V (Page-25)**.

- 2) With respect to the Non-Teaching staff and pensioners, the Panjab University follows the pay-scales and pension rules of Punjab Government respectively. Therefore, as and when the Government of Punjab would notify the revised pay scale/pension, the resultant additional provision shall be incorporated in the budget of the University for seeking enhanced contribution from respective governments.
- 3) Earlier as a practice, the pay revision notification relating to teaching staff used to be adopted by the University after the same got notified by the Govt. of Punjab.
- 4) That as per the latest directive MHRD dated 19.6.2017, the salary expenditure towards teaching staff (i.e. 1378 as assessed by the Manpower Audit Committee of University) and such number of non-teaching staff as would commensurate with the prescribed norm of teaching to non-teaching staff ratio i.e., 1:1.1 is to be met out of grant released by the MHRD/ UGC.

Item 4

That the pay of Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar be fixed at the minimum of the pay of Rs.43000+GPRs.10000/- in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 w.e.f. the date of joining.

- NOTE:**1) The post of Registrar in Panjab University is a tenure post, appointment on which is made (at the first instance) for a fixed period of 4 years under Regulation 1.2, 1.3 under Chapter-III of Calendar Volume-I of 2007, page 104.

In terms of the above provisions, Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) was appointed by direct

selection against Advertisement No.3/2014 in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000+GP 10000/-

Before the appointment as Registrar in P.U., Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) served as an officer in Corps of EME in Indian Army and retired there from as Col. on 30.09.2014. At the time of retirement, the last pay was Rs.57950 +GP of Rs.8700. After appointment as Registrar in Panjab University, Col. Chadha (Retd.) requested to protect his last pay drawn in the Indian Army.

- 2) As per the orders of the Vice-Chancellor the present pay of Col. Chadha has been fixed at the minimum stage of Rs.43000/- in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 plus GP of Rs.10000 as an interim measure till a final decision is taken with respect to grant of higher start.
- 3) After due consideration, the Vice-Chancellor referred the matter to the Syndicate under Regulation 1.4 under Chapter-III of P.U. Calendar Volume-I of 2007 page 104. The relevant part of which is reproduced here below:

“The pay-scale and salary of the Registrar shall be determined by the Senate on the recommendation of the Syndicate”.

The Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.05.2016 vide Paragraph 25 to consider for grant of higher start/appropriate advance increments to Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar on the minimum pay of Rs.43000+GP10000 in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 +GP 10000. The Syndicate after due consideration resolved to grant higher start to Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar by granting two increments on the minimum pay of Rs.43000+GP 10000.

- 4) There have been precedents where the Syndicate had allowed advance increments to the Registrars earlier also. For example, the Syndicate at its meeting dated 31.01.2012 Para (41) **(Appendix- X) (Page-50)** has resolved that two increments be granted to Professor A.K. Bhandari on his appointment as Registrar on the analogy of Professor Paramjit Singh and Professor S.S. Bari.

- 5) With respect to the above pay fixation of the Registrar, the audit made certain observations which are placed at **(Appendix-XI) (Page 51 to 53)**.
- 6) The above issue was submitted before the BOF in its meeting dated August 1, 2016 wherein it was resolved to seek the comments of the MHRD by giving comprehensive details of the case.
- 7) In compliance to the decision of the BOF, the case was submitted to the MHRD vide letter No.3513/FDO dated 24.08.2016 and No.3563/FDO dated 31.08.2016 **(Appendix-XII) (Page 54 to 84)**.
- 8) On 31st August, 2016, the University received a letter dated 24.08.2016 from Shri R.C. Bhatt, Deputy Director (IA), University Grants Commission wherein the UGC has raised certain observations with respect to the pay of the Vice- Chancellor and the Registrar, P.U., Chandigarh **(Appendix- XIII) (Page 85 to 86)**.
- 9) The University submitted point wise clarification on all observations vide letter No. 3823/FDO dated 5.9.2016 **(Appendix-XIV) (Page 87 to 93)**.
- 10) Further input was given on the above issue to MHRD/UGC vide letter No.4256/FDO dated 27.10.2016 **(Appendix- XV) (Page 94 to 113)**.
- 11) On 2.11.2016, the University received a communication from UGC in reference to the reply submitted by University on 05.09.2016 as referred in Point-5 above **(Appendix- XVI) (Page 114 to 116)**.
- 12) In response to the above communication of UGC, the University submitted further clarification vide No.4306/FDO dated 4.11.2016 **(Appendix- XVII) (Page 117-118)**.
- 13) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered to seek the Legal Opinion on this issue from Shri Girish Agnihotri (Sr. Adv. & Legal Retainer) and Shri Anmol Rattan Sidhu (Sr. Adv. & Legal Retainer). The Legal opinion rendered by Shri Girish Agnihotri is attached as **(Appendix-XVIII) (Page 119 to 124)**.

- 14) **The matter was again placed vide item No. 17 in the BOF dated 15.11.2016**, which was deferred for the time being so that MHRD/UGC may be approached to give their comments at the earliest.
- 15) The Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi vide letter No. F. No. 2-14/2016-U II dated 27.10.2017 has clarified that in view of reply received from the Panjab University dated 8.5.2017 that the appointment has been made as per terms of regulation 1.2 of PU Calendar Volume-I of 2007, thus appropriate decision on pay fixation of Shri G.S. Chadha, Registrar, PU may be taken strictly in accordance with rules and regulations of Panjab University Act **(Appendix – XIX) (Page 125 to 130)**.
- 16) The Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.5.2016 has already recommended a higher start to Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar by granting two advance increment on minimum pay of Rs. 43000+GP10000 (Note 3 above refers).

Item 6

Noted and ratified the following Memorandum of Understanding with State Bank of India:

- NOTE:** 1) Regarding issue of smart Combo Cards for students, Research Scholars, faculty and staff of the University in terms of recommendation of Committee dated 06.12.2016. The MoU is placed at **(Appendix-XXIV) (Page 139 to 144)**.
- 2) Regarding disbursement of pension through SBI, the charges for same to be paid on par with the rates prescribed by RBI for disbursal of monthly pension of State/ Central Government pensioners in terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 31.07.2016 and 17.12.2016 vide Para XXII. The MoU is placed at **(Appendix-XXV) (Page 145 to 151)**.

Item 7

That:-

- (i) a sum of Rs. 5.76 lacs per annum from Financial Year 2018-2019 be sanctioned under the budget Head "Hiring of Bus

Service” out of Revenue Account of PURC, Kauni to hire a bus on lease to ferry rural area students from different villages to and fro PURC, Kauni.

- (ii) a sum of Rs.100/- p.m. be charged from the students for providing transportation facility to the students.

NOTE:1) The Director, PURC Kauni raised the issues/ concerns of the students with VC for providing transportation to the students in rural area as lot of inconvenience is being faced by them.

- 2)** In the initial years, no fee shall be charged from rural students so as to enhance the enrollment. The position shall be reviewed after two academic sessions.

Item 9

That an allocation of Rs. 50.00 lacs be sanctioned out of the interest income of “Foundation for Higher Education & Research Fund Account” under the Head “Up-gradation of Operation Theater” in the Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science, specifically for Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery.

NOTE: 1) The matter was discussed for up-gradation of Operation Theater on 7.11.2017 wherein the Vice Chancellor, DUI, Principal along with Professors of Dental Institute were present.

- 2)** Detailed note to substantiate the need for procurement and installation of the required infrastructure for up-gradation of Operation Theater was submitted by Dr. Hemant Batra, Professor & Head, Dental Institute after the discussions held on 7.11.2017 which is reproduced as under:

“This is to submit that at the beginning of MDS program in the Dental Institute specifically for MDS in Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery, it was discussed that there is essential requirement of Operation Theater along with the attachment of medical college. The post-graduation started in year 2015 and today we are in the final year.

We already had a duly sanctioned approval for using the clinical facilities at Government Medical College & Hospital Sector 32 from Chandigarh

Administration vide letter number Endst. No. 3926/FII(6)/2013/3493 dated 25.4.2013. Alongside there was a hope of our own 100 bedded hospital with a fully functional Operation Theater in our own institute was not envisaged and no specific amount was marked for it. As of today the 100 bedded hospital has been shelled off and GMCH is allowing us to use there facility of Operation Theater with an embargo of three years "time given to develop Operation Theatre in the Institute"

In view of the facts mentioned above this is to request you to provide the Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery in the Dental institute with a suitable budget for procurement and installation of the required infrastructure. The details of the minimum basic requirement for the up-gradation of the existing set up has been attached along with. Kindly help us on urgent basis as the course is in final stages from approval authorities."

- 3)** At present, there is no specific budget earmarked to develop Operation Theater in the institute. The list of minimum basic requirements for up-gradation of the existing set up is at **Appendix -XXVI (Page-152 to 155).**

Item 11

That to purchase 3 Nos. of Multifunctional Copy Printers is amounting to Rs. 21.00 lacs (approx.) for Confidential Unit of Controller of Examination out the Development Fund 2018-2019 be sanctioned.

NOTE: A Central Purchase Committee in its meeting held on 15.9.2017 recommended the purchase of 3 multifunctional copy printers for Confidential Unit of Controller of Examination. The relevant portion of the minutes of meeting are reproduced as under:

"The committee also reviewed the requirement received from the confidential Unit of Controller of Examinations office for the purchase of copy printers and photocopier for office use. The committee also reviewed the specification enclosed

along with the requisition and approved the same to be purchase for office use. Thus the store section is advised to invite quotations as per purchase rules after the budget approval”

Item 12

That an amount of Rs.23.28 crores may be allocated for the completion of the under construction Multipurpose Auditorium in South Campus, Sector-25, Panjab University, Chandigarh by transferring it to the development fund for its utilization.

(After the conclusion of the meeting, the members visited the site of Multipurpose Auditorium in South Campus, Sector-25, Panjab University, Chandigarh.)

NOTE: 1) The work of construction of multipurpose auditorium is under progress. The total estimated completion cost of this project is Rs.72.67 crore **(Appendix-XXX)(Page-162 to 178)** against which the following budget provisions have already been allocated:

- a) Rs.13.16 crores out of the collections from students of P.U. Campus as well as affiliated colleges and interest thereon.
- b) Rs.20.00 crores out of University funds.
- c) Rs.12.00 crores out of grants sanctioned by the UGC/Central Government (i.e., special grant, XIIth Plan, general development assistance;

2) It is submitted that the University receives grant(s) from various funding agencies to carry out specific research projects/ schemes/ programmes etc. under the plan head. Prior to the year 2001-02, both accounts i.e., Non-Plan as well as Plan were transacted through a single bank account with a corresponding one cash book. In the financial year 2001-02, a separate bank account with corresponding separate cash book was opened for Plan account. A specific amount was transferred from Non-Plan account to such newly opened separate bank account of Plan fund. In the year 2006-07, another account was opened in

the Canara Bank to carry out the transactions relating to Plan grant(s) from UGC. At present, the University maintains two bank accounts to carry out the transactions of all research projects/schemes/programmes with corresponding two separate cash books, i.e., one for UGC sponsored research projects/schemes/programmes and the second one for other agencies such as DST, DBT, CSIR, etc.

- 3) The proposed allocation is being sought out of the balance available under Plan account. It is pertinent to mention that from the financial year 2016-17, the Government of India has dispensed with the system of classification of budget under Non-Plan and Plan head as the concept of Revenue and Capital Budget has been introduced.
- 4) After excluding the balances of each sponsored research project/ scheme along with accrued interest thereon up to 31.03.2017, an amount of Rs. 29.62 crores is available in the Plan account (upto 31.03.2016 the amount was Rs.23.28 crores) which is an accumulated plan account balance of Panjab University and interest thereon since the period 2001-02 onwards.

It may be added that earlier the Syndicate has approved to calculate and credit the interest to a specific Research Project/ Scheme with a uniform rate of interest @ of 4% (the rate which was applicable on saving bank account) on the capital/non-recurring component only. However, in view of the specific query of funding agency regarding the amount of actual interest earned on specific Research Project and Scheme, the balance of each project has been re-calculated by applying the method as above.

- 6) The office has worked out the balance of each sponsored project and scheme as on 31st March, 2017 after crediting the due amount of interest on annual basis. The due amount of interest was worked out on the average annual balance of the individual project/ scheme by applying the

same rate of proportion which the amount of actual interest earned in a given year bears to the average annual balance of composite plan account, as explained here below:

(i)	Total interest earned during the year on the overall plan balance.	xxx
(ii)	Average consolidated balances* available during each year	xxx
(iii)	Interest factor per Rupee of avg. balance [interest(i) divided by avg. balance (ii)]	xxx
(iv)	Interest allocated [avg. balance of each project in a given year multiplied by interest factor (iii)]	xxx

***avg, consolidated bal.=Op. Balance +Cl. Balance (cash book and investments) divided by 2, ignoring the negative balance, if any.**

It may be added that earlier the Syndicate has approved to calculate and credit the interest to a specific Research Project/ Scheme with a uniform rate of interest @ of 4% (the rate which was applicable on saving bank account) on the capital/non-recurring component only. However, in view of the specific query of funding agency regarding the amount of actual interest earned on specific Research Project and Scheme, the balance of each project has been re-calculated by applying the method as above.

Item 14

Noted and ratified the decision of the Vice-Chancellor for allowing the refund of fee to Ms. Sakshi Kaushal, a student of B.A LLB at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur during the session 2014-2015 as special case.

NOTE: 1) Ms. Sakshi Kaushal was a student of BALLB 1st year at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur who had left the department due to unavoidable reasons and applied for

refund of fees on 22.11.2014 **Appendix-XXXVII (Page-205)** as stated by her.

- 2) The record of SSGPURC Hoshiarpur revealed that the same was received vide No. 2482 dated 10.12.2014.
- 3) Her claim of refund was forwarded by Director SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur to ARA-II on dated 31.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXXVIII (Page-206)**) which was rejected as the same was receipt after the due date, i.e., 30th November,2014 and same was conveyed by Director PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur to Ms. Sakshi Kaushal D/o Sanjeev Sharma **Appendix-XXXIX (Page 207)**.
- 4) Subsequently, the candidate had filed the petition in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide CWP No. 2814 of 2017 for seeking claim of refund along with interest/ costs.
- 5) The university engaged Sh. B.L. Gupta, Advocate as counsel to defend the Panjab University in the CWP No. 2814 of 2017.
- 6) The University Counsel appointed that there is an ambiguity in the University Rules as two due dates have been mentioned for receipt of application of refund i.e. 30th November & 15th December of a given year. On his advise the Vice-Chancellor allowed the refund of fee (**Appendix-XL (Page 208)**). The legal Counsel had also advised that the date of internal process of refund of application i.e. 15th December be deleted from Handbook of information and only one date i.e. 30th November should continue. The opinion of the counsel for University is placed at **Appendix-XLI (Page 209)**.
- 7) The present status of CWP No. 2814 of 2017 stands **dismissed as infructuous (Appendix-XLII) (Page 210)**.
- 8) The ACLA had admitted and passed the payment with the observations that the payment be got approved from Board of Finance as there is financial implication involved in case so that similar other case does not occur in future.

Item 15

Noted and ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in sanctioning the Interim Relief @ 5% of Basic Pay/ Pension allowed to the Non-Teaching employees/ pensioners w.e.f. October 1st 2017 paid in November, 2017 onwards in terms of Punjab Government Notification No. 6/1/1995-1FP1/86 dated 16.2.2017 **(Appendix-XLIII) (Page-211)** in anticipation of approval of Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate. The interim relief will be treated as pay for all intents and purposes. Amount of interim relief will be absorbed in the pay revision to be allowed by the Panjab University on the recommendations of 6th pay commission set up by Govt. of Punjab.

- NOTE:1)** The Panjab University adopts the Punjab Government recommendations/ notifications issued from time to time with regard to revision of pay scales, allowances etc. to Non-Teaching employees.
- 2)** Budget Estimate Committee in its meeting held on 29.9.2017 also recommended to allow the Interim Relief @ 5% of Basic Pay/ Pension to Non-Teaching employees/ pensioners in terms of Punjab Government Notification dated 16.2.2017.

Item 16

Noted the following correction in the Budget Head:

Existing nomenclature of Budget Head	Corrected nomenclature of Budget
Stipends for Rotatory Internship @ 9000 p.m. X 100 students and Stipend to MDS students @ Rs. 10000/- p.m. per student for 14 students.	Stipends for Rotatory Internship @ 9000 p.m. X 100 students and Stipend to MDS students @ Rs. 10000/- p.m. per student for 17 students (Ist, IInd & IIIrd year).

Item 17

The audited consolidated financial statements for the year 2016-17, be approved 'in Principle' with remarks that members may convey their observation, if any, before the finalization of the minutes.

Item 18

That the budget provision be enhanced from Rs.10000/- p.m. to Rs.15000/- p.m. under the Budget head "Honorarium to Advisor Architect" of Architect Unit w.e.f. 30.03.2017.

Additional Financial Liability : Rs 60000/- p.a.

- NOTE: 1)** The Vice Chancellor as per authorization of the Syndicate in its meeting held on 31.07.2016 (Para 18) appointed three Technical Advisors i.e. one each for Civil, Electrical and Architecture at a fixed honorarium of Rs.15000/- p.m. initially for a period of one year w.e.f. date of their joining. The same were approved in meeting of Syndicate on 30.04.2017 Para 41-I(vii).
- 2)** There is adequate provision to meet the expenditure of Technical advisors appointed for Civil and Electrical. However, at present, a budgetary provision of Rs.10000/-p.m. has been earmarked for Budget head "Honorarium to Advisor Architect" of Architect Unit which needs to be enhanced from existing Rs.10000/- p.m. to Rs.15000/- p.m. to enable the office to release the honorarium of Technical Advisor appointed for Architect Unit i.e. w.e.f. 30.03.2017.

(Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 28.11.2017, available in the separate volume.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him give them a little preamble to the Board of Finance meeting and whatever stands before them on behalf of the Board of Finance. They have already sent their revised estimates for the current financial year and also about the incomes. Both the Centre Government as well as the Punjab Government are committed to give them whatever they have promised. The uncertainty is as to what would be the internal income this year. They would know of their internal income only when they cross over to the end of the first semester. When they would cross to the 2nd semester, the fees would be collected and then they would know whether they would be in a position to balance the budget. So hopefully, there would be adequate money to pay everyone salary upto the end of February, 2018. Right now they have to pay salaries and pension for December, January and February 2018. He is confident that they would be able to pay the salaries. But if there is difficulty in paying salaries up to the end of February, 2018 that feedback would be provided to them when they meet on 6th of January, 2018. As of now that is the situation for the current financial year. Now in between Govt. of India has notified the acceptance of the 7th Pay Commission and they have made a categorical declaration that Centre would meet its commitment towards central institutions upto 31st of March, 2018. Centre is also committed to provide some money to the State Govts. for the implementation of 7th Pay Commission for university, College teachers and so on. But the Govt. of India has changed the level of support. That time the level of support is going to be less than the level of support during the previous Pay Commission. Not only the support is going to be less but also the period for the support to be given is going to be less. So, that is a matter between Centre and State Govts. But the Govt. of India has made a categorical declaration that any State Govt. which wants to claim money for implementing 7th Pay Commission and they want to claim

their share from the Centre Govt. whatever is their share, whatever the quantum is required for implementation of 7th Pay Commission, 50% of it would be given by the Centre Govt. But there is money needed in the current financial year and the arrears from 1st of January 2016 to up to 31st of March, 2017. The Centre Govt. has said that previous arrears of 27 months, 40% share of these arrears would be released by 31st of March, 2018. Now who could claim that money? Only that government could claim the money which would declare their intent to implement it. If they do not declare their entity then they could not claim. So they are a unique institution in India because they are an Inter-State Body Corporate who is the state for them. MHRD has given a directive that the term 'State' for Panjab University notionally is the Punjab Govt. after the Re-organisation Act 1966, the 3rd Pay Commission came in 1973 after the reorganisation, 4th Pay Commission effective from January 1986, 5th Pay Commission from 1st January, 1996, 6th Pay Commission from 1st January, 2016. For Panjab University they have made a categorical declaration and Shri Satya pal Jain Ji was present there in the morning and in the Court also it has been categorically stated by various Counsels that the Centre would release money for Panjab University teachers and 1.1 times the non-teachers only after the Punjab Government issues a notification. So, U.T. also cannot implement the 7th Pay Commission for the College teachers of the U.T. as well as for the grant-in aid positions of U.T. until the Punjab Govt. notifies the same. The U.T. also has to recover the money from the Centre. So, at the moment they could not implement 7th Pay Commission until the Punjab does it. But they wanted to protect the claim to the Centre. In their case how much money Centre Government would require for implementing the 7th Pay Commission. In terms of arrears that they need for first twenty-seven months plus the money they needed in the current year. So they have given them the estimates. They have also informed the High Court of their needs. So, they need from the Centre to implement 7th Pay Commission and incremental increase between 30 to 35 crores. Now the Centre is only going to pay for their teachers already working plus 1.1 times non-teaching employees multiplied by 1378, estimated at 1500 non-teaching employees. They have made rough estimates and have told them that they (Central Government) would have to pay Rs. 35 crore extra each year. Rs.65 crore would be given on account of arrear. They have also told to the Punjab Govt. that their share for implementing the 7th Pay Commission for the remaining employees. Right now the Punjab Government is giving funds to the tune of about Rs.20-27 crores as they could not increase income. To implement 7th Pay Commission they could not enhance University income. They could not suddenly go and say University income would be enhanced by enhancing the tuition fee and examination fee to implement the 7th Pay Commission. Since the 7th Pay Commission implementation is the decision of the Governments, i.e. the Centre and the State. So, as and when Punjab Govt. would implement the 7th Pay Commission for their employees which also include employees of universities whether at Patiala, Amritsar, Health University, Animal Husbandry University, Punjab Technical University. Punjab Government has to pay to all of them. So he pleaded to the Chief Secretary, Punjab who has accepted that liability is of the Punjab Govt. How much money they needed extra, that money is of the order of Rs.25 crore. That means 27 crores which have been given to them; 22-23 crore more would be added. The Punjab Chief Secretary has also said that Centre's directive regarding old deficit should be met by university's own income. The Punjab Govt. is okay with it. They would not question Centre Govt. directive regarding not meeting old deficit of University. It would happen gradually and hopefully when they announced that old deficit would be no meaning because Rs. 22-23 crore would be needed each year. So their claim to the Punjab Govt. over the last three years is around Rs.63 crore, added to it Rs. 15-16 crore is nothing. It will be Rs. 70 to Rs. 75 crore instead of Rs. 63 crore. So, the Chief Secretary of Punjab is aware and, in principle, he accepts that their 7th Pay Commission liability, they would consider it along with their own liabilities for the universities in Punjab, in particular Patiala and Amritsar. So, that is what the situation is at the moment. The Board of Finance's tables should be looked into from that

aspect. If they have to implement it, what is it, they want from Punjab Govt. and Centre Govt. for arrears and what is the incremental cost they want from them in every subsequent year. Right now, the Centre is committed to provide six percent more on the previous year's grants. At the moment that is the situation and that situation was when they asked them for the estimates. They submitted them the estimates for five years and one year has been passed. What is formula of 6 per cent, there is no permanency of it. That is for the next 3-4 years. But, in principle they have accepted that they have to pay for that many teachers and that many employees. Number of employees could not be reduced, the only thing that they could decrease is that they keep losing retiring teachers and they are not yet committed that vacancies of all retiring teachers would be allowed to fill up. They are putting pressure on them even if they do not want to allow them to fill more than what they are paying the salary today, at least people who have retired since last three years, might be allowed to fill up those position. They have requested to fill up at least the statutory positions. For example Pharmacy Council has asked for filling of positions. As they do not fill up the positions, their standing with the Pharmacy Council would be disturbed. Bar Council has asked for filling up positions of Professors. At least they might be permitted to fill statutory requirements and that also applies to DCI, Rehabilitation Council of India wherever there are external agencies involved, they are pleading with them that please allow them to fill up all the current day positions that they are paying salaries. They are also pleading with them that for those positions where they are not paying full salaries, in the sense that these teachers are appointed under Regulation 5, Chapter V(A), Panjab University Calendar Volume I and they are not given continuance. Every year they grant them continuation. They are not giving these people annual increment. They are not giving regularity to the staff because they are not giving regularity to the staff, the staff could not apply for external funding as they do not apply for external funding for research project, and they do not have research scholars to work for them. Their output in terms of research is suffering. So they have also asked the Centre to allow them to fill up the posts Chief of University Security, Dean College Development Council and Deputy Registrars. For the posts of Dy. Registrar they have to advertise again. Employees are saying that 50% Deputy Registrar's posts should be from within the employees and remaining 50% from outside. But first allow them to fill up the post only then they could do 50:50 ratio. They are not giving any decision, so that is where they are struck. The Board of Finance's proposal actually is just a summary of what he has told them in a qualitatively, the quantification of whatever of these is what the Board of Finance proposals are. One of the Board of Finance recommendations is related to Annual Maintenance Budget plus there are some specific items. So there are remarks against those specific items, each of those specific items actually has been vetted by the remarks on the MHRD plus the inputs on the Punjab Govt. and the U.T. administration. So they tried to plead something, somewhere they succeeded and somewhere they had to accept diktats of the MHRD and the Punjab Govt. That is, the nutshell; whatever is there, they do not know how many of them had the leisure to go through all of them. If they wish to comment on whatever is sent to them, item wise, the Vice Chancellor requested the members to raise their hands and conclude the same.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that what he (Vice-Chancellor) has explained, he is talking about that. They are talking about salaries and in the minutes he has seen and he (Vice-Chancellor) himself has said that salaries of teachers directly come from the Centre and there is no share of Punjab Govt. in it. Regarding sharing that 50% share would be paid by the Central Govt. and 50% , as the Vice Chncellor has said that earlier it was 80% for five years, and the Govt. has reduced it. So now there is doubt that the government could take more time to implement it. When the letter had come, the Vice Chancellor might remember, he had said that he is satisfied with the contents of the letter. As such teachers full salary and also 1.1 non-teaching salary would be paid by the Centre Govt.

They have their own resources and that letter is okay. Accordingly, the same thing has been said in the Supreme Court and the case was finished.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when that matter was in the Supreme Court, till then recommendations of 7th Pay Commission were not approved.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that they all knew about the 7th Pay Commission would be announced shortly. Unfortunately, whenever he raised the issue of Central University; it was not taken in good taste and considered as if he has committed some sin. There was always a doubt in his mind that whenever recommendations of 7th Pay Commission would come, they would be tagged with the Punjab Government. The initiative that he (Vice Chancellor) has taken with the Chancellor Shri Vankiah Naidu ji and Governor of Punjab and U.T., they are grateful to them. Then a press note was issued by the MHRD where it was very clearly written that because Panjab University is an Interstate Body Corporate and they would not further help in that matter and the situation is the same today. 100% share of teachers salaries have to be paid by the Centre Govt. This has also been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal that there is no rationale to wait for the notification of the Punjab Govt. The Vice Chancellor has also said that the grants are being received directly from MHRD, but the resolved part is that they have to wait, till Punjab Govt. notifies the same. Today they have accepted to wait. The Vice Chancellor has resisted the other things and the Centre Government has already started saying that if Panjab University is attached with the Punjab Govt., they should should also implement the probation period of three years and pay just the basic salary. This has been started in the Universities of Punjab. Afterall for how long they would be doing this. Unfortunately last time the Item No. C-70 could not be discussed and today also Item C-70 could not be taken up. He does not know what is its fate. They said repeatedly that Panjab University is a national institute and they receive grant directly from the Centre, but they should see where they are standing. When the Centre Govt. notified, they clearly mentioned that the grants would be given to Central Universities and Central Funded Institutes. But they do not fall in both these categories. Afterall, they should think about it. But now they are complicating the things more. In today's newspaper there is a photograph showing that Panchkula MLA met the Chancellor in that regard. When Panjab University is receiving maximum of the grant from the Central Government, then they are tagged with the Punjab Government and waiting for notification of the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission to be implemented. He (Vice Chancellor) is saying that it is being done since it was being done in the past also. If something is being done in the past, it does not mean that the same should be repeated. But, Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that it did not happen that when, in the past, the Centre Govt. give money, they did not gave the grant after counting the number of teachers. It means that it was for the purpose of calculation only and that was not the assurance for salary. That time they thought that if they agree to give the salary of all the teachers, there would not be any crises. But, today after 4-6 months, crisis has come. So, he requested that they might pay attention for grant of Central Status to the University for which they had been struggling in the past. He pointed out that both groups of teacher union fought election on the issue of University's status and now it is felt as if they are committing some crime whereas there is no solution of this problem except it. He has to say it again that there is no solution except central status. In the recent past Prime Minister went to Patna University and said that central university is the thing of the past. In view of this statement, some of his friends said that Panjab University could not become Central University. But, there is some ambiguity in understanding this. It is already written on the website of MHRD that no State University could become Central University, but theirs is not a State University. The Vice Chancellor has already said that their salaries are paid by the Centre Govt. There is no university in the country where Centre Govt. has set such a formula. He has request to the Vice-Chancellor and all the members in spite of being emotional, they

should think for the betterment of the University as earlier in the morning the Vice-Chancellor had pointed out that all the universities of Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Punjab have developed into universities from the regional centres of Panjab University. He had earlier also requested in the regard, but the Vice-Chancellor got offended. They could follow the earlier proposal as the Vice-Chancellor is still having sufficient time to take care of the proposal. He repeatedly said that he is telling about how to proceed in the matter. As the people of Haryana are interested for affiliation of Colleges of Haryana and asking for a share in the University, the Vice-Chancellor should talk to those persons to help the University in getting the central status. Similarly, they should also talk to the Punjab Government. From somewhere beginning has to be done. Governors of these States might be contacted for the same and convince them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is a Senator and faculty member of the University and requested him to join the Public Interest Litigation in the High Court and articulate the matter.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the problem is that when the case was going on in High Court and the Supreme Court and when the Supreme Court asked about the options, but they did not provide options from the University to the Supreme Court till date. As desired by the Vice-Chancellor, he would think upon and try from his sources.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Supreme Court did not ask for options and he is saying things which have no basis.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh explained that High Court had said that Panjab University should be made a Central University and Punjab Govt. should not create hindrances. He does not have the newspaper cutting with him otherwise he would have read it out. Some voices are raised by members against the proposal and the matter stands closed. If the central status is not approved then they have to wait for grants from Punjab Govt. again and again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not put a Public Interest Litigation. Public Interest Litigation has been put by the Court on its own. Whatever he was asked to explained by the Court, he had gone and explain to the Court. He did not put the case in the Supreme Court. The case in the Supreme Court was put up by the UGC challenging the decision given by the High Court. He has no grounds to go and say in the Supreme Court something like that, they be made central university. Whatever is asked from the University Counsel by the Court, he would give answer only to that.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that High Court has said about that. He would show the cutting of judgement. High Court's judge had remarked in this regard. So, they should seek for help from that High Court's judge.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he would just like to make two-three brief comments on the issue before them arising from the item of Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they should stick to the item of the Board of Finance. Whatever he has told, is there anything to be corrected in what is presented to them.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said, "no", but he just wanted to quote some general remarks. First of all he acknowledges the trust reposed on him by asking him to serve on the Board of Finance. Serving on the Board of Finance is a heavy responsibility in an institution which is facing unprecedented financial difficulty and he needed the

cooperation of everybody to discharge that as a member of the Board of Finance. As far as the Board of Finance report is concerned, first of all he would like to express satisfaction that for a change, the figures put before them show, on the surface, a balance between income and expenditure which they never did before because he has a summary which shows that the income estimate is Rs. 656 crore and so is the expenditure. But that is cosmetic improvement. Look at it closely. There is Rs. 100 crore money required which is not at all clear as to wherefrom it would be coming. He commended the Vice-Chancellor for the valuable efforts made by him in apprising the new Chancellor of the University of their problems and would like to say thanks to him (Chancellor) for convening a meeting of all the so-called stakeholders. But in his view there is only one stakeholder and that is the Central Govt. The chief stakeholder is the State Govt. and he was disappointed like Dr. Gurmeet Singh to see from the records of the discussion that took place there that MHRD which in his view is the chief stakeholder and has the responsibility under the present statute to ensure that the requirements of this University are met and from which sources they are going to be met. He does not want to go into those details but he is disappointed to see a very low level representation from MHRD stating that the Inter State Body Corporate status of this University imposes restrictions on them for providing the funds. That is the position, they could not probably accept. He is all for efforts to amend the statutes to remove that ambiguity but that ambiguity is not in his mind or in the statutes. It is only in the minds of those on whom even the present statutes cause that responsibility. This Senate approved a resolution which he had moved, in which it was clearly stated that according to the present statutes and reported relevant section of the Punjab Re-organisation Act under which the Central Govt. is clearly given the task of directing the State Govt. concerned of as to how much they are going to pay. In other words, total provision from the Centre and from the respective State Govt. meets their total requirements. But he does not want to go into those details. The ambiguity is there in the statutes which needs to be removed. But statutes could not be changed overnight. Until that happens, they could not accept a situation where they could agree that present statutes place any restrictions, they do not. The only thing is that those on whom that responsibility is now caused by the present statutes are not fulfilling their responsibilities. That is the point they have to repeatedly stress upon that the Government should not take shelter behind the so called ambiguity in the statute with regard to the status of this University. He does not want to go into these details because that is not the occasion to do that. But he finds there are some parallel exercises under way about the changes in the statute. They have to systemise it and a number of committees are working on governance reforms and he has the proposal that Dr. Gurmeet Singh has been putting forward. He is happy to know that the efforts are on way in this matter that they have already put in a claim for status for Institute of Excellence. All these have to be brought together in a co-ordinated way. That takes time. He agrees that they should it speed up. The Committee which had already worked and the Committee which is now working on the governance reforms are to be asked to speed up. They could not be working on them forever and the same have to be brought before the decision making bodies and then they have to put these in a consolidated, practical and workable proposal which could then be considered by those concerned and the amendment to the statute is not something that happens overnight. But the process has to begin expeditiously. So, these are the two main points which he wished to make. He has repeatedly emphasized and raised that there is no ambiguity that the Central Govt. has simply to discharge its responsibility and make sure that the University is able to meet its own requirements and budget it and approve it first by the Board of Finance then by Syndicate and then by Senate accordingly in each of which so called stakeholders are fully represented.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that as in the last meeting of the Board of Finance it was discussed that they had implemented the 6th Pay Commission after Punjab Govt. Notification. Dr. Sandhu has also told him last time the recommendations of the Pay

Commission were implemented before the Punjab Govt. notification. If last time they implemented before the Punjab Govt. notification then why not this time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was unsure of the factual position as Dr. Gurmeet Singh has stated. When the Board of Finance meeting happened, then the Punjab Govt. and U.T. Govt. representatives were in the meeting. It was categorically stated by them that the Panjab University implemented it after the Punjab Govt. announcement of acceptance of 6th Pay Commission. So, in the Court also Punjab Govt.'s Counsel stated that was the position. So he would again go and check up the dates. But when something is stated by an authorised representative of the Govt., one has to at least at that stage accept things on the face value.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that this is also a political issue. So far as he is aware he speaks with sense of responsibility that erstwhile UPA Government's position was that they will not take a minute to make Panjab University a Central University, if Punjab agrees because of the federal nature of the Indian constitution. They did not want to annoy the Punjab and he does not know whether the present Govt. has changed but that may be a view discontinuing because they might consider these ambiguities but there is an Act in which they are defined as Body Corporate. The Govt. of India could not direct Punjab Govt. to pay tax money into Panjab University kitty. That is the decision which should have been taken at the political level in Punjab and, therefore, he thinks it is not wrong to accept or to concede that they have to work under Punjab Government. If they change their mindset, the position can be somewhat easy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that administrator of the U.T. who is also concurrently the Governor of Punjab is talking to his counterparts namely, Governor of Haryana. He is directly talking to the Chief Secretary of Haryana. He is also interfacing with the Chief Secretary of Punjab, Education Secretaries of all these ministries. So at least a Governor is the Central Govt. representative. He has accepted, at least mentally, that attending to the concerns of the Panjab University while it is located in Union Territory of India is the responsibility in some sense of the Central Govt. of India. That is the reason why he took that matter in the interstate council meeting when the Hon'ble Home Minister was there. He has been told that the Hon'ble Home Minister is to visit Chandigarh in near future and that is why he has been asked to hurry up and meet all these things and give back the things that the Hon'ble Governor wants to take that matter with the Hon'ble Home Minister very very soon. So Centre is being approached that it is their responsibility. At least it is being taken up by the Administrator, Union Territory and why the Haryana is being roped in. That again is the recognition of this fact that Chandigarh is a very small physical area surrounded by territories of Punjab and Haryana and overall development plan of this region not just the Chandigarh Central City, overall development plan of this region which pertains to traffic congestion making roads which are going across Punjab, Haryana by-pass. So it is the overall development that there is a move wherein both the Governors situated in Chandigarh that the colleges in this greater metropolitan region, should be seen to be affiliated to Panjab University. Just as there is traffic problem for which all the states have to cooperate. Similarly the higher educational needs of the children studying in schools under tricity region, it is in that part of the larger agenda that there is this move that the Haryana Colleges in the neighbourhood of Chandigarh, they should be also, in principle, be affiliated. There is also a Govt College, Mohali just 10 minutes ride from P.U. Campus and is not part of the Panjab University. Colleges in Panchkula are not part of the Panjab University. People working in Chandigarh are living in Punjab and Haryana and as the time would go, more and more people working in the Chandigarh city would all be living outside Chandigarh, where would their children go. They have to go to schools. They have to go the colleges which are affiliated to the same University. So it is in that spirit that this notion of Interstate Body Corporate is seen to be

getting preserved, but while as a responsibility towards the Union Territory, Chandigarh, the Centre should step in to meet the needs of the Panjab University and when they talk about Central University, what is their desired expectation, their expectations are that their financial needs should be taken care of, their financial needs which are towards the salaries, maintenance and the development. The Governor Punjab and Administrator U.T. has categorically stated to the Chancellor that the developmental needs of the Panjab University ought to get accommodated in the developmental responsibility of the Union Territory Administration. So he asked him to articulate what is needed and to put it before the Court. All their developmental needs they have articulated to the Chief Secretaries of Punjab and Haryana, Advisor to the U.T. Administration namely Shri Parimal Rai, Finance Secretary Shri Ajoy Kumar Sinha. So they are making all efforts that whatever the Central University gets in terms of their maintenance needs, their developmental needs, and their things should also get attended to. There should be a clear cut algorithm that this becomes a problem of the past and the University could move forward. So that is what the situation is. At the moment next hearing is on 15th of January, 2018. So everybody is supposed to go and tell. The Court has taken a note of it. High Court has also said that a reserve fund of Panjab University be created in the form that some money of the order of 100 to 200 crore should be placed at the disposal of the Panjab University in a manner that as the financial year starts, Panjab University starts spending out of that, as the financial year ends, everybody gives a resource that reserve fund on 1st of April, every year should be that sum of money so that there is never a crisis that their salaries would not be paid. All these things have been articulated, stated and given in the Press and so on. Sometimes the Judge has written it in the judgement. Sometimes he says things in the Court, but does not get recorded. That is the way their Country works. They could not force a Judge to write. They have to see that Public Interest Litigation has not come to an end. Public Interest Litigation could not come to an end until the primary purpose for which the Public Interest Litigation was put in is seen to be satisfied and the primary purpose is, how would the premier institution of India continue.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she wished to seek certain clarifications from Finance & Development Officer regarding the financial statement of 2016-17. Before that on behalf of PUTA, she would like to make a statement that the decision of the Board of Finance that they (teachers) have to wait till the notification from the Punjab Govt. for implementation of 7th Pay Commission is not acceptable to them and therefore that might be registered in the minutes. Secondly, it is also requested that the University authorities must take up the issue to the Centre Govt. and MHRD and conveying this from the floor of the Senate that since 100% of teachers' salaries are being paid by the Central Govt., there is no need to postpone this (seventh Pay Commission).

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they have no money, how could start implementing?

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice-Chancellor to take up the issue with the Central Govt.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had already taken up it with the Centre Govt.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that teachers do not accept the decision of the Board of Finance.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Senate does not accept that decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is the meaning of saying that they do not accept that decision. Do they have the resource to implement anything?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that earlier they had been asking the Central Govt. for the resources, why not now. The University has to plead the case with the Central Govt.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are pleading the case.

Professor Rajesh Gill further said that she would like to plead on the lines suggested by Dr. Gurmeet Singh. Even when they talk about the ongoing PIL case in the High Court, these arguments should have been that salaries are already being paid by the Central Govt. and therefore, why they (Central Government) does not declare Panjab University as a Central University. Rather, they have moved the other way round. The argument should have been that 100% salary is being paid by the Central Govt. and MHRD, so the case is never being pleaded at that level.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she being the PUTA President could associate in the Court case and speak and articulate whatever she wants to do.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that as Vice-Chancellor, he has been there personally, he is presenting and pleading what she is saying. How many times he pleaded for grant of central status to Panjab University. Have they been able to put forth the issue of central status? Perhaps, it is never.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a pronouncement by the Supreme Court that they are Inter State Body Corporate. He does not want to contest that unilaterally. He could not do that. Now it is a part of court case and she could come and say whatever she has to say.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it meant that whatever has been said by the Board of Finance, they have accepted it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not Board of Finance; it is the Supreme Court's pronouncement that Panjab University is Inter State Body Corporate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first of all, there was a comment from MHRD that the implementation of the 7th Pay Commission should take place after Punjab Govt. notification. Then he also questioned where it is written that they could implement the same after adoption of 7th Pay Commission recommendation by the Punjab Govt. At least, it is nowhere mentioned in Panjab University Calendar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could say whatever they want, but they could not do anything until the money is received.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the representative of the Punjab Government had said that they have a document from MHRD which they might check.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would check it what is the factual position.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should decide it today itself in the meeting of Senate that the teachers might be granted new grades before the Punjab Govt. notifies the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be so because they need an amount of Rs. 22 crore from Punjab Govt. to implement the 7th Pay Commission for all the non-teaching employees. Then he is not recommending.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that non-teaching employee's grades are as per grades of Punjab Govt.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not recommend the implementation of 7th Pay Commission only for teachers as the non teaching employees could not be left behind.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they (non-teaching employees) have got 5% interim as per Punjab Govt. notification.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that non-teaching employees could not be tagged with the teachers as their pay scales are the same as that of the Punjab Govt.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could propose the resolution whatever they want to and get it passed. Accordingly, he would conduct the voting. He is not recommending that the 7th Pay Commission is implemented for teachers earlier than that for non-teaching. Teachers are the senior and better paid people in the University and could wait for the 7th Pay Commission.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this leads to a division amongst the employees and it is a new argument. This was also supported by Professor Rajesh Gill.

The Vice-Chancellor said that is not a new argument. He had been part of the academic institution of the Atomic Energy. In the Atomic Energy, the employees get it first; the scientists and the academicians always get their salaries after that.

Professor Rajesh Gill that it is a new dimension altogether which has been brought today.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked who is funding teachers' salaries.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice-Chancellor not to twist the things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not twisting the things and is telling the reality. If they intend to run away from the reality, that is their choice.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that there is only solution of this problem and they should think of it.

The Vice-Chancellor requested them (teachers) to move to the Court and become a party in the case. They do not want to accept the challenge and nobody wants to move to the Court.

Professor Rajesh Gill said if they talk about the challenge, since there is a financial crunch in the University, what they have done for curtailing the expenditure. She requested to consider the CVO reports (Item No. 71) alongwith this item first.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now they are discussing Item No.C-80.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is the problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nobody is running away from anything. He requested Professor Rajesh Gill not to divert the attention of the House by doing such thing.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they are closing their eyes to so many things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nobody is closing eyes and requested her to stop accusing unnecessarily.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she wants to seek certain clarifications on the financial statements. Referring to Page No. 18 in the University Main Accounts, she said that for the year 2015-16, an amount of Rs. 45 crore is shown whereas in the year 2016-17, it is Rs. 5 crore. She wanted to know the cash and bank balance appearing at page 278 of the Budget. Could he (Finance and Development Officer) explain that why is that drop?

It was clarified (by Finance & Development Officer) that she is comparing the position of 1st April 2016 with that of 1st April, 2017. So, there are hundreds and thousands transactions which have occurred and accordingly, the closing balance has reached to that level. So, she could just check each and every record and find out the same. Verbally, he could not explain as to how this figure has reached.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that on page 29, schedule 13 relating to the income of the Guest House, she wanted to know as to for which Guest House this income has been shown.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that this is the schedule for prior period items. Earlier, the income of guest house was kept in a separate account which was transferred back to the main account. So, that was the income related to that account and according to him it relates to the College Bhawan.

Professor Rajesh Gill asked where they show the income from other guest houses. There have been charges for the use of the Alumni House and the same have not been shown in the budget.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that they could not show the income of Alumni House as it is a separate legal entity and the same is registered under the Societies Registration Act. That is not part of the University. The income of Alumni House could not be incorporated in the University account books.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to how this income is accounted for.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that is separate legal entity and has separate governing body. It is registered as a Society under the Societies Registration Act.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that only the expenditure is shown in the budget and not the income.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that it is true, the expenditure shown is for the paraphernalia provided by the University to run it as a

Department of Alumni Relations. There is separate body called Alumni Association. So, that income of Alumni House could not be incorporated in the University account books.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that regarding audit observations in financial statement on page 51, at Sr. No.1 regarding the records destroyed in fire in financial year 2016-17, she would like to know the status whether all the destroyed record has been reconstructed.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that only after reconstruction of the record, that audit has been completed.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that what did he mean by that these audit observations made earlier.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that while conducting the audit, they have given the observations. Whichever record has been destroyed, that was reconstructed on the basis of transactions.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she wanted the Finance and Development Officer to make a statement that all cases have been completed and reconstructed.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that more than 400 service books were destroyed. Out of that, around 250 service books have been reconstructed and the others are under process. Re-construction of service book is tedious task.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are large number of teachers who have been running from pillar to post for re-construction of their service books. She wanted to know if they have fixed any deadline as to when the destroyed service books would be reconstructed.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that they want to do it as soon as possible. He would like to finish it within one month. There is not much difficulty in the cases of teachers. But so far as the non-teaching cases are concerned, they are facing problems because non-teaching persons might have served in various departments. In the case of teachers, whole service record is available in one department, so, they are facing not that much difficulty.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are so many teachers whose service books are not being re-constructed.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that some issues are there and they are sorting out the same. They want to finish it as soon as possible. That is their endeavour.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired about Sr. No.5 of the Account relating to hostel, DSW and sports fund, figures of income, expenditure, investment and closing balance etc. got audited by the Panjab University from the Chartered Accountant. She asked as to since when they have not got audited the same.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that it has been pre-audited starting this financial year from the local audit department.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it meant that prior to that no pre-auditing was being done and the only the CA was auditing the accounts to which the Finance and Development Officer replied in the affirmative.

Professor Ronki Ram said that as Shri Sibal has very rightly said that the issue is very important and actually they are making appeals in one thing and the public concern is other thing. But they are a Body regulated by certain regulations. How come those regulations are to be put in? So, that is the responsibility of the Central Govt., State Government, and the University. They are fulfilling their obligations. When they are not fulfilling their obligations they are requesting them. They are finding that an increase of 6 per cent from the earlier grant of Rs. 176 crore has been effected taking it to Rs. 207 crores. Punjab has increased that money. But whenever the problem of shortage of funds comes, they start asking for the central status to Panjab University. If somebody wants to do this thing, they could do this. This is a question of legal entity. So, how they could say to do this or that? All the time they have to appeal to the Central Govt. and the Panjab Govt. to discharge their obligations so that Panjab University could run smoothly. The issue of Central University status to Panjab University has nothing to do with all this. They should not find alibi on one point or the other and raise the issue again and again. They all wanted it, fought for it but the thing is that it is not possible. Now as rightly said at this moment, if somebody wanted to make an appeal anyway, one is welcome. But on this issue, they could not ask to implement the Pay Commission recommendations otherwise they would do such and such thing. According to him, they are weakening their case and they should not unnecessarily open another political front which would not give any benefit, rather create more hurdles in the way of Panjab University.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the minutes of the Board of Finance were sent to his residence only yesterday at 10.00 a.m. and could see at 4.00 p.m. when he reached home from the College. He requested to send the minutes in time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first the minutes of the Board of Finance have to go to the Syndicate and only then these are presented to the Senate. What is there in the minutes that one could say that it is not acceptable.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since the matters are related with finance, they have to read thoroughly.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that sometimes some suggestions are also to be made by the members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members could give the suggestions. But let them accept whatever is before them.

While referring to **sub-item 7**, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is good that they have made arrangements for a bus for the Rural Centre at Kauni. He has been raising this issue since the year 2013 that at this Centre, for the last about 5 years, there is no student taking admission in the BBA and PGDCA courses. In the B.Com. course, the intake capacity is 40 but according to him, the number of students is not even in double digit. Perhaps only those students who could not get admission at Muktsar, go to Kauni for taking admission. In the year 2013, he had requested to start the B.P.Ed. course which could have run smoothly, the area being a rural one. They could also start any other skill oriented or vocational course there. He had read in the newspaper that the Vice-Chancellor had a meeting with the Hon'ble Finance Minister of Punjab who has asked him to prepare a blueprint. He enquired whether they are proposing for starting of any vocational courses or any further meeting has happened in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no further meeting could take place. But he (Finance Minister) is open to receiving a proposal from Panjab University for having more vocational courses. But more vocational courses mean enhanced expenditure. So, when they would submit a proposal to him, they would propose to seek additional funds specifically for the Rural Centre, Kauni.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they could think of submitting a proposal for starting the B.Voc. or retail management courses.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that Shri Raghbir Dyal be associated for submitting the proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would surely do it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether they could utilise the interest accrued on the funds meant for the multipurpose auditorium as usually in the Colleges they have to refund the grants with interest. He enquired whether there is any audit problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this was an issue which was raised by various Government representatives. That is why the item was taken back to them and during this meeting, they have okayed it that the University could use it for this purpose.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it should be got checked so that there is no audit objection later on as usually the Government wants back the unutilised grant with interest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the concurrence of the Government representatives has been taken as they have not done anything wrong.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Raghbir Dyal has asked a very pertinent question. The representatives of the U.T. Administration and Punjab Government have given the concurrence. The Vice-Chancellor added that the MHRD has also given the concurrence. Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the money does not belong either to the MHRD, U.T. Administration or the Punjab Government. It is like a case that the money belonged to someone while the concurrence is being given by someone else. They had faced a lot of problems during the year 2015-16 on the interest issue when the Government asked to refund that money.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that they have apportioned the due interest to all the new research projects and schemes. Now, there is no interest which could be further allocated to any research project or scheme. After deducting and excluding all those figures, they have arrived at these figures. Actually, earlier this amount was deposited in a plan account before the year 2000-01 and the University did not have two different accounts. When they differentiated these two accounts in the year 2001, they transferred a specific amount to plan account. In that account, they used to receive grants from various funding agencies. This is the money in addition to whatever amount they have transferred and what they are receiving from the funding agencies. Before arriving at this figure, they calculated the due interest on the amount of Rs.23 crores which had already been allocated to these projects. That calculation has been worked out and after excluding that amount only, they have allocated the amount. Still after allocating this, they have kept an amount of Rs.6 crores in plan account for any emergency because sometimes the funding agencies ask the University to spend the money which is later on reimbursed by these agencies. So, all those things have been taken care of that no research project is hampered and the interest has been allocated to the research projects.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that for all practical purposes, that money belonged to the University. Then what is the need of having the concurrence of the U.T. Administration and Punjab Government.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that this amount was kept in a plan account to take care of the research projects. Now the Government has dispensed with the system of plan and non-plan accounts and made it clear that if the University has to arrange for itself the developmental expenditure. This is a ongoing project. So, they have no option except to fund the projects.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether only the unspent amount has been transferred or the unspent money with interest has been transferred.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that the unspent amount, its interest and the University contribution was transferred.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it meant that there is no technical difficulty. He enquired whether with this amount that project could be completed.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that the present cost of the project is Rs.17 crores and by the time they would spend the amount, it would earn interest also.

Shri Ashok Goyal supplemented the viewpoints of many members that it is the recommendation of the Board of Finance which has come to the Senate through the Syndicate wherein they have said that the Panjab University should implement the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission only after the same is notified and implemented by the Punjab Government. That is their viewpoint. But as suggested earlier, according to him, the Senate could also take a view on it. He appreciated the concern of the Vice-Chancellor that under no circumstances the salaries should be revised for teachers first and for non-teaching thereafter. He would not even say that it should be revised for non-teaching first and then for teachers because they are one entity and all are members of one family. As and when the salaries are to be revised, the pay scales are to be implemented, the same should be implemented in one go. The only difference is that as far as teachers are concerned, pay scales are revised by the UGC and for the non-teaching employees the pay scales are at par with Punjab Government. As far as funding is concerned, they have not to depend upon the Punjab Government for that matter. According to him, this could be written on behalf of the Senate to UGC and MHRD that the Senate has resolved that implementation of 7th Pay Commission should not be linked with the notification by the Punjab Government in this regard and the Panjab University has resolved that it should be allowed to implement the revised pay scales independent of the Punjab Government notification.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can write, but they will not release the money.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let them not release the money, but at least, let they start making apart case that if the Punjab Government says that Panjab Government is not their liability, Central Government says that they are neither a Central University nor a State University and an Inter State Body Corporate, at least they should start making up that they should be allowed.

The Vice Chancellor said it meant to keep a pressure on them to which Shri Ashok Goyal spoke in the affirmative.

Professor Chaman Lal said that this is a very significant issue and let they should consider it seriously as this is an issue relating to the status of Panjab University. He wanted to caution the whole Senate that to involve Haryana in the Panjab University affairs would further complicate the issue. The first complications could be that the Punjab Government could object to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that that the Punjab Government has been written by the Central Government about their views on the issue. The Central Government is already aware of the matter. In the Courts, the Additional Advocate General has stated that the Punjab Government has been written to by the Central Government and they will give their response in the Court on 15th of January.

Professor Chaman Lal said that it is right that they would give their response on 15th Jaunary, but they should remain cautious about it because the Punjab Government is likely to object to it. Since there are already complications, and if the Punjab Government objected to it, it would further increase the complications. So, he would like to request them to be cautious. Secondly, since the financial matters are very complicated, of course, they may take the help of the Court, but one thing which seems to be is that there is no chance of the Panjab University becoming a Central University because there seems to be no agreement on this issue. The formulae which were though, they should work on those. They should take help from the Punjab Governor only and not from the Haryana Governor. If they contacted the Haryana Governor, the matter would get more complicated.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not contacted the Governor of Haryana.

Professor Chaman Lal suggested that they should consult the MHRD, UGC, Punjab Governor and Punjab Government to find out a way i.e. to make it a heritage University, University of Excellence. He also asked if they have applied under a new scheme of the Central Government of declaring one hundred Universities as world class Universities.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have applied for the World Class University status to Panjab University and it has been mentioned in the Vice Chancellor's statement. Secondly, he would like to say that they are holding premature discussion on the issue of implementation of 7th Pay Commission recommendation because the UGC and MHRD has not notified it even for the Central Universities. When that notification would come only then they could discuss it. There would be then another complication. The grades of teachers and non-teaching staff are revised separately. As and when whosoever grades would be revised, that has to be notified. So, there is no clash of non-teaching and teaching employees. When the Punjab Government would revise the grades of non-teaching employees, those would be implemented. Similarly, when the Central Government would revise the teachers' grades, those would be implemented. So, it should be not be taken as one against the other. Suppose, the Punjab Government did not revise the grades for one year, does it mean that the teachers' grades would also be stopped for one year. To, his mind, there should be no resentment.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not equated these two things.

Professor Chaman Lal further said that Senate should resolve it that as and when the MHRD and UGC notifies, the Punjab Government should also notify it, but the question is where from the funds would come. That has to be taken care of.

While referring to **Note 1 of sub-item 6** relating to Combo Card, Professor J.K. Goswamy said that an MoU has been signed between S.B.I. and the Panjab University for a Combo Card. They have gone through lot of discussion in the faculty. They have apprehensions about it and he was of the opinion that they should re-discuss it which should include some PUTA representatives also so that they can go through the whole issue. He again said that there are lot of apprehensions and reservations to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should make the Combo card provision at least for the students.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that he had been a victim of losing Rs. Eighteen thousand by using Combo Card of State Bank of India. He was told by the Bank that once they gave the debit care, it is not their responsibility. They are going to have MoU with the Bank. When the students would come in arms, how they would take care of it. He knew that the University cannot provide Cyber Security, but at the same time, the SBI is also suffering lot of security breach. No OTPs are coming in those cases. There are some companies on Google Services where Rs. 20 to 25 thousands commonly have been removed from their accounts.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that this item should be kept in abeyance.

Professor J.K. Goswamy also supported the view point of Shri Ashok Goyal and said that this needs introspection even from students' point of view because finally that is going to fall on them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Goswamy is right that as far as debit card is concerned, it is not bank's responsibility.

Professor Rajat Sandhir requested that **Note No. 2, Sub-Item 6** regarding disbursement of pension through S.B.I. be approved. This was also endorsed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue regarding Combo Card be kept in abeyance and let they not take a decision in haste.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a minor thing as it is not to be implemented immediately.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that S.B.I. has floated many scheme like that of Combo Card, but most of the employees are not aware of all these schemes. The office advertises such facilities being provided by the S.B.I. To his mind, almost hundred percent employees are not aware of the Combo Card. Pensioners are already facing problems because the S.B.I. did not credit money in their bank accounts till late evening whereas the same is sent by the University before noon. Sometime the employees with their wards have to wait till late evening even in adverse weather conditions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the SBI organise an awareness seminar in the auditorium.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that the University employees are the customers of the State Bank of India and it should not implement anything only in consultation with the University authorities but should also take into confidence the employees also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Deepak Kaushik is right and all the stakeholders, i.e., teachers, non-teaching employees and the students, should also be included in the Committee

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would hold a public lecture, it would be recorded and webcast. The FAQ (frequently asked questions) would also be prepared.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they need to have discussions on various clauses of the MoU also as there are some problems.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Shri Prabhjit Singh pointed out that about after about a period of 8-9 months, they have received the proceedings of meeting of the Senate held on 25th March, 2017. Under the Item C-13, he had raised an issue in which it is mentioned that the Vice-Chancellor would look into the same. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to let him know as to what decision has been taken on that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, he could not tell about it and requested Shri Prabhjit Singh to give in writing so that it could be followed up.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there is a clash in dates of entrance examination to 5-year Law course and +2 examinations and requested the Controller of Examinations to address the issue.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa further requested that the next meeting scheduled for 6th January be rescheduled as there are holidays in between. He suggested that it could be fixed on 14th January to which the Vice-Chancellor said that he is not available on 14th January. Finally, it was agreed to hold the next meeting on 7th January, 2018 at 11.00 a.m.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the recommendations of the Board of Finance **(Item C-80 on the agenda)** contained in its meeting dated 28.11.2017 (Items 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18) as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 (Para 2), be approved;
- (ii) the recommendations of the Board of Finance **(Item C-80 on the agenda)** contained in its meeting dated 28.11.2017 **(Item-6 Note-2)**, as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 (Para 2), be approved; and

Note-1 (regarding issue of smart combo card) be kept in abeyance for which the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee consisting of all the stakeholders including the representative(s) of teachers, non-teaching employees, students and representative of SBI to look into the security aspect, etc. and also

organise public lecture to sensitize about the use of combo card.

XXXII. The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-46** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, viz. –

R-1. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Dr. Jyoti Sood, as Assistant Professor at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., purely on temporary basis, for the period during which she has actually worked, i.e., w.e.f. 04.05.2016 to 30.06.2016 and 07.07.2016 to 31.12.2016, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions according to which she had worked previously during the session 2015-16.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 14(i))

R-2. That the minutes of the Committee dated 06.04.2017 and 11.04.2017, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.03.2017 (Para 13) to evaluate the recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding the UGC's amendments (3rd/4th amendments), Regulations, 2016 and suggest modifications in the template and applications form for direct recruitment as well as Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) promotions, be approved.

NOTE: The circular has been issued by the Estt. vide No. 3297-3396 dated 22.5.2017 in anticipation of approval of the Senate Branch with regard to application forms for CAS promotions/direct recruitment and templates.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 26)

R-3. That in terms of the recommendations of the Selection Committee dated 28.03.2017, the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the promotion of Dr. Satyapal Sehgal, Associate Professor, Department of Hindi from Associate Professor (Stage 4) to Professor (Stage 5), with effect from 01.01.2009, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+AGP of Rs.10,000/- under UGC Career Advancement Scheme at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

NOTE: As per recommendations of the Selection Committee, it has been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(i))

R-4. That in accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Professor

Aneel Kumar Raina, Department of English & Cultural Studies, Panjab University on contract basis upto 21.04.2022 (i.e. the date of his attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date he joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

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

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(ii))

R-5. That in accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the extension in re-employment of Dr. Devi Sirohi, Professor(Re-Employed), Department of History, P.U., on contract basis upto 31.12.2017 i.e. on attaining the age of 65 years of age, on the usual terms & conditions.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(iii))

R-6. In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation Syamala Devi, Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Professor on contract basis upto 21.07.2022 (i.e. the date of her attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

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

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(i))

- R-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed transition of payment of salary to Dr. Samer Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Microbial Biotechnology from Ramalingaswami fellowship to Panjab University w.e.f. 02.07.2017 onwards, as the term of his fellowship has concluded on 01.07.2017.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(ii))

- R-8.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Mr. Saumyadeep Bhattacharya, Assistant Professor, P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date he will start work for the academic session 2017-18, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39600 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which he was working earlier.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(iii))

- R-9.** That the Vice Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has appointed following persons (who fulfill the eligibility conditions as per UGC/University) as Part-Time Assistant Professors, at P.U. Regional Centre, (P.U. Extn. Library), Civil Lines, Ludhiana, on an honorarium of Rs. 22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) w.e.f. the date they start working for even semester for Academic Session 2016-17 against the vacant positions of the Centre:

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Subject to be taught
1	Dr. Kuljit Singh	Law
2.	Mr. Sunil Mittal	Law

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(iv))

- R-10.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following as Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date they start/started work, for the session 2017-18 upto the start of summer vacations 2018, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 appearing at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name of Person	Branch
1.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Assistant Professor in Commerce
3.	Mrs. Navdeep Kaur	Assistant Professor in English

4.	Dr. Inderjit Singh	Assistant Professor in Political Science
5.	Dr. Sukhjeet Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
6.	Dr. Sumit Mohan	Assistant Professor in Hindi
7.	Dr. Ram Singh	Assistant Professor in Commerce
8.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Assistant Professor in Economics
9.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	Assistant Professor in History
10.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Assistant Professor in Physical Education

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(iv))

R-11. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Dr. Vishal Agrawal, Assistant Professor (Temporary), Department of Biochemistry, P.U. up to 30.06.2017, with one day break on 01.05.2017, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor (temporary), Department of Biochemistry, P.U., for next academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. the date he start/started work, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which he was working during the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(v))

R-12. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Imrose Tiwana as Part-Time Assistant Professor in Law in the Department of Laws, P.U. and name of Ms. Naseem Yadlapati as Part-Time Assistant Professor, in the waiting list, on an honorarium of Rs.22,800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week) for the Academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. the date he/she start work.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(vi))

R-13. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, and Board of Finance has appointed Professor Nuruddin Farah as visiting Professor from outside the country in the Department of English & Cultural Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, an honorarium of upto Rs.50000/- p.m. for a period of three weeks, from 15.03.2017 to 04.04.2017, as per University Rules.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(v))

R-14. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following:

1. In supersession to office order No.709-715/Estt. dated 11.01.2017, Shri Sudhir Kumar Baweja, Tutor-cum-Curator (Designated as Teacher), USOL, Chandigarh, be allowed to work continue as such even after 31.01.2017 (the date on which he completes the age of 60 years) to comply the court orders in CWP No.1286 of 2017 (Sudhir Kumar Baweja Vs. Panjab Unviersity, Chandigarh) till the final outcome of the CWP filed by him, i.e. 25.04.2017.
2. He be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him, if any, by the University on same terms & conditions.
3. He be paid salary on the same conditions as the Vice-Chancellor has already ordered that “ in the court case (LPA No.1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. Panjab University and others and connected LPAs) be paid salary which they were drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 16.08.2016 passed by the Hon’ble Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. P.U. and other excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone) as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the LPA filed by them. The payments to all such appellants shall be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the prescribed undertaking.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(vi))

R-15. That the orders of the Vice-Chancellor issued vide No.8135-145/Estt. dated 09.06.2017 with regard to appointment of Professor Suveera Gill, University Business School, P.U. as Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University P.U. w.e.f. the date she accepts the responsibility, till further orders, in place of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra (appointed as Dean of University Instruction from 07.06.2017), be ratified.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 22)

R-16. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) re-appointed (afresh) the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 10.07.2017 till the end of session 2017-18 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, with one day break as usual, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Designation & Subject
1.	Ms. Inderjot Kaur	Assistant Professor in Law
2.	Shri Hardip Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi

- (ii) appointed Dr. Rajnish Mutneja as Assistant Professor at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib on Part-time basis w.e.f. 10.07.2017 till the end of session 2017-18 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through regular selection whichever is earlier, on an honorarium or Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week), on the same term and condition on which he was working earlier for the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(i))

R-17. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has:

- (i) re-appointed afresh Dr. Ramandeep Kaur Saluja, Associate Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis from 03.03.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 02.02.2018 with one day break on 02.03.2017 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier.
- (ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis from 04.05.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 03.04.2018 with one day break on 03.05.2017 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name and Designation
1.	Dr. Rose Kanwal Jeet Kaur, Assistant Professor
2.	Dr. Poonam Sood, Assistant Professor
3.	Dr. Lalit Kumar, Associate Professor
4.	Dr. Vishakha Grover, Associate Professor
5.	Dr. Shipra Gupta, Associate Professor
6.	Dr. Puneet, Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Neha Bansal, Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal, Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. Sunint Singh, Assistant Professor

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(ii))

R-18. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following Lab. Instructors at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University Rule as under and has also allowed to charge/paid their salary against the vacant posts of Technical Officers/Workshop Instructor/ Senior Workshop Superintendent/ Deputy Librarian as mentioned below against each in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology as before:

Sr. No.	Name	Post against which salary to be charged
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore, (I.T.)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan, (M.E.)	Technical Officer
3.	Ms. Seema, (Biotechnology)	Workshop Instructor
4.	Mr. Lokesh, (CSE)	Senior Workshop Superintendent
5.	Ms. Sunaina Gulati, (CSE)	Deputy Librarian

- (i) w.e.f. 01.06.2017 to 07.07.2017 or till the vacancies are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier; and
- (ii) for next Academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. 11.07.2017 to 01.06.2018 i.e. upto end of semester examinations, (after one day break on 10.07.2017, 08.07.2017 & 09.07.2017 being Saturday & Sunday) or till the vacancies are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(v))

R-19. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Chander Prakash, Assistant Professor (temporary), University Institute of Engineering & Technology, w.e.f. 13.07.2017, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(i))

R-20. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has sanctioned Extra Ordinary leave without pay to Dr. B.S. Ghuman, Professor, Department of Public Administration, P.U. Chandigarh, for one year with immediate effect i.e., 14.08.2017 (A.N.), under Regulation 11 (G) at page 139-143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to enable him to join as Vice-Chancellor, Punjabi University, Patiala.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(xii))

R-21. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor (temporary), in the Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering, Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U., w.e.f. the date he starts/started work, purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, for the next academic session 2017-18, or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is

earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which he has worked during the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(xiii))

R-22. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Richa Rastogi Thakur, as Assistant Professor (Temporary) in Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, University Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U. w.e.f. the date she starts/started work, purely on temporary basis, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, for the academic session 2017-18, or till the posts are filled in, on through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which she has worked during the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(xiv))

R-23. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following as Assistant Professors, purely on temporary basis at P.U. Constituent College Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur, w.e.f. the date they will start/started work for the session 2017-18 upto the start of summer vacations 2018, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible, as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Dr. Resham Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
3.	Dr. Harnam Singh	Assistant Professor in Physical Education
4.	Ms. Simarjeet Kaur	Assistant Professor in Mathematics
5.	Ms. Nishi	Assistant Professor in Commerce
6.	Mr. Mohammad Sazid	Assistant Professor in Commerce
7.	Mr. Harjinder Singh Bhardwaj	Assistant Professor in Political Science

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(xv))

R-24. That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate:

- (i) re-appointed afresh the following faculty member at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U. purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 16.8.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 15.7.2018 with break on 14.8.2017 (Break Day) and 15.8.2017 (Holiday) or till the posts are filled up, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007,

on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Monika Nagpal	Assistant Professor
2.	Dr. Amrita Rawla	Assistant Professor
3.	Dr. Rajeev Rattan	Assistant Professor
4.	Dr. Prabhjot Kaur	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Manjot Kaur	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Amandeep Kaur	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Vandana Gupta	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Rajni Jain	Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. M.K. Chhabra	Associate Professor

- (ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U. purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 15.9.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 14.8.2018 with break on 14.9.2017 (Break day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Prabhleen Brar	Sr. Assistant Professor
2.	Dr. Rosy Arora	Sr. Assistant Professor
3.	Dr. Vivek Kapoor	Sr. Assistant Professor
4..	Dr. Ruchi Singla	Sr. Assistant Professor

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(xvi))

- R-25.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed the following as Assistant Professors, purely on temporary basis, Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt. S.B.S. Nagar, w.e.f. the date they will start/started work for the session 2017-18 upto the start of summer vacations 2018, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/-, plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 111-112, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. (Ms.) Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi
2.	Ms. Sukhjit Nahar	Sociology

3.	Mr. Hari Krishan	History
4.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi
5.	Dr. (Ms.) Poonam Dwivedi	English
6.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics
7.	Mr. Inder Bhagat	Computer Science
8.	Dr. Hari Nath	Hindi
9.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Commerce
10.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce
11.	Mr. Deepak	Commerce Science

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(xviii))

R-26. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 10.04.2017 of the Selection Committee and also approved the appointment of the following Doctors (Full-Time/Part-Time) purely on contract basis at B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. initially for the period of six months (w.e.f. the dates they report for duty) and further extendable on six monthly basis or as per any amended University rules, on the recommendation of the Administrative Committee of BGJ Institute of Health on their satisfactory services, with the terms & conditions as notified by the C.M.O. vide Notice No.407-415/HC dated 01.03.2017:

Sr. No.	Name of Doctors	Designation	Salary per month (fixed) (in Rs.)
1.	Dr. R.V. Suri	Medical Officer (Full-Time)	45,000/-
2.	Dr. Harmanjot Dhindsa	Medical Officer (Full-Time)	45,000/-
3.	Dr. Madhu Tuli	Part-Time Medical Specialist	20,000/-
4.	Dr. Meenu Kapila	Part-Time Ayurvedic Medical Officer	10,000/-

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(xii))

R-27. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of the following incumbents in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, w.e.f. the date they reports for duty, against the following vacant posts in the Department of Physics:

Sr. No.	Name of the Incumbent	Promoted as
1.	Shri Rup Lal Bhardwaj, Sr. Technician (G-II)	Senior Technical Assistant (G-I)
2.	Shri Dinesh Kumar, Sr. Technician (G-II)	Senior Scientific Assistant (G-I)

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 36(x))

- R-28.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed to introduce M.Phil. in the subject of Human Rights & Duties in the Centre for Human Rights & Duties, P.U., from the academic session 2017-18, with a condition that no more Guest Faculty be inducted.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 14(v))

- R-29.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the meeting of the College Development Council dated 13.02.2017.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(viii))

- R-30.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following recommendations of the Academic Council dated 21.6.2017 (Para XXI) that:

1. the following courses be introduced from the academic session 2017-18:

- (i) Masters in Governance and Leadership
- (ii) Certificate Courses in Governance and Leadership (3 months duration)
 1. Certificate Course in Citizenship
 2. Certificate Course in Financial Management in Public Affairs
 3. Certificate Course in Leadership Skills
 4. Certificate Course in Campaign Management
 5. Certificate Course in Practical Skills in Areas such as Media Skills, Public Speaking, Campaign Strategies, Handling Conflicts
 6. Certificate Course in Ethics in Public Policy
- (iii) Crash Courses in Governance and Leadership (4 weeks duration)
 1. Legislative Skills
 2. Legal Awareness
 3. Media Skills
 4. Campaigning
 5. Gender budgeting
 6. Women and Human Rights
 7. Women in Politics and Decision-making

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(viii))

- R-31.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the new nomenclature of the course "Environment, Road Safety Education, Violence against Women/Children and Drug Abuse" instead of previous nomenclature i.e. Environment, Road Safety Education and Violence against Women and Children, as the paper Drug Abuse is to be introduced from the session 2017-18 (vide Syndicate Para 36 R(xi) dated 28.05.2017).

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 40(ix))

R-32. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the dated 2.2.2017 (Item 4) and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate and Government of India/Publication in the Government of India Gazette, has approved the following amendment/additions in Regulation 1.1, 2.14, 4 and 6 at pages 52-59 under Chapter II(A) of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007 effective from the session 2015-2016:

Item 4

That the Regulations 1.1, 2.14, 4 and 6 (Chapter II (A) (vi) appearing at pages 52-59 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, be amended/added, as under, in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATIONS	PROPOSED REGULATIONS
<p>1.1 There shall be two separate Board of Studies in the following subjects: one for the Under-graduate Studies for all examinations upto B.A./B.Sc./ B.Com and B.A. (Honours) and the other for Post-Graduate Studies for all the M.A./M.Sc. /M.Com. examinations including Post-graduate Diploma Courses of one year duration excluding M.Phil. and Honours School Courses.</p> <p>English, Hindi, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Economics, History, Political Science & Civics, Philosophy, Psychology, Public Administration, Sociology, Botany, Chemistry, Mathematics , Zoology, Physics, Stastics, Geography and Commerce</p>	<p>1.1 There shall be two separate Board of Studies in the following subjects: one for the Under-graduate Studies for all examinations upto B.A./B.Sc./B.Com. and B.A. (Honours) and the other for Post-Graduate Studies for all the M.A./M.Sc./ M.Com. examinations including Post-graduate Diploma Courses of one year duration excluding M.Phil. and Honours School Courses and Law courses.</p> <p>English, Hindi, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Economics, History, Political Science & Civics, Philosophy, Psychology, Public Administration, Sociology, Botany, Chemistry, Mathematics , Zoology, Physics, Statistics, Geography and Commerce, Police Administration, Biochemistry, Biotechnology, Bioinformatics, Microbiology, Fashion Design, Fine Arts, Computer Science and Applications, Defence & Strategic Studies, Home Science, Law, Library Science, Music (Vocal and Instrumental) and Dance, Physical Education (UG),</p>

	Agriculture.
<p>4. The Board of Studies in the following subjects and their conveners shall be nominated by the Syndicate:</p> <p>I. Arabic II. Persian III. Urdu IV. Bengali V. Tamil VI. Sindhi VII. French VIII. German IX. Russian & Slovak X. Tibetan XI. Music and Dance XII. Arts and Fine Arts XIII. Courses in Library Science XIV. Defence & Strategic Studies</p> <p>[This Board will consider matters relating to Military Training (Optional subject also)]</p> <p>XV. Post graduate Studies in Pharmaceutical Sciences XVI. Chemical Engineering XVII. Civil Engineering</p> <p>XVIII. Electrical Engineering XIX. Mechanical Engineering XX. Aeronautical Engineering XXI. Applied Sciences XXII. Metallurgical Engineering XXIII. Electronics and Electrical Communication XXIV. Engineering and Production Engineering XXV. Post graduate Medical Education and Research XXVI. Dental Surgery XXVII. Home Science XXVIII. Pharmacy XXIX. Nursing XXX. Law</p>	<p>4. The Board of Studies in the following subjects and their conveners shall be nominated by the Syndicate:</p> <p>I. Arabic II. Architecture & Planning III. Bengali IV. Chemical Engineering V. Chinese VI. Civil Engineering VII. Dental Surgery VIII. Electrical Engineering IX. Electronics & Electrical Communication X. French XI. Gandhian Studies XII. German XIII. Indian Theatre XIV. Mechanical Engineering XV. P.G. Medical Education & Research XVI. Mass Communication XVII. Postgraduate in Nursing XVIII. Nursing XIX. Persian XX. Pharmacy XXI. P.G. in Pharmaceutical Science</p> <p>XXII. Physical Education (Post graduate) XXIII. Russian XXIV. University Institute of Legal Studies XXV. Tibetan XXVI. Telugu XXVII. Tamil XXVIII. Kannada XXIX. Malayalam XXX. Assamese XXXI. Slovak XXXII. Urdu XXXIII. Sindhi</p>

<p>XXXI. Indian Theatre XXXII. Chinese XXXIII. Mass Communication XXXIV. Architecture XXXV. Post-graduate Physical Education XXXVI. Under-graduate Physical Education XXXVII. Telgu XXXVIII. Kannada XXXIX. Malayalam XL. Manipuri (for the admission of 1989-90 only) XLI. Gandhian Studies XLII. Post-graduate studies in Nursing XLIII. Assamese XLIV. Computer Science & Engineering XLV. Under-graduate Board of Studies in Computer Science & Applications XLVI. Post-graduate Board of Studies in Computer Science and Applications XLVII. Environmental Education XLVIII. Vocational Agriculture (i) The Dean of the Faculty concerned shall be an ex-officio member of the Boards XVI to XXX and XLIII. (ii) Head of the University Teaching Department of Chemical Engineering shall be an ex-officio member of the Board of Studies concerned. (iii) The Principals of the Engineering Colleges shall be ex-officio members of all the Board of Studies, except Chemical Engineering. The conveners of the various Board of Studies in Engineering of both the Engineering</p>	
--	--

<p>Colleges be nominated by rotation, according to a seniority of the College.</p>	
<p>6. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in these Regulations; where in the opinion of the Syndicate, it is not possible to form a 'Board of Studies in the case of subjects listed in Regulations 1.1,1.2, 2.3 and 2.5, in accordance with these regulations the Syndicate may nominate a Committee to discharge the functions of the Board of Studies.</p>	<p>6. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in these Regulations; where ;in the opinion of the Syndicate, it is not possible to form a 'Board of Studies in the case of subjects listed in Regulations 1.1,1.2,2.3 and 2.5, in accordance with these regulations the Syndicate may nominate a Committee to discharge the functions of the Board of Studies in the following subjects:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. M. Tech. Energy Management II. M. Tech. (Instrumentation) III. M. Tech. (Microelectronics) IV. Applied Sciences Engineering V. B.E./M.E. (Information Technology) VI. B.E. (Food Technology) VII. B.E. (Bio-Technology) VIII. M.E. (Electronics & Communication Engineering) IX. B.E./M.E (Computer Science & Engineering) X. M.E. (Construction Technology & Management) XI. M.E. (Instrumentation & Control) XII. M.E. (Manufacturing & Technology) XIII. M.Tech. (Engineering & Education) XIV. Human Genomics XV. Vivekananda Studies XVI. Women's Gender Studies. XVII. P.G. Diploma in Health, Family Welfare & Population

	<p>Education</p> <p>XVIII. Human Right and Duties</p> <p>XIX. M.Sc. Solid Waste Management</p> <p>XX. M.Tech. Nano-Science & Nano-Technology</p> <p>XXI. Nuclear Medicine & Medical Physics</p> <p>XXII. Social Work</p> <p>XXIII. MBA CIT</p> <p>XXIV. Geology</p> <p>XXV. Ayurveda</p> <p>XXVI. Environmental Education</p> <p>XXVII. Social Sciences</p> <p>XXVIII. Homoeopathy</p> <p>XXIX. Gemmology and Jewellery</p> <p>XXX. Public Health</p> <p>XXXI. M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology</p> <p>XXXII. M.Sc. Instrumentation</p> <p>XXXIII. Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering</p> <p>XXXIV. Law (PG)</p> <p>XXXV. Any other (If any).</p>
--	---

Amendment in the Regulation of 4 and 6 also affects the Regulation 2.14

<p>2.14.The Boards of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Studies shall be elected by the Faculties as specified below:</p> <p>English, Hindi, ..Faculty of Punjabi and Languages Sanskrit</p> <p>Economics, History, ..Faculty of Arts Political Science & Civics, Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology, Public Administration</p>	<p>2.14 The Boards of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Studies shall be elected by the Faculties as specified below:</p> <p>English, Hindi, ..Faculty of Punjabi and Languages Sanskrit</p> <p>Economics, ..Faculty of History, Arts Political Science & Civics, Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology, Public Administration, Geography, Police</p>
---	---

Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry Botany, Zoology	Faculty of Science	Administration (UG), Defence and Strategic Studies (UG), Library Science	Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry Botany, Zoology	Faculty of Science
Geography	..Faculty of Arts and Science	Biochemistry (UG), Biotechnology (UG) Bioinformatics (UG), Microbiology (UG), Fashion Design (UG), Computer Science & Applications (UG), Home Science (UG)		
Medicine Education	..Faculty of Medical Sciences ..Faculty of Education	Agriculture		.. Faculty of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture
Commerce	Faculty of Business Management and Commerce	Medicine		Faculty of Medical Sciences
		Education, Physical Education (UG)		..Faculty of Education
		Commerce		.. Faculty of Business Management and Commerce

	Fine Arts (UG) ..Faculty of Music (Vocal Design and and Fine Arts Instrumental) & Dance (UG)
	Law (UG) Faculty of Law

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(ix))

- R-33.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Regulations Committee dated 2.2.2017 (Item 10) and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate and Government of India/Publication in the Government of India Gazette, has approved the following amendment in Regulation 10 at page 125 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
10. The graduates from Science/Engineering stream or any other stream with Honours in Geography as one of the subjects from Panjab University or any other University recognized as equivalent by the Panjab University shall be eligible for the admission to the course.	10. The candidates with B.Sc. from all streams and any other stream with honours in Geography as one of the subject and B.E. in any stream be made eligible for admission to M.Sc. (Environment Science) examinations.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(x))

- R-34.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved Defence Institute of Physiology and Allied Sciences (DIPAS), Delhi as a recognised Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. in the subject of Biotechnology Engineering.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xi))

- R-35.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed a candidate to apply for only four courses on one application and approved the fee for admission process through Cloud-Based Online Admission Management Services for select courses for the academic session 2017-18 as under:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Fee to be charged (Rs.)
Candidate can apply for 4 courses only on one admission form		
1.	For online application for admission to 1 course	300
2.	For online application for admission to 2 course	400
3.	For online application for admission to 3	500

	course	
4.	For online application for admission to 4 course	600
Candidate intending to apply for more than 4 courses is required to submit another admission form		
		Additional Fee to be charged (Rs.)
1.	For online application for admission to 5 th course	300
2.	For online application for admission to 6 th course	400
3.	For online application for admission to 7 th course	500
4.	For online application for admission to 8 th course	600
Candidate intending to apply for more than 8 courses is required to submit yet another admission form with the above mentioned additional fee per additional course.		

Further it was decided that there will be a concession of 50% in fee to SC/ST/PWD candidates.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40 (xii))

R-36. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed I.N.M.O. Awardees to join B.Sc. (Hons.) in Department of Mathematics, without appearing in the PU-CET (U.G.) entrance test.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xiii))

R-37. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the following Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between:

- (i) University of the Fraser Valley (UFV), Abbotsford, Canada and Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ii) Pepperdine University, School of Law, The Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution, U.S. and University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxxix))

R-38. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Memorial University of Newfoundland, Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada (Hereinafter referred to as MUN) and Panjab University, Chandigarh, India (Hereinafter referred to as PU).

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xl))

R-39. That the letter No.1847/DUI/DS dated 19.04.2017 of Dean of University Instruction along with minutes dated 01.03.2017 of Tender Committee for the opening of Technical and Financial bid for the implementation of "Cloud-Based Online Admission Management Services

[Software as a Service-Managed Services] for admission to Teaching Departments at Panjab University (PU), Chandigarh for the academic session 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xliv))

- R-40.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has deputed Shri S.S. Sangha, Principal, Dashmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib to Dashmesh Girls College, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date of joining. During the period of deputation the lien of his post of Principal at Dasmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib shall be retained. Further the period of deputation can be extended beyond one year if the Management deems fit.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 36(i))

- R-41.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the eligibility conditions for the Entrance Test of PULEET-2017.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 36(ii))

- R-42.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the nomenclature of Bachelor of Clinical Optometry (B.Optom) course being run at Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, be amended to Bachelor of Optometry (B.Optom) from the admission batch 2017-18, as per UGC specifications of degree.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 36(ix))

- R-43.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to introduce the paper/topic "Drug Abuse: Problem, Prevention and Management" having 2 credit/50 marks (40 theory+10 internal) at undergraduate level, as a fourth part of the paper "Environment, Road Safety Education and Violence against Women and Children" from the academic session 2017-18.

NOTE: The examination (one hour duration) would be held along with the paper on "Environment, Road Safety Education and Violence against Women and Children".

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 36(xi))

- R-44.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the Syndicate, has approved that the fee-fund structure to be followed by the Degree Colleges affiliated to Panjab University and constituent Colleges for the session 2017-18 would remain same as prevailed in the year 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 36(xii))

- R-45.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that entrance test for admission to LL.B. and LL.M. courses in the Department of Laws and Panjab University Regional

Centres, be conducted from the coming session, i.e., 2017-18, for 100 marks instead of 75 marks and the pattern/format of entrance test be also changed i.e. 100 marks of MCQs instead of 75 marks i.e. 50 marks objective type questions and 25 marks for subjective type questions and the duration of the test be also increased by 15 minutes i.e. for 1 hour 30 minutes instead of 1 hour 15 minutes.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xv))

R-46. That the following Fellows be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against their names in anticipation of approval of Senate:

1.	Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal MLA Village Manjhi P.O. Nare Distt. Hoshiarpur	1. Medical Sciences 2. Languages 3. Business Management and Commerce 4. Pharmaceutical Sciences
2.	Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu MLA 50, Model Gram Ludhiana	1. Medical Sciences 2. Arts 3. Education 4. Engineering & Technology

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 31)

XXXIII. The information contained in **Items I-1 to I-134** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, viz.-

I-1 That the Syndicate has felicitated to the following:

- (i) Dr. Vishal Sharma, Assistant Professor, Institute of Forensic Science, on having received a grant of Rs.25,11,520/- for the research project titled 'A Novel & Non-Destructive Method of Characterization, Differentiation, and Dating of Writing Ink Samples by using FTIR Spectroscopy and Chemometrics: Application to Forensic Questioned Document Examination' from Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB) (a statutory body of the DST, Govt. of India).
- (ii) Professor K.N. Pathak, former Vice Chancellor of PU, on having been appointed as the Chairperson of PGI Ethics Committee.
- (iii) Professor V.K. Kapoor, former Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on having been honoured with IASTAM Gopal Das Parikh Award 2017 for his contributions in drug development by the Indian Association for the study of Traditional Asian Medicine.

- (iv) Professor Jagat Ram, Head, Advanced Eye Centre, PGIMER, on having taken over as Director, PGIMER.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 1)

- (v) Professor Arun Kumar Grover for having been selected as a member of the CSIR Society for a term of three years w.e.f. January 6, 2017 to January 5, 2020.
- (vi) Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Hindi on having been awarded by Chandigarh Sahitya Academy for his book "Hindi: Badlata Parivesh".
- (vii) Professor Rana Nayyar, Department of English & Cultural Studies on having been honoured by Chandigarh Sahitya Academy for translating from Hindi, Punjabi to English.
- (viii) Dr. Savita Chaudhary, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry on having been selected for the Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award (2014-15) by Haryana State.
- (ix) (a) Professor Shelley Walia, Department of English and Cultural Studies,
 (b) Professor M M Aggarwal, Department of Physics
 (c) Professor K P Singh Department of Physics
 (d) Professor V.T. Sebastian, Department of Philosophy
 on having been awarded the Emeritus Fellowship by the UGC for the year 2017-18.
- (x) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry on having received a grant of Rs.20.60 lakhs for the project under the DBT's Program.
- (xi) (a) Postgraduate Govt. College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh,
 (b) GGSDS College, Sector-32, Chandigarh
 (c) MCM DAV College, Sector 36, Chandigarh
 on having been placed in the first 100 Colleges under NIRF Ranking.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 1)

- (xii) Dr. Rehana Parveen, Professor of Urdu, Department of Evening Studies, on having been conferred with 'Award of Recognition' by the Chandigarh Sahitya Academy for

her outstanding contribution in Urdu Literature/Language.

- (xiii) Govt. College of Education, Sector-20, Chandigarh on having been accredited by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) with the 'A' Grade with CGPA of 3.23.
- (xiv) Dev Samaj College of Education, Sector-36, Chandigarh on having been accredited by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) with the 'A' Grade with CGPA of 3.22.
- (xv) Professor Raghuram Rao Akkinapalli, former Professor at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences on assuming the charge of Director, National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education & Research (NIPER) Mohali.
- (xvi) Dr. Nishima Wangoo, Assistant Professor of Applied Sciences (Chemistry), UIET on funding of her Project entitled, "Self assembled amino acid based constructs as potential antimicrobial traps" by DST-SERB.
- (xvii) Dr. Rohit K. Sharma, Department of Chemistry, on having been awarded a Project entitled "Enhancement of the immunogenicity and protective efficacy of lipopeptide vaccine against Mycobacterium Tuberculosis using peptidomimetic and conjugation with isoniazid" by DST-SERB.
- (xviii) Dr. Neeraj Kumar Singh, Assistant Librarian, AC Joshi Library, on having been awarded the prestigious Commonwealth Professional Fellowship at the University of East London, UK.
- (xix) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor, UIPS, on having been awarded with Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award (2016-17) by Haryana State Council for Science & Technology.
- (xx) Dr. Savita Chaudhary on having been awarded with Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award (2014-15) by Haryana State Council for Science & Technology.
- (xxi) Professor Ashok Vijn, an alumna of Department of Chemistry, PU, on having been decorated with the honour of 'Ordre de Montreal' in Canada.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 1)

- (xxii) Professor Sukhbir Kaur, Chairperson, Department of Zoology, PU, on having received Fellowship Award/Scroll from Zoological Society of India and on

having been elected as President of the Indian Society of Parasitology (ISP).

- (xxiii) Professor Seema Kapoor, Faculty Advisor, Enactus SSBUI CET Team on having won the Best Faculty Advisor.
- (xxiv) Enactus SSBUI CET team of Panjab University on having been declared as one of the top 4 finalists out of 160 teams nationwide during ENACTUS NATIONALS-2017 and also on having won the 2nd runners up prize of Rs. 75000/- as Mahindra Rise Grant.
- (xxv) Team of students from UIET under the mentorship of Mr. Arun Kumar Dhawan (Programming Assistant) & Mr. Satish Sharma (Jr. Technician) and Team Leader Ms. Manisha Singh (student) on having won a cash prize of Rs. 10,000/- for developing Android App in the Smart India Hackathon 2017.
- (xxvi) Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, former F.D.O., PU, on having been nominated as a member of Juvenile Justice Board of UT, Chandigarh for a period of three years.
- (xxvii) Shri Navtej Singh (SAIF/CIL), Dr. Arun Bansal IQAC and Dr. Anupreet Mavi (UIAMS) on having been selected by Punjab Biodiversity Board for the 1st Census of State Animal “Blackbuck” at Abohar Wildlife Sanctuary in collaboration with Department of Forest & Wildlife Preservation, Punjab.
- (xxviii) Mr. Sarwar Beg, a UGC Senior Research Fellow at University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), PU, on having been bestowed with ‘Sun Pharma Science Scholar Award’ by Sun Pharma Science Foundation for his research work on cardiovascular drugs.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 1)

- (xxix) Mrs. Anu Chatrath, Senior Advocate, Senior Senate Member & Dean, Faculty of Law, PU, has been elevated to the position of Additional Advocate General, Government of Punjab.
- (xxx) Dr. Rohit Sharma, Department of Microbial Biotechnology, on having been sanctioned a grant of Rs. 3.5 crore to establish a Centre ‘Bioincubators Nurturing Entrepreneurship for Scaling Technologies (BioNEST)’.

- (xxxix) Dr. Harish Kumar, Department of Computer Science & Engineering (UIET) on his having been appointed as Chief Coordinator for implementing the scheme under the Skill and Personality Development Programme Centre (SPDP) for SC/ST students to University Institute of Engineering & Technology.
- (xxxix) Shri Satinder Sartaaaj, PU alumnus, a well known sufi composer, singer and lyricist, for playing a lead role in the Hollywood production titled "The Black Prince" based on the life of Maharajah Duleep Singh, youngest son of Maharajah Ranjit Singh.
- (xxxix) Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor, PU, on having been appointed as Chairman of the Research Council of CSIR-National Physical Laboratory (SCIR-NPL), New Delhi for a period of three years.
- (xxxix) Dr. Neeru Malik, on having qualified International Technical Official for World Tennis Championship.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 1)

- (xxxv) Hon'ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu ji on having taken over as Vice-President of India & the Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxvi) Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public Administration and Fellow, PU, on being appointed as (i) Vice Chancellor of Punjabi University, Patiala and (ii) on being elected as President of the Association of British Scholars (ABS), Chandigarh Chapter for a period of two years.
- (xxxvii) Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU and President, Chandigarh Region Innovation Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), on his being appointed as member of Group of Eight Australian Universities-India Ph.D Advisory Taskforce.
- (xxxviii) Prof. Virinder Kumar Walia, Department of Zoology on being awarded with gold medal by the Indian Academy of Environment Sciences, Haridwar, for his contribution to the cause of environment and zoology in general and discipline of entomology.
- (xxxix) Renowned Punjabi sufi singer, poet, actor and composer - Dr. Satinder Sartaaaj on his being designated as the Brand Ambassador of Panjab University.
- (xl) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences for approval of UGC Networking Resource Centre

Programme (UGC-NRC) for Phase-II for a period of five years i.e. 2017 to 2022 with a allocated budget of Rs.5.00 crores.

- (xli) Mr. Birbal Waddhera of Department of Sports, PU, on having been appointed as a Coach of Tennis Team of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar participating in the World University Games.
- (xlii) Dr Rakesh Malik, Deputy Director, Department of Sports, PU on being appointed as Manager of the National Athletics Team participating in the World University Games.
- (xliii) Professor R.P. Bambah for contributing a one-time sum of Rs. 7 lakhs to the Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund Account.
- (xliv) Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal for having offered to contribute Rs. 2 lakhs every year and having contributed Rs.2 lakhs for the first year to the Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund Account.
- (xlv) Professor Rajinder Jindal. Department of Zoology, on having been awarded Gold Medal by the Indian Academy of Environmental Sciences, Haridwar;

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 1)

I-2

That the syndicate has noted the following:

1. Panjab University has secured 2nd Rank by getting 43880 points for the award of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (MAKA) Trophy as published by Association of Indian Universities in Annual Performance Report, National University Games 2015-16. Further, I wish to inform that Panjab University players have performed better during the session 2016-17 and trust that PU will gain more points for the award of MAKA Trophy as compared to the session 2015-16.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 1 (viii))

2. The expenditure on the two newly opened Constituent Colleges up to the end of the current session be allowed to be met out of the balance funds of the 4 Constituent Colleges.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 1(v))

3. Smt. Kirron Kher, Member of Parliament, UT, Chandigarh and Fellow, Panjab University released Prof. Balwant Gargi Stamp on May 31, 2017 in the presence

of Shri P.K. Swain, Chief Postmaster General (Punjab, and Chandigarh) at PU Campus.

4. Prof. Suveera Gill of University Business School, PU, was assigned to look after the work of Chief Vigilance Officer in lieu of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, who had been appointed as Dean of University Instruction by the Syndicate. It will come up as an agenda item.
5. Under the MoU signed between the PU and the University of Wurzburg (UW), Germany, Prof. Upinder Sawhney has gone to Wurzburg to teach a course on the 'Development process of Indian economy'. She will be there for a period of 6 months.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 1(1, 2 &7))

6. In a bid to strengthen academic ties with Julius Maxmilian University of Wurzburg, Germany and to explore possibilities of academic exchange, interaction and cooperation under MoU, Panjab University has selected five girl students (four from Political Science Department and one from Institute of Social Science Education & Research-ISSER) to participate in the International Summer School in Germany from July 27 to August 4, 2017.
7. Government of India had enabled the nucleation of Design Innovation Centre (DIC) at Panjab University, Chandigarh as a part of National Innovation Design network. UIET of PU was identified as a Hub with three spokes at Dentgal Institute, PU, PEC University of Technology and Central Scientific Instruments Organisation (CSIR-CSIO). An update on their operations and progress so far is being made available to the Syndicate for information and perusal. You would be sent this document.
8. I may inform the Syndicate that PU had advertised 93 teaching positions of Assistant Professors in 2013, out of which 63 positions could be filled in the stipulated time. In 2014, another advertisement was given for 153 teaching positions (56 Assistant Professors; 55 Associate Professors and 42 Professors), out of which 44 could be filled (9 Assistant Professors; 25 Associate Professors and 10 Professors) within the validity period of the advertisement (upto May 30, 2015). No advertisement for teaching positions at PU Campus was released in 2015. Last one which was released is 2014. It is in that background that we have sought permission some algorithm to fund us, we should be permitted to start filling up at least all those positions which have been got vacated because people have retired, otherwise the teacher-student ratio would be adversely affected.

9. The Chandigarh Region Innovation and Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) and the Confederation of Indian Industries (CII) has signed a memorandum on industry-academia partnership in the presence of UT Administrator and Governor, Punjab, Shri V.P. Singh Badnore at CRIKC-CII Conclave on Industry-Academia Partnership on July 7, 2017. The MoU envisages that a 'CRIKC-CII (North Region) Industry-Academia (I-A) Board' will be established to prepare a roadmap and devise governance model for enhancing partnership programmes between the research and educational institutes in Chandigarh and industries represented by CII (North Region).
10. Panjab University has submitted a claim of 66495 points for MAKATrophy for the year 2016-17. This is nearly 40% more than the claim of 43380 points during 2015-16, when PU was placed at the second rank. The Sports Director of AIU shall invite all the claimants for the top five spots for validation of their claims, in about ten days from now and before the end of August 2017, the winner of the MAKATrophy shall be declared. The Punjabi University has improved their performance. Last year, they had number which was 67000. For this year, their claim is 19000 points and last year Guru Nanak Dev University was claiming 60000 points. Their claim this year is less than 40000. So, if our claim is validated, we will be able to retain the 2nd position. If the claim of Punjabi University does not get validated then we may have a chance of even becoming a MAKATrophy winner.
11. Five hundred trees have been planted in Sector-25 of PU Campus on Saturday, July 22, 2017 in association with Infosys, IT Park, UT Chandigarh. The Infosys has also been requested to make a grant available to P.U. so that these 500 plants can be cared for during the first three years and we have to put them a proposal in a 50-50 partnership, so that these plants could be cared for during the next three years.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 1(3, 4, 5, 6, 7 &10))

12. Fresenius Kabi Oncology Limited, (FKOL), a multinational from Italy, having office at Gurgaon, has set up a microbiology laboratory at the Cluster Innovation Centre (CIC), operational under the supervision of Dr. Rohit Sharma as Coordinator. A 3-D graphics laboratory was also inaugurated on the occasion by FKOL Secretary and Director, Shri Nikhil Kulshrestha. CIC is co-located along with Department of Microbial Technology in Sector-25.
13. Panjab University has signed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Department of

Biochemistry of Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada for a joint research in the field of biochemistry on July 24. This MoU would facilitate the students and faculty exchange in the area of Biochemistry between the two universities.

14. University Business School had organized an interaction session with the faculty of Nottingham Business School (NBS), the famous business school of UK, on July 24, to explore the possibility of collaboration between the two Institutions for exchange of faculty, students and joint research projects.
15. Centre for Policy Research (CPR), a DST project which enjoins PU to promote Industry-Academia Interaction nationally, held a very successful three day event at PU Campus from August 17-19, 2017. All the five CPRs in India were reviewed on the first day by an expert team lead by Chairman, DST Policy Research Cell, namely, Prof. Baldev Raj, Director, NIAS, Bangalore and Chancellor, Academy of CSIR which is a deemed university now. On the second day, he chaired a committee to review proposals of new Medical Instrumentation Hubs and reviewed existing Hubs in India. PGI is likely to get a Medical Instrumentation Hub in next phase. On the third day Dr. V.K. Saraswat, Member, NITI Aayog and Chancellor, JNU, Dr. Girish Sahni, Director General, CSIR & Dr Baldev Raj participated in Round Table Meet (RTM) on 'Country Specific Models for Public Private Partnership (PPP) to rejuvenate R&D in India'. This RTM was attended by R&D Industry giants from all over India, which included Directors from Reliance Industries Limited, Navi Mumbai, HCL Technologies, Noida, Representative of Research Parks at Indian Institute of Technology, Madras (IITM) and IITD,. The Automotive Research Association of India, Pune, (ARAI), BIRAC (DBT), senior officials from other Departments of Central Government (DST, DBT, BCIL), Directors of CSIR Labs and officials from British High Commission, etc. also were the partner of this Round Table Meet. It lasted the whole day.

Dr V.K. Saraswat spent the whole day at PU and visited other sites on the Campus. Prof. Rupinder Tewari, Coordinator, CPR, very effectively organized the three day back to back events with the assistance of the new young staff of CPR. Dr V.K. Saraswat was very appreciative of the progress made by CPR at PU during the first phase of three years. The second phase of CPR for three years also stands approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 1 (viii, ix, xii and xiii))

I-3. That the syndicate has noted and approved the following:

- (i) Election Commission of India through the office of Chief Electoral Officer, Punjab, has sanctioned the proposal put up by Research Promotion Cell, Panjab University to conduct Endline Survey of Knowledge, Attitude, Practices (KAP) of citizens in the state of Punjab. Professor Ashutosh Kumar and Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal shall coordinate the survey. Office of the CEO, Punjab has accepted the proposal and will release for the above task an amount of Rs.5,45,000/-.
- (ii) School of Oriental Studies (SOAS), University of London and Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS), Mumbai, have partnered with three institutions in India, which include, Panjab University, Chandigarh, Presidency (College) University, Kolkata and South Asian University, Delhi to establish UK-India Research Methods Node: Fostering and consolidating Research training and collaboration in the Social Sciences and Humanities under the UKERI-UGC Collaboration Scheme. This is to run in Project mode for three years and is being funded by a UK-India Fund. This project would lay the foundations for more extensive research between India and UK in Social Sciences and Humanities. Prof. Ronki Ram, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor in Political Science and Fellow, PU, is the lead person from PU in this project. The broad areas identified by the project leaders are: (a) Historical and archival research (b) Development and livelihoods (c) Education, health and well-being and (d) Economic and social change.
- (iii) Shri H.K. Dua, former Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha), Former Editor-in-Chief of Hindustan Times, Indian Express, The Tribune and alumnus of Panjab University, shall deliver the Keynote Address on the theme of 7th Chandigarh Social Science Congress (CHASSCONG) titled 'Achieving Sustainable Development Goals : Opportunities, Challenges & Strategies' scheduled on March 21, 2017 at 10 a.m. in the University Auditorium.
- (iv) Shri Shekhar Gupta, Eminent Journalist, Chairman, Editor-in-Chief, Printline Media Pvt. Ltd. and alumnus Panjab University, will present the Valedictory Address on the theme of the 7th Chandigarh Social Science Congress (CHASSCONG), titled 'Achieving Sustainable Development Goals : Opportunities, Challenges & Strategies' scheduled on March 22, 2017 at 2.30 p.m. in the University Auditorium.
- (v) The first General Body meeting of the Chandigarh Regional Innovation and Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) Society was held at PU on Sunday, February 26, 2017.

On this occasion, the state-of-art video conference facility created under CRIKC in the Central Instrumentation Laboratory (CIL) was inaugurated by the CRIKC President and Vice Chancellor, PU, Prof. Arun K. Grover. This facility has been partially funded from former MPLAD grant made available by the former Member of Parliament, UT, Chandigarh and former Union Minister Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, an alumnus, PU and senior member, P.U. Senate. He has given Rs.1 crore, 2/3rd of which has been utilized for the purchase of buses and the remaining for the office equipment and other facilities.

Similarly Shri H.K. Dua had given a grant which had been utilized by the School of Communication Studies.

- (vi) I am concerned to bring to the attention of members of the Syndicate that a retired faculty member of PU has recently intimidated a senior most officer of the University in discharge of his duty and carrying out orders approved by the Governing Bodies of the University. This kind of conduct causes lot of anguish and I believe the University Officers and staff need to be provided adequate support so that they can withstand intimidation and provocation(s).

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 1 (1, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 10))

- (vii) Professor Roger D. Kornberg, Nobel Laureate, Stanford School of Medicine, Stanford University, USA, visited PU from April 25 to 28, 2017 under the aegis of DST Inspire Scheme. He delivered the Panjab University Pharmaceutical Sciences Oration 2017 on April 25, 2017. He interacted with School students in two Sessions. He also delivered Public lecture at PGIMER and presented a Seminar at CSIR IMTECH on April 27, 2017.
- (viii) Ms. Garima Sharma, Research Scholar doing Ph.D. under the supervision of Prof. Indu Pal Kaur, Nanotechnology Lab at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) has received the prestigious scholarship 'Prime Minister's Fellowship for Doctoral Research'. This is a unique scholarship scheme of Science & Engineering Research Board, Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, implemented by Confederation of Indian Industry. She is the first Research Scholar of Panjab University who has got this Fellowship.

This fellowship gives a given researcher Rs.50,000/-, Rs.25,000/- come from DST and Rs.25,000/- come from other and after two years it becomes Rs.50,000/-. They are also entitled to contingency and they have to work

with the industry from the premise that they are doing their Ph.D. and when its product comes up in patent form.

- (ix) On the basis of performance of the Networking Resource Centre (NRC) in Pharmaceutical Sciences, the Empowered Committee of UGC on Basic Scientific Research, has recommended for Phase II of Networking Resource Centre at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.
- (x) Appointments have been sought with Chief Minister of Punjab and Hon'ble Union Minister of Human Resource and Development to articulate the financial concerns of PU. MHRD, UGC and Punjab Government have also been approached to release the first installment of grant to meet the immediate needs of the University to tide over the crisis.
- (xi) Next hearing of SLP filed by UGC in Apex Court is on May 1, 2017 and that of CWP titled 'Court on its own motion Vs. PU' in Punjab & Haryana High Court is on May 4, 2017.
- (xii) As per NIRF rankings, the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences has been ranked at Number 03 among the Pharmacy Institutes of the country.
- (xiii) Justice B.B. Parsoon, a distinguished alumnus and Chairperson of PU Governance Reforms Committee has been selected by the Supreme Court to be a member on a committee constituted for reviewing the Rules and Procedures to be followed in High Courts all over India. The committee comprises of 8 members, viz., 4 High Court Judges and same number of District Judges.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 1 (1, 7, 8,10,11,12 and 14))

- (xiv) The tuition fee and other charges for the students enrolled in different courses at the affiliated colleges of PU for the year 2017-18, shall remain the same as those in the year 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 1 (10))

- (xv) It is recommended that admission at B.A. first year level in the Department of Evening Studies be restricted to 200 students in 2017-2018 instead of 300 students as had been in the recent years. The pass percentage of students in B.A. I, II and III have been examined to arrive at such a recommendation in consultation with DUI and Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies in addition to feedback from IQAC which looked at the performance of B.A. I, II and III courses.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 1 (11))

(xvi) In view of recent developments concerning financial matters of our University, the 'Think Tank' for financial requirements is proposed to be re-constituted as follows:

- i) Prof. A.K. Grover (Chairman)
Vice Chancellor
- ii) Prof. Meenakshi Malhotra, DUI
- iii) Prof. A.K. Bhandari
- iv) Prof. Rajiv Lochan
- v) Shri Satya Pal Jain
- vi) Prof. D.V.S. Jain
- vii) Prof. Shelly Walia
- viii) Shri Subhash Sharma
- ix) Prof. Keshav Malhotra
- x) Prof. Ronki Ram
- xi) Prof. Navdeep Goyal
- xii) Prof. Sanjay Kaushik
- xiii) PUTA President
- xiv) Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar
- xv) Shri Vikram Nayyar, FDO
Secretary to Vice Chancellor (Convener)

(xvii) There is an urgent need to induct/seek approval from MHRD/UGC for the following officers in the University: Some letters have been received which have been sent to the members by e-mail as a part of the information where we can seek to fill the positions which are vacant. We are seeking approval for:

- i) Chief of University Security
- ii) Fire Officer (new position to be created)
- iii) Medical Officers (there is only one regular Medical Officer and most of the posts are vacant, against some of them temporary arrangements stand made at present)
- iv) Deputy Registrars
- v) Associate and full Professors in the reserved category (SC and ST), which are vacant. We have passed a resolution in the Senate to fill up these posts.
- vi) Assistant Professor positions against which appointments stand made at present on yearly renewal basis in various PU institutes and departments. We have a large number of faculty which is continuing on yearly basis with the approval of the Syndicate. But it is better to think of regularising them by way of advertisement.

- (xviii) A common Committee including representatives from the Colleges, campus, Syndics, Senators, DPI Colleges is proposed to be constituted.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 1 (10, 11 & 12))

I-4. In pursuance of orders dated 27.01.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1286 of 2017 (Mr. Jayanth N. Pethkar Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which is fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, along with CWP No. 26187 of 2016, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 14.02.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Mr. Jayanth N. Pethkar, Associate Professor, School of Communication Studies, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.03.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 28.02.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 15(i))

I-5. In pursuance of orders dated 13.02.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 2534 of 2017 (Dr. Smriti Sood Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which is fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Smriti Sood, Professor, University Business School, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.03.2017 as applicable, in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & other similar cases and

salary be paid which she was drawing as on 28.02.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by her. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.

- (ii) all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 15(ii))

I-6. In pursuance of orders dated 06.04.2017/25.04.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 7196 of 2017 (Dr. Aneel Kumar Raina Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which has been adjourned sine die and will be heard after decision of Division bench in LPA 1505-2016, wherein the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has passed interim orders in the same terms as CWP No.26187 of 2016. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Aneel Kumar Raina, Professor, Department of English and Cultural Studies, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.05.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 30.04.2017 without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) He be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).
- (iii) The office orders regarding re-employment already issued vide No.1781-1788/Estt.-I dated 20.03.2017 have been treated as withdrawn.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(v))

I-7. In pursuance of notice dated 30.01.2017 issued by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1373 of 2017 (Dr. Vijay Nagpal Vs Panjab University & Ors.) wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 14.02.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Vijay Nagpal, Professor, Department of Law, be considered to continue in service as Professor w.e.f. 01.02.2017 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 31.01.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(i))

I-8. In pursuance of notice dated 18.03.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 5573 of 2017 (Dr. Satya Pal Sehgal & Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which is fixed for 25.04.2017, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 25.02.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Satya Pal Sehgal, Professor, Department of Hindi and Dr. Suresh K Chadha, Professor, UBS, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.04.2017 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which they were drawing as on 31.03.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by him. The payment to them shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which they should submit the undertaking as per performa.

- (ii) all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(ii))

I-9. In pursuance of orders dated 22.05.2017/24.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 11226 of 2017 (Dr. (Ms.) Gayathiri Pathmanathan Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) which has been adjourned sine die and will be heard after decision of Division Bench in LPA 1505-2016, wherein the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has passed interim orders in the same terms as CWP No.22165 of 2016. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. (Ms.) Gayathiri Pathmanathan, Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.06.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 31.05.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per Performa.
- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(v))

I-10. In pursuance of orders dated 25.04.2017/24.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 8368 of 2017 (Dr. Renu Chadha & Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which has been adjourned sine die and will be heard after decision of Division Bench in LPA 1505-2016, wherein the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has passed interim orders in the same terms as CWP No.22165 of 2016. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Ashwani Kumar Bhandari, Professor, Department of Mathematics, be considered to continue in service w.e.f.

01.06.2017 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 31.05.2017 without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him will be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.

- (ii) He be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(vi))

I-11. In pursuance of orders dated 25.04.2017/24.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 8368 of 2017 (Dr. Renu Chadha & Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which has been adjourned sine die and will be heard after decision of Division Bench in LPA 1505-2016, wherein the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has passed interim orders in the same terms as CWP No.22165 of 2016. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Renu Chadha, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.06.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 31.05.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(viii))

I-12. In pursuance of orders dated 25.04.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 7773 of 2017 (Dr. Kuldeep Singh Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which has been adjourned sine die and will be heard after decision of Division Bench in LPA No. 1505 of 2016. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University

& Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Kuldip Singh, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Nihalsingh Wala, Moga, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.05.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 30.04.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) if allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(i))

I-13.

In pursuance of orders dated 24.05.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 11527 of 2017 (Dr. Manoj Kumar Sharma Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with CWP No. 22165 of 2016, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim directions issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No. 1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is pending before the Hon'ble High Court, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Manoj Kumar Sharma, Professor, UBS, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.07.2017 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 30.06.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him will be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(ii))

I-14. In pursuance of the interim directions issued by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.3182 of 2017 (Navjeet Kaur Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) the Vice-Chancellor has:

1. Allowed Ms. Navjeet Kaur, Deputy Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., Chandigarh to work continue as such even after 31.03.2017 (the date on which she completes the age of 60 years) to comply te court orders in CWP No.3182 of 2017 (Navjeet Kaur Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) till the final outcome of lthe CWP filed by her.
2. Allowed her to retain the residential accommodation(s) allotted to her by the University on same terms and conditions.
3. Ordered that she be paid salary on the same conditions as the Vice-Chancellor has already ordered that "in the court case (LPA No.1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and others and connected LPAs) be paid salary salary which they were drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 16.08.2016 passed by Hon'ble Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. P.U. and other excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone) as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the LPA filed by them. The payments to all such appellants shall be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the prescribed undertaking".

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(xv))

I-15. That the following faculty members be re-appointed:

- (i) as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) at University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. w.e.f. the date they start work, for the session 2017-18, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same term and conditions according to which they have worked previously during the session 2016-2017, under Regulation 5 page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:
 1. Dr. Abha Sethi
 2. Ms. Shafali
 3. Mr. Harvinder Singh
- (ii) as Part Time Assistant Professor at University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. w.e.f. the date they start work, for the coming session 2017-18, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same term and conditions according to which they have worked previously during the session 2016-2017:
 1. Ms. Nancy Sharma
 2. Mr. Sanjeev Kumar
 3. Ms. Amrit Pal Kaur
 4. Ms. Supreet Gill
 5. Ms. Harman Shergill

6. Ms. Shivani Gupta
7. Dr. Jaswinder Kaur
8. Ms. Alamdeep Kaur

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 18)

- I-16.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following as Assistant Professor at P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Distt. Moga, purely on temporary basis for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break) on the same term and conditions on which they are working earlier vide letter No. 7618-27/Estt.I dated 14.07.2016, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi
2.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English
3.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi
4.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce
5.	Ms. Monica	Commerce
6.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology
7.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics
8.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics
9.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science
10.	Mrs. Simarnjit Kaur	Computer Science

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(xv))

- I-17.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of following Assistant Professors purely on temporary basis at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur to work as such up to 31.05.2017, with one day break as usual against the vacant post of the centre or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/-, plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of Assistant Professor	Branch/Subject
1.	Shri Kanwal Preet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
4.	Ms. Monika	ECE
5.	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
6.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
7.	Shri Gurpinder Singh	I.T
8.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T
9.	Mrs. Ritika Arora	I.T
10.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.
11.	Mr. Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
12.	Mr. Gurwinder Singh	Mech.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(xvi))

I-18. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

(i) extended the term of appointment of following as Assistant Professor (temporary), University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management, P.U. upto June, 2017 on the same term and conditions with one day break as usual:

1. Mr. Gaurav Kashyap
2. Mr. Abhishek Ghai
3. Mr. Manoj Semwal
4. Mr. Amit Katoch
5. Ms. Lipika Gullani

(ii) re-appointed above persons (in terms of decision dated 31.05.2015 of Syndicate) as Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 11.07.2017, for the academic session 2017-18 against the vacant posts of the Institute, or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP plus allowances under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(vi))

I-19. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor (temporary), Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering, Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, upto 30.06.2017 with one day break on 01.05.2017, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(vii))

I-20. That the appointment of Mr. Aman Moudgil as Guest Faculty in UILS, be approved post-facto as a special case and the honorarium @ Rs. 1000/- per lecture subject to the maximum ceiling of Rs.25000/-p.m. be released w.e.f. 21.07.2016, to meet with the audit objection and to avoid the hardship to him, under Regulation 8 appearing at page 113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 3)

I-21. That –

(i) the recommendations of the examiners, of (i) Professor J.N. Agrewala, (ii) Professor Jairoop Singh and (iii) Dr. R.K. Tuli, in respect of evaluation of research work of Dr. Inderjit Singh for award of D.Sc. degree by Panjab University, Chandigarh, under Regulation 4 at page 198 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 be approved; and

- (ii) D.Sc. degree to Dr. Inderjit Singh, under Regulation 4 at page 198 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, be awarded.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 5)

I-22. That:

- (i) the term of appointment of following persons as Assistant Professor (temporary) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U. be extended upto 30.06.2017 on the same term & conditions with one day break on 01.05.2017:

Sr. No.	Name of person	Branch
1.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Maths
2.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Management
3.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Management
4.	Ms. Geetu	Physics
5.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE
6.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE
7.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE
8.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT
9.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT
10.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Chemistry
11.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE
12.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Biotech.
13.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Maths
14.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Biotech.
15.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
16.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
17.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
18.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
19.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
20.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
21.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
22.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Biotech
23.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro-Electronics
24.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
25.	Mr. Chander Prakash	Mech.
26.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
27.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
28.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Physics
29.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Maths
30.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Biotech
31.	Dr. Gursharan Singh	Biotech

- (ii) the persons mentioned above, be re-appointed (afresh) as Assistant Professor (temporary) at UIET, P.U., for next academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. the date they start work, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP

Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which they have worked during the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 7)

I-23. That:

- (i) the term of appointment of Dr. Neha Singla as Assistant Professor (temporary) in the Department of Biophysics, be extended upto 30.06.2017, with one day break on 01.05.2017, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible as per University rules and under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Dr. Neha Singla, be re-appointed (afresh) as Assistant Professor (temporary) in the Department of Biophysics, for next academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. the date she starts work, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 8)

I-24. That –

- (i) Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan, be asked to join the post of Director Public Relation-cum-Editor, P.U. News in the University by 5.5.2017.
- (ii) if she fails to join the University by 5.5.2017, the recommendations (i) to (vii), be approved and process for filling up the post of Director Public Relations be initiated.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 38)

- (iii) the orders of the Vice-Chancellor dated 10.05.2017 with regard to grant of extension in joining time up to 10.05.2017, to Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan as Director of Public Relation-cum-Editor, P.U. News, to meet with the audit objection, be ratified.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 23)

I-25. That the Vice-Chancellor, has extended the term of appointment of the following as Assistant Professors, purely on temporary basis at Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt. Nawanshehar for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break) on the same terms and conditions, on which they were working earlier as per letter No. 7618-

27/Estt.I dated 14.07.2016, under Regulation 5 appearing at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi
2.	Dr. (Ms.) Poonam Dwivedi	English
3.	Mr. Hari Nath	Hindi
4.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi
5.	Ms. Sukhjit Nahar	Sociology
6.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Commerce
7.	Mr. Hari Krishan	History
8.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce
9.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics
10.	Mr. Inder Bhagat	Computer Science
11.	Mr. Deepak	Computer Science

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(iii))

- I-26.** That the Vice-Chancellor, has extended the term of appointment of the following as Assistant Professors at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., purely on temporary basis for the month of May & June 2017 (with one day break), under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-2017:

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member	Designation
1.	Ms. Twinkle Bedi	- Assistant Professor in Computer Engineering
2.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	- Assistant Professor in Mathematics

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(ix))

- I-27.** That the Vice Chancellor has appointed following persons as Guest Faculty, at P.U. Regional Centre, (P.U. Extn. Library), Civil Lines, Ludhiana, on lecture basis on an honorarium of Rs.1000/- per lecture subject to the ceiling of Rs. 25000/- p.m. w.e.f. the date they start working for even semester for Academic Session 2016-17 against the vacant positions of the Centre or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, in terms of decision of the Senate dated 25.5.2014, according to which the departments can appoint upto 3 Guest Faculty/Part-time teachers concurrently against 1 vacant post:

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Subject to be taught
1.	Mr. Prince Marwaha	Economics
2.	Ms. Vijeta Budhiraja	English
3.	Ms. Ekta Gupta	Law
4.	Ms. Tamanna Kohli	Law

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(iii))

- I-28.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professor at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muksar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for one month i.e. upto 31.5.2017 (with one break), on the same terms and conditions on which they are working earlier letter No. 7471-72/Estt. I dated 8.7.2016, under Regulation 5 given at page 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007:

1.	Dr. Gurjit Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Mr. Surinder Singh	Assistant Professor in Political Science
3.	Ms. Seema	Assistant Professor in Physical Education

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(iv))

- I-29.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following persons (who worked during the last session and their work and conduct have been found satisfactory) as Assistant Professor, P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2017-18, w.e.f. the date they start work, against the vacant posts of the Institute, or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 appearing at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of Person	Branch
1.	Shri Kanwal Preet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
4.	Ms. Monika	ECE
5.	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
6.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
7.	Shri Gurpinder Singh	I.T.
8.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.
9.	Ms. Ritika Arora	I.T.
10.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.
11.	Shri Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
12.	Shri Gurwinder Singh	Mech.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(ii))

- I-30.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed following persons as Part-time Assistant Professor, P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) for the session 2017-18, w.e.f. the date they start work for the session:

1. Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha
2. Ms. Kamy Rani

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(iii))

- I-31.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. (Mrs.) Kusum Harjai, Professor, Department of Microbiology, P.U. as Head/Coordinator of Central Animal House for the period of three years w.e.f. the date she takes over the charge, on an honorarium of Rs. 2000/- per month to be paid as per existing budgetary provision of Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(iv))

- I-32.** That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following persons as Part Time Assistant Professor, on an honorarium of Rs. 22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana w.e.f. the date they start work for the current session 2017-18, against the vacant positions of the Centre:

- 1 Ms. Vandana Bhanot
- 2 Mr. Sharwan Sehgal
- 3 Ms. Sarita Paul
- 4 Dr. Kuljit Singh
- 5 Mr. Sunil Mittal

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(v))

- I-33.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted post-facto approval for extension in the term of appointment of Ms. Alamdeep Kaur, as Part-time Assistant Professor, at University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U., w.e.f. 31.08.2016 to 30.04.2017 (for the academic session 2016-17) on the same term and conditions on the basis of which she has worked previously up to 30.08.2016 and also granted her post-facto sanction for maternity leave w.e.f. 31.08.2016 to 26.02.2017=180 days in term of Syndicate decision dated 22.02.2014 and leave without pay for remaining two days i.e. 27 & 28 February 2017, as she joined on 01.03.2017.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(viii))

- I-34.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following persons as Assistant Professor, Department of Biotechnology, P.U., purely on temporary basis, for one more year i.e. for academic session 2017-2018, w.e.f. the date they start the work against vacant post of the Department or till the post are filled in on regular basis through proper selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 +AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007:

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

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(xii))

- I-35.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) the following as Assistant Professors at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 10.07.2017 for the academic session 2017-2018 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis through proper selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances admissible as per university rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-2017:

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member	Designation
1.	Ms. Twinkle Bedi	- Assistant Professor in Computer Engineering
2.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	- Assistant Professor in Mathematics

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(xiii))

- I-36.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Harsimran Kaur Boparai, as Assistant Professor in Anaesthesia, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., (purely on temporary basis) w.e.f. 01.07.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 31.05.2018 with one day break on 30.06.2017 (break day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(xi))

- I-37.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor (Temporary) at Centre for Public Health, IEAST, P.U. till 30.06.2017 (with one day break), under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier vide letter No.5741-42/Estt.-I dated 26.05.2016.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(i))

- I-38.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muksar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break), on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier as per letter No.8482-83/Estt.-I dated 16.08.2016, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

1. Mrs. Inderjot Kaur, Assistant Professor in Law
2. Mr. Hardip Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(ii))

- I-39.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur (purely on temporary basis) for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break) on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier vide letter No.7617/Estt. I dated 14.07.2016, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Punjabi
2.	Dr. Resham Singh	Punjabi
3.	Dr. Harnam Singh	Physical Education
4.	Ms. Simarjeet Kaur	Mathematics
5.	Ms. Nishi	Commerce
6.	Mr. Mohammad Sazid	Commerce
7.	Mr. Harjinder Singh Bhardwaj	Political Science

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(iii))

- I-40.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur, on contract basis for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break), on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier as per letter No. 7610-11/Estt. dated 14.07.2016:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Shri Varun Maini	Computer Science
2.	Shri Pawan Kumar	Computer Science

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(iv))

- I-41.** That the Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Dr. Jyoti Sood as Assistant Professor (temporary), UIET, P.U. upto 30.04.2017.
- (ii) granted further extension w.e.f. 02.05.2017 to 30.06.2017 on the same term and conditions with one day break on 01.05.2017.
- (iii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Jyoti Sood as Assistant Professor (temporary), University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., for the next academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. the date she starts work in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(vii))

- I-42.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor (Temporary) at Centre for Public Health, IEAST, P.U. after 30.06.2017 (with one day break) for the session 2017-18, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier vide letter No.5741-42/Estt.-I dated 26.05.2016.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(xi))

- I-43.** In supersession of order dated 4766-73/Estt-I dated 10.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has allowed Dr. Kuldip Singh, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Distt. Moga, to look after the affairs of P.U. Constituent College at Dharamkot, in addition to his own duties, with immediate effect, till further orders.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 41(i))

- I-44.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term appointment of following as Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break) on the same terms and conditions on which they are working earlier vide letter No.7618-27/Estt.I dated 14.07.2016, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Inderjit Singh	Political Science
2.	Dr. Sukhjeet Singh	Punjabi
3.	Dr. Ram Singh	Commerce
4.	Dr. Sumit Mohan	Hindi
5.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Punjabi
6.	Mrs. Navdeep Kaur	English
7.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Commerce
8.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Economics
9.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	History
10.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Physical Education

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(xii))

- I-45.** That Mohd. Shamshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, P.U. w.e.f. 10.07.2017, for the session 2017-2018, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions according to which they have worked previously during the session 2016-2017 under Regulation 5 appearing at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, as requested by the Chairperson vide letter dated 08.06.2017, Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, P.U.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 2)

I-46. That Dr. Zarreen Fatima, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor in Department of Urdu, P.U., on contract basis at fixed emoluments of Rs. 30400/- per month for the session 2017-18 w.e.f. 10.07.2017 to 31.05.2018, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions according to which she worked previously during the session 2016-17, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 20)

I-47. That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Mr. Saumyadeep Bhattacharya, Assistant Professor in English (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break), on the same terms and conditions on which he is working earlier as per letter No.8739/Estt-I dated 23.08.2016, under Regulation 5 (a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(xiv))

I-48. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Ms. Rajni Chauhan, Assistant Professor in Commerce, University School of Open Learning, P.U., purely on temporary basis, against the vacant post of the Department, w.e.f. the date she starts work, for the academic session 2017-18 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP or Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(iii))

I-49. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed (afresh) the following as Assistant Professors at P.U. Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 10.07.2017 till the end of session 2017-18, or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, with one day break as usual, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/-, plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation	Nature of Appointment
1.	Dr. Gurjit Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi	Temporary basis
2.	Mr. Surinder Singh	Assistant Professor in Political Science	Temporary basis
3.	Ms. Seema	Assistant Professor in Physical Education	Temporary basis

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(iv))

- I-50.** As authorized by the Syndicate meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 18), the Vice-Chancellor has appointed the following persons as technical advisor in Architect and Construction Office, Panjab University, on a fixed honorarium of Rs.15,000/- p.m. for the period of one year i.e. w.e.f. the date he/she joins duty:

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Respective field
1.	Ms. Sumit Kaur	Technical Advisor (Architect), Architect Office, P.U.
2.	Er. Ajit Singh Gulati	Technical Advisor (Electrical), Construction Office, P.U.
3.	Shri Yogesh Gupta	Technical Advisor (Civil), Construction Office, P.U.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(vii))

- I-51.** In terms of the recommendation of the Board of Finance dated 13.02.2017 (Item 2), & Syndicate decision dated 25.02.2017 (Para 3) and in anticipation of the approval of the Senate, has appointed Dr. Khushwinder Kaur, Assistant Professor at Department of Chemistry for one year only against the vacant sanctioned post, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 1.03.2017 or till the regular post is filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. calendar Vol. I, 2007.

- NOTE:** 1. The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/ specialization(s) and to meet the needs of the allied departments at a given point of time, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.
2. The copy of circular has been issued by the Estt. vide Endst. No. 1876-80/Estt. 1 dated 24.3.2017 to the quarter concerned.

- I-52.** That –

- (i) the Syndicate reaffirms that re-employment of Professor Vijay K. Chopra stands curtailed w.e.f. 31.01.2017;
- (ii) the University should not avail the services of Professor Vijay K. Chopra for any further teaching assignment as per liberty accorded to the University by the High Court;
- (iii) the continuing misdemeanours of Professor Vijay K. Chopra are out-rightly condemned, particularly which amount to threatening or coercing the officers and Senate/Syndicate members of the University, who are performing their duties, under the direction and supervision of competent authority.

NOTE The Syndicate authorised the Vice-Chancellor:

- (i) to communicate to the Advisor to the Administrator, U.T. Chandigarh all the misdemeanours of Professor Vijay K. Chopra along with relevant papers;
- (ii) to seek legal opinion on filing a defamation and/or misappropriation case against Professor Vijay K. Chopra.
- (iii) the Syndicate was also constituted a Committee including Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Mohammad Khalid to follow up the cases of misappropriation of funds of Punjab Financial Corporation by Professor Vijay K. Chopra. The Vice-Chancellor be authorised to nominate the Chairperson of the Committee amongst them.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 9)

I-53. To note the orders dated 24.4.2017 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in LPA -1651-2016 (O&M) Dr. Vijay Chopra versus Panjab University others.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(vi))

I-54. To note letter No. VPS/15/1/2017 dated 03.03.2017 received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to the Vice-President of India, New Delhi, along with e-mail dated 27.02.2017 of Professor Vijay K. Chopra, DES-MDRC, P.U. regarding alleged mismanagement and irregularities in P.U.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 15(v))

I-55. To note the reply dated 10.07.2017 sent to Shri Venkata Sastry Yedla, Director (U.II) MHRD, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of India, New Delhi, pursuant to letter No. VPS/15/2/2012 dated 14.06.2017 of Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to the Vice-President of India.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(v))

I-56. In partial supersession to office order No. 2005-12/Estt.I dated 30.3.2017, the Vice-Chancellor has allowed Dr. Vijay Nagpal, Professor Department of Laws to continue in service as professor w.e.f. 1.2.2017 without any break, and avail the salary benefits, which he was drawing as on 31.1.2017 excluding HRA, subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjusted against the final dues to

him for which he has to give an undertaking on the attached format giving reference to his own court case.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(i))

I-57. That the Vice-Chancellor, has granted extension in joining time of Dr. Harmanjot Dhindsa, Medical Officer (Full-Time), BJK Institute of Health, P.U. for one month i.e. up to 14.07.2017.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(vi))

I-58. That the Vice-Chancellor, has allowed to include the page containing category III(E) (ii) & III F and a note, in the application form of Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (3rd Amendment Regulation, 2016), already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.04.2017 (Para 26).

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(vii))

I-59. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Board of Control dated 06.02.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following rules for admission to B.A. Honours in Economics and Admission criteria for B.A. Honours in Economics to be incorporated in Handbook of Information-2017:

Rules for admission to B.A. Honours in Economics:

Eligibility Conditions:

1. Given the quantitative requirements of the program, only students who have passed mathematics at the Class XII level are eligible for admission.
2. The candidate must not be above 20 years of age as on 1st August of the year in which admission is sought to the First Semester (22 years in the case of SC/ST).

Admission criteria for B.A. Honours in Economics to be incorporated in Handbook of Information-2017:

- (i) On merit basis.
 - (ii) (a) The merit will be calculated on the basis of the marks secured in best five subjects, which must include Mathematics & English.
 - (b) 2% additional weightage of marks obtained at (a) above will be given to students who have studied economics at +2 level.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 14(ii))

I-60. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Board of Control dated 06.02.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following admission Criteria for M.A. Economics in the Department of Economics to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information-2017:

Admission Criteria for M.A. Economics in the Department in Economics:

3. The admission to various courses in the Department of Economics will broadly conform to the conditions as per Panjab University Calendar. However, in view of the fact that the students of M.A. Economics from the department compete with the students from Delhi School of Economics, Jawaharlal Nehru University and other reputed Universities, the members of Board of Control unanimously decided that:-

It is imperative that the students entering the department for Master's course must have studied economics equivalent to the students who graduate from Panjab University with Economics as one of the subjects in B.A. Accordingly, the following must be incorporated in the admission criteria and calculation of merit at the time of admission. It was, further, reiterated that this condition must be applicable to the students seeking admission in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh:

- (i) On merit basis
- (ii) Students who have studied economics less than 25% of the aggregate marks at the undergraduate level of Panjab University or any other recognized University will be considered as having studied inadequate economics, therefore, the student will be awarded zero out of 600 marks.
- (iii) Honours weightage would be given only to students who have studied at least four papers of Economics in Economics Honours in addition to their fulfilling the adequacy condition in Economics as defined in (ii) above.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 14(iii))

I-61. That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Academic Committee dated 14.02.2017 regarding criteria for PU CET (PG) Entrance Test for admission in M.A. History Semester-I, for the session 2017-18:

- The Candidates should have passed the written Entrance Test conducted by Panjab University, Chandigarh. The merit list will be prepared considering the marks obtained in the Entrance Test and the Qualifying Examination as per the following criteria:

Written Test	:	50%
Qualifying Examination	:	50%

The pass percentage of entrance test in history is 35% (30% in case of candidates belonging to SC/ST/BC/PWD) w.e.f. the session 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 14(iv))

I-62. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Academic/ Administrative Committee dated 24.3.2017 and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following eligibility criteria for Master Course in Defence and Strategic in the Department of Defence and National Security Studies for the academic session 2017-18:

- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45% marks in the subject of Post graduate course (Defence and Strategic Studies) or 50% marks in the aggregate.
- (ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of Post graduate course (Defence and Strategic Studies).
- (iii) Bachelor's degree in any discipline with 50% marks in the aggregate.
- (iv) Master's degree examination in any other subject.
- (v) Candidate belonging to Armed Forces i.e. Army, Navy, Air Force & Central Armed Police Forces (CAPF) after having put in five years of regular service provided they have passed the graduation examination.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxii))

I-63. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following eligibility conditions laid down by Bar Council of India vide No. BCI: D: 1519 (LE:cir-6) dated 17.09.2016 for B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 years Integrated course:

Course	Eligibility
B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 years/B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 years Integrated Course	<p>Candidate should have passed 10+2 examination with at least 50% marks (45% marks in case of SC/ST/BC/PWD) from any recognized Board/University.</p> <p>The applicants who have obtained 10+2 Higher Secondary Pass Certificate or First Degree Certificate after prosecuting Studies in distance or correspondence method shall also be considered as eligible for admission in the Integrated Five Years Course.</p> <p>The applicants who have obtained 10+2 through Open Universities system directly without having any</p>

	<p>basic qualification for prosecuting such studies are not eligible for admission in the law courses. As per proviso and explanation to Rule 5 (b) of Bar Council of India Rules of Legal Education, 2008.</p> <p>The admission to the said course/s shall be on the basis of merit of Entrance Test and 10+2 marks and other admissible weightage.</p> <p>No candidate shall be eligible for admission to 1st semester of B.A./B.Com. LL.B.(Hons.) unless he/she appears in and qualifies the Entrance Test for the relevant year of admission.</p> <p>A student who falls short of lectures in the 1st Semester of the said course/s in any previous academic session shall be eligible for admission on qualifying the Entrance Test again provided she/he fulfils all other eligibility conditions.</p> <p>The admission to the said course/s shall be on the basis of Final Merit List.</p>
--	---

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xiv))

I-64. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved following eligibility conditions for admission to Bachelor of Laws (LL.B. Professional 3 Years Course-Semester System) for the session 2017-18:

The entrance test for Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.) based on PUCET (PG) shall be open to all such candidates who possess the qualifications as mentioned below:-

- Bachelor's/Master's Degree in any discipline with at least 45%* marks in aggregate from Panjab University or any other University recognized by Bar Council of India and Panjab University.
- In case of a candidates having a Bachelor's degree of this University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate, through Modern Indian Languages (Hindi or Urdu or Punjabi (Gurmukhi Script) and/or in a classical Languages (Sanskrit or Persian or Arabic) the aggregate of 45% marks shall be calculated by taking into account the percentage of aggregate marks that he had secured at the language examination, excluding the marks for additional optional paper, English and the elective subject taken together.

*5% concession is admissible in eligibility marks to SC/ST/BC/PWD candidates.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xvi))

- I-65.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the total number of the seats for B.A. LL.B and LL.B courses in the campus of Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Hoshiarpur, will be 60 in each course for the session 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xvii))

- I-66.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved 60 seats for LL.B. 3 year course and 60 seats for B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) at University Institute of Law, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, as mentioned in the Bar Council of India letter No. BCI:D:1501/2015 (LE) dated 30.07.2015.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xviii))

- I-67.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved following eligibility criteria for admission to M.Sc. (Hons.) in Chemistry, Department of Chemistry & Centre of Advanced Studies in Chemistry, P.U:

Eligibility Criteria approved by the Syndicate vide Para 47-R(xxviii) dated 20.01.2017	Proposed Criteria
(a) B.Sc. (H.S.) student of P.U. after passing B.Sc. (H.S.) in Chemistry from Department of Chemistry, Panjab University OR (b) Admission based on P.U. CET-(PG) for B.Sc. (Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks from P.U. or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry in all the three years/six semesters and (ii) any two science subjects during two years/four semesters during graduation. One of the subjects can be Mathematics along with another science subject.	(a) No Change OR (b) Admission based on P.U. CET-(P.G.) for B.Sc. (Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks from P.U. or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry in all the three years/six semesters and (ii) any two Science subjects during two years/four semesters during graduation.
(c) The maximum of 5% weightage be given to B.Sc. (Hons.) students.	(c) The maximum of 15% weightage be given to B.Sc. (Hons.) students.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xix))

I-68. That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 24.03.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the eligibility/admission criteria for the following course in the Department of French & Francophone Studies, P.U. Chandigarh, for the session 2017-18:

Course	No. of seats	Duration of Course	Eligibility	Admission Criteria
Certificate	200+ (20 NRI)	One year	(a) +2 examination of the Board of School Education, Punjab/ Haryana or Central Board of Secondary Education, Delhi. Or (b) An examination of another University/ Board/Body recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent.	On Merit
Diploma	50+ (5 NRI)	One year	(a) Certificate course in French. (b) B.A. Part-I examination with French as an elective subject of Panjab University. (c) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a) and (b) as above. Provided that:- (i) For admission to Diploma Course in French, a candidate who has obtained A2 de 1 ^{re} Alliance Francaise shall also be eligible	On Merit
Advanced Diploma	29+ (3 NRI)	One year	(a) Diploma in French. (b) B.A. Part-II examination with French as an elective subject of Panjab University. (c) An examination of another University/ Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a) and (b) as above. Provided that: (i) For admission to Diploma Course in French, a candidate who has obtained B1 de 1 ^{re} Alliance Francaise shall also be eligible.	On Merit
M.A.	17+(2 NRI)	Two Years	(i) A Bachelor's degree with at	On Merit

			<p>least 45 percent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 percent marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.</p> <p>(iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>Provided that:</p> <p>(i) For the M.A. in French, a candidate who has a bachelor's degree under 10+2+3 system of education and Advanced Diploma in French with at least 45 percent marks from Panjab University or any other University recognized by Panjab University shall also be eligible.</p> <p>(ii) A candidate who has Master's degree in any other subject must have the knowledge of French equivalent to that of Graduation level/ Advanced Diploma to be eligible to apply for M.A. in French.</p> <p>(iii) A candidate who has 50 percent marks in the aggregate in Bachelor's degree must have the knowledge of French equivalent to that of Graduation level/ Advanced Diploma to be eligible to apply for M.A. in French.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxv))

I-69. That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the eligibility/admission criteria for the following course at School of Communication Studies to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information, 2017:

Course	No. of seats	Duration of Course	Eligibility	Mode of Admission
M.A. (Journalism & Mass Communication)	30+5 (2 NRI)	Two Years	<p>A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course:</p> <p>(i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 percent marks in the subject of Journalism & Mass Communication.</p> <p>(ii) Bachelor's degree in any subject attaining at least 50% marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(iii) Bachelor's degree with Honours in the subject of Journalism & Mass Communication.</p> <p>(iv) Master's degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>Admission based on P.U. CET (PG) Entrance Test</p>	<p>Admission based on P.U. CET (PG) Entrance Test</p> <p>Entrance Test:60% Qualifying</p> <p>Examination: 40%</p> <p>The total marks for Entrance Test are 75, which have been split up as under:</p> <p>(i) Marks for written test 65 (ii) Marks for Group Discussion 5 (iii) Marks for Interview 5</p> <p>The aggregate marks obtained above will be normalized to marks scored out of 60.</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>1. Only those candidates will be called for group discussion & interview, in order of merit, who have secured a minimum of 40% marks in the Written test except in case of candidates belonging to Scheduled Caste/ Scheduled Tribes who must secure a minimum of 35% marks.</p> <p>2. The number of candidates called by the department for group discussion/interview shall be five times the number of seats</p>

				<p>in each category is very large.</p> <p>3. Should any category not have five times the number of candidates then all the candidates in that particular category discussion and interview.</p> <p>4. The candidates called for Group Discussion and Interview will have to produce Detailed Marks Card (DMC) of the qualifying exam certificates in original on or before the final day of Group Discussion/Interview schedule, failing which they shall not be allowed to participate in the Group discussion and interview.</p>
PG Diploma in Advertising & Public Relations	15	1 year	Bachelor's degree from this University or another recognized University	Admission based on an Entrance Test at departmental level
Ph. D. Program	Subject to availability	3-year program up to three year extension	Master's degree (at least 55% marks for General Category and 50% marks for SC/ST category)	Admission based on an Entrance Test NET/JRF

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxvi))

I-70. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following eligibility criteria for admission to M.A. History of Art to be incorporated in the Hand Book of Information, 2017:

- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.
- (ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.
- (iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.
Provided that-

For History of Art, a person who has passed one of the following shall be eligible-

- (1) B.A. (Pass) examination with 45 per cent marks in any of the following subjects:-
 - (a) Art
 - (b) Music
 - (c) Psychology
 - (d) Philosophy
 - (e) Sociology
 - (f) Sanskrit
 - (g) History
 - (h) English
 - (i) Ancient Indian History Culture & Archaeology
 - (j) Home Science
 - (k) Any one of the Modern Indian Languages/Classical Languages;
- (2) B.A. (Pass)/B.Sc. (Home Science) examination in second division with at least 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.
- (3) B.F.A./Bachelor of Architecture examination with at least 45 per cent marks in the aggregate
- (4) Master's examination in any subject.
Provided he qualifies in an aptitude test conducted by the Department of Art History and Visual Arts as per guidelines laid down by the concerned Board of Control.

NOTE: A person who has passed one of the above mentioned examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognised by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxvii))

I-71. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Academic Committee dated 24.3.2017 and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following eligibility and admission criteria in the Department of History, P.U., w.e.f. the session 2017-18:

Eligibility Criteria

1. B.A. with Honours in History

2. Bachelor's degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate.
3. B.A. (Pass)/B.Sc. (Pass) examination in full subjects obtaining at least 45% marks in the subject of History.
4. Master's degree examination in another subject or another faculty.

Admission Criteria

1. The candidates should have passed the written Entrance Test conducted by Panjab University, Chandigarh. The merit list will be prepared considering the marks obtained in the Entrance Test and the Qualifying Examination as per the following criteria:

Written Test	:	50%
Qualifying Examination	:	50%
2. Academic and other weightage if any will be based on the percentage of marks obtained by the eligible candidates in the Qualifying examination as prescribed in Section 16.1 of Handbook of Information.
3. The pass percentage of entrance test in history is 35% (30% in case of candidates belonging to SC/ST/BC/PWD).

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxviii))

I-72. That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Academic and Administrative Committee of School of Punjabi Studies dated 24.03.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the eligibility criteria for admission to M.A. Punjabi as under:

- (i) Bachelor's Degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subjects of Post-Graduate course or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate provide the candidate has passed Punjabi as an elective or literature subject.
- (ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School Course.
- (iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject provided the candidate must have studied Punjabi as a compulsory subject at graduation level.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxix))

I-73. That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Administrative-cum-Academic Committee in Sanskrit 03.04.2017 of Department of Sanskrit and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved that a person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by

the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:

- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 percent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course.
- (ii) A Bachelor's degree obtaining 50 percent marks in the aggregate provided the candidate has passed Sanskrit as an elective or literature subject.
- (iii) B.A. with Honour's in the Subject of the Post Graduate Course.
- (iv) B.Sc. Honour's School Course.
- (v) Master's degree examination in any other subject provided the candidate has studies Sanskrit at Graduation level.
- (vi) For M.A. Sanskrit Part-I course, a person who has passed "Shastri" examination either under 3 year (10+2+3) Degree Course New Scheme or under the Old Scheme (10+2+3) Degree Course.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxx))

I-74. That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Academic and Administrative Committees dated 24.03.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the eligibility/admission criteria for admission to M.A. 1st semester (English) in the Department of English and Cultural Studies, P.U, Chandigarh, as under to be incorporated in the Hand book of Information of 2017:

Course	No. of seats	Duration of Course	Eligibility	Mode of Admission
M.A. (English)	95+5 (Vocational subject/ Functional English)+ 15 (NRI seats)	Two Years (Semester System)	A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or from any other University whose examination has been recognized equivalent to the corresponding examination of this University: (xlvi) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 percent marks in English (Elective). (xlvii) A bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 percent marks in English Compulsory subject. (xlviii) Bachelor's degree in	Based on Entrance Test (PU CET) The pass percentage in case of Entrance Test in English stands increased to 35% (30% in case of candidate belonging to SC/ST/BC/PWD w.e.f. the session 2013-14. Merit criteria: Academics : 50% PGCET : 50% 5% additional seats

			any faculty obtaining at least 50 percent marks in the aggregate. (xlix) B.A. with honours in English. (l) B.A./B.Sc. with Honours in subject other than English obtaining at least 50 percent marks in the aggregate. (li) Master's degree in any other subject obtaining at least 50 percent marks in the aggregate.	created for Vocational Subject (Functional English)
--	--	--	---	---

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxxii))

I-75. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved eligibility criteria for admission to M.A. (Education) course in the Department of Education, P.U., Chandigarh, for the session 2017-18:

A person who has passed one of the following examination from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:-

- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.
- (ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.
- (iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.

Provided that:

- (a) For the Education Course, Bachelor's degree in any discipline/stream with 50% marks from only recognized Indian University with B.Ed.

OR

For the Education Course, A student who has passed B.A./B.Sc. examination with Education; or Philosophy; or Psychology; or Sociology; or Public Administration; or History; or Economics; or Geography; or Political Science; or Anthropology with 50% marks.

- (b) For the Education Course, A Foreign National student having 50% marks in the qualifying examination or equivalent grade from Foreign University having the equivalent graduate degree certificate by the Association of Indian University (AIU).

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxxiii))

I-76. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendations (Item No.1 & 2) dated 29.03.2017 of the Joint Administrative and Academic Committees of Centre for Social Work regarding Eligibility conditions and weightage criteria for admission to Master of Social Work:

Item No.1: Eligibility conditions for Admission to Master of Social Work (as per Calendar Volume-II, page No.91 at Sr. No.11.1).

A person who has passed one of the following examinations from Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:-

- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 percent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 percent marks in the aggregate.
- (ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School Course.
- (iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.

In addition, for admission to Master of Social Work, a person who has passed the Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45% marks in the subject of Social Work from a recognized University/Institute or a person who has passed a Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 50% marks in any faculty from a recognized University/Institute shall also be eligible for admission to Master of Social Work.

Item No.2: Weightage Criteria for Admission to Master of Social Work.

10 (Ten) times the number of category wise seats will be called for Group Discussion and Personal Interview strictly on the basis of merit of qualifying examination. Weightage will be given as follows:-

Qualifying examination	: 85% weightage
Group discussion	10% weightage
Interview	5% weightage

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(XXXIV))

I-77. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Academic Committee of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies dated 24.3.2017 and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following admission criteria for P.G. Course in Comparative Study of Religion as mentioned in the University Calendar Volume II 2007 at page 91:

- A. A person who has passed out one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognised by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course:
- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45% marks in the subject of Post graduate course or 50% marks in the aggregate.
 - (ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of Post graduate course or B.Sc. Hons School course.
 - (iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.
- B. For the course comparative studies of Religion a person who has passed B.A./B.Sc. examination with History, Ancient History, Religious Studies, Religious and Sikh Study, Sikh Study, Philosophy, Sociology, Social Work, Modern Indian Languages obtaining at least 45% marks shall also be eligible.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxxv))

I-78. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following changes in eligibility condition at Centre for Human Rights & Duties, to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information, 2017:

- 11.1 An applicant who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:-
- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 percent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course or 50 percent marks in the aggregate in any of the social science discipline.
 - (ii) B.A. with Honour's in the Subject of the Post Graduate Course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.
 - (iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.
Provided that:
 - (a) For the Human Rights & Duties course, if an applicant who has passed one of the following examinations shall also be eligible:

B.A. (Pass) with 45 percent marks in Political science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology or History, Women's Studies, Police Administration, Public Administration, Social Work, Gandhian and Peace Studies.

- (b) A Postgraduate Diploma in the subject of Human Rights with 50% marks.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxxvi))

I-79. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the emergent faculty meeting of the Department of Political Science dated 30.3.2017 and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the eligibility criteria, etc., for admission to M.A. Political Science for the academic session 2017-18 to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information 2017, as under:

1. Only the eligibility criteria for admission to M.A. (Political Science) 1st semester, which existed in P.U. Calendar, Vol. II, 2007 Regulation 11.1 and reproduced below, be mentioned in the Handbook of Information 2017:

A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:

- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.
- (ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.
- (iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.
A person who has passed B.A. with 45% marks in any social science discipline shall also be eligible.

2. The following norms be incorporated below the eligibility criteria for admission in M.A. Political Science in the Handbook of Information 2017 so that there is no confusion/ambiguity at the time of admission:

- (i) Subject weightage will be given to those candidates who have taken six full papers in Political Science in B.A. Course.
- (ii) Weightage for Hons. in Political Science i.e. 15% shall be given to those candidates who have studied ten papers in Political Science in B.A. Course.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxxvii))

I-80. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation (Item No. 1) of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 24.03.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that a person who has passed one of the following examination from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:

- (i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.
- (ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.
- (iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.

Provided that: for Gandhian and Peace Studies course, a person who has passed one of the following examinations at Graduation and Post Graduation shall also be eligible:-

For Gandhian Studies obtaining 45 per cent marks in any of the subjects in Gandhian & Peace Studies, History, Political Science, Economics, Philosophy, Psychology, Public Administration, Geography, Sociology, Ancient Indian History- Culture & Archeology, Women Studies, Human Rights & Duties, Defence Studies, Social Work, Police Administration and Graduation in any stream with 50% marks in the aggregate.

60% Academic Merit and 40% Aptitude Test on Departmental level.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 40(xxxviii))

I-81. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved that Dr. Monika Nagpal, Assistant Professor on temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, be granted exemption in fee for higher study (MDS), from the said Institute, and permitted to retain her seat on payment of token amount of 10% of the tuition fee, if, she gets a seat in MDS course.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 36(v))

I-82. That request dated 11.5.2017 of Dr. Monika Nagpal, Assistant Professor on temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted and she be granted 50% exemption in fee for higher study (MDS) from the said Institute

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 4)

I-83. That the residence building at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur campus (which was donated by Late Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger), be converted into a guest house and the immediate

family members of Late Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger be allowed to stay in this guest house accommodation free of cost as and when they visit the campus in the coming years.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 9)

I-84. That inspection report dated 03.06.2017 of Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, Fire & Emergency Services, regarding Fire & Safety point of view in the Administrative Block of Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted and the Fire Safety Manual for Panjab University, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 18)

I-85. That Girls Hostel No. 10, P.U., be named as Neerja Bhanot Hostel.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 12)

I-86. That in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Finance dated 1st August 2017, the request made by Shri J.S. Rathore, Assistant Professor, DCMS, USOL in his representations be not acceded to.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 11)

I-87. That –

- (i) the status of actions/court proceedings/ departmental enquiry against Ms. Pooja Bagga and Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), Pension Cell with regard to misappropriation of funds by Ms. Pooja Bagga, Ex-Daily wage, Clerk, Pension Cell, be noted; and
- (ii) the subsistence allowance being paid to Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), Pension Cell, be continued to be paid as earlier.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 21)

I-88. That concern of the Syndicate be conveyed to Dr. Sarvnarinder Kaur, Department of Biophysics for approaching the National Commission for Scheduled Caste without first trying to sort out the issue at the University level.

NOTE: A Committee of the following persons has been constituted to look into the matter and submit its report:

1. Professor Pam Rajput
2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
3. Professor Promila Pathak, President, PUTA
4. New President, PUTA (to be elected)

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 26)

I-89. That Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Registrar and few other Syndicate members be requested to visit the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Panipat and explore better options regarding utilization/disposal of the two properties of Panjab University situated there.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 29)

I-90. That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to approve the revised Ph.D. Registration Form (s), as recommended by the committee (constituted by the DUI) in its meeting dated 13.01.2017 with suggested modifications.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 6)

I-91. That report of the survey committee dated 18.04.2017 in respect of newly proposed degree College namely Doraha College for Girls, Doraha, Distt. Ludhiana, to undertake and assess the availability of Land/Building/required Infrastructure and other facilities for starting of the proposed new course, be approved subject to verification of the Land Use Certificate from the competent authority.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 11)

I-92. To note the letter dated 06.05.2017 of President, Punjab Government College Principal Association.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(ii))

I-93. To note the recommendation (No.5) of the Sub-Committee dated 31.3.2017 that the nomenclature of the M.Sc. (Honours School), be changed to M.Sc. (Honours School System) as per specimen.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(iii))

I-94. To note the recommendations dated 25.04.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding complaint of Ms. Sapandeeep Verma against Guru Nanak College of Education, Gopalpur, Distt. Ludhiana.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(x))

I-95. That of the report PUCASH on complaint of sexual harassment, be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 33)

I-96. To note the letter No.VPS/15/2/2012 dated 10.04.2017 received from the Chancellor office.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(xi))

I-97. That a communication be sent to the MHRD requesting them to expedite the reply as the matter has already been delayed beyond the permissible limit of 90 days which is a violation of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 6)

- I-98.** That there being unanimity on referring the matter to PUCASH, the Registrar is authorised to seek directions from the Joint Secretary, MHRD and OSD to the Vice-President of India and act accordingly.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 25)

- I-99.** To note the complaint received from a Principal of an affiliated College of Panjab University, by the Vice-Chancellor.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(xiii))

- I-100.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allow to adopt Gazette Notification of Govt. of India, New Delhi dated 29.05.2017 with regard to the amendments made in NCTE Regulation 2014.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(x))

- I-101.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the guidelines 2017 for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree(which are in conformity with UGC Minimum Standards and Procedures for the award of Ph.D. degree) Regulation 2016 and the said guidelines will become effective from the date of issuance of circular i.e. 29.06.2017.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 42(vi))

- I-102.** To note DO letter No. 1/3/2013-PD dated 27.3.2017 received from Girish Sahni, Secretary Government of India, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research and Director General that the Hon'ble Prime Minister of India, in his capacity as ex-officio President of CSIR, has nominated the Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, as one of the members of the Governing Body for a term of three year with effect from 06th January 2017 to 05th January 2020.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(v))

- I-103.** To note letter No.1847/DUI/DS dated 19.04.2017 of Dean of University Instruction along with minutes dated 01.03.2017 of Tender Committee for the opening of Technical and Financial bid for the implementation of "Cloud-Based Online Admission Management Services [Software as a Service-Managed Services] for admission to Teaching Departments at Panjab University (PU), Chandigarh for the academic session 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(vi))

- I-104.** That the Vice-Chancellor has allowed to invest a sum of Rs.8,46,800/- (comprising of Rs.8,00,000/- as additional donation made by Professor DVS Jain for existing endowment namely 'Smt. Prem Lata and Professor D.V.S Jain Research Foundation' and Rs.46800/- as interest accrued @ 25% during the year 2015-16) in the shape of FDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited

compounded quarterly in the Special Endowment Trust Fund A/c No.10444978140.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(viii))

- I-105.** That the Vice-Chancellor has accepted the additional donation of Rs.27,50,000/- (Rs. Twenty Seven Lakhs fifty thousand) made by the family of Dr. Urmi Kessar in the existing endowment namely 'Dr. Urmi Kessar Oration/Lecture' and has also allowed to invest the same in the shape of FDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year in the Special Endowment Trust Fund A/c No.10444978140.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 41(xvi))

- I-106.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendations (No. iv & v) of the Sub-Committee of Administrative Committee dated 19.05.2017 USOL, to be incorporated in the Prospectus of PU-MBA (Executive) Entrance Test-2017:

- (i) The cut off percentage for MBA (Executive) for General Category should be 20% and for reserved category (SC/ST/BC/PwD etc.) should be 15%.
- (ii) The fee for MBA (Executive) and B.Ed. students will be charged only through Bank draft. The MBA students will deposit draft amounting to Rs.24,487/- and B.Ed. students will deposit draft amounting to Rs.16,892/-

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(vii))

- I-107.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Florida Polytechnic University, USA.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 36(iv))

- I-108.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh and M/s Boolean Ventura Private Limited, New Delhi.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 40(x))

- I-109.** That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh and M/s Esteem Industries Inc. Baddi, H.P., be executed.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 26)

- I-110.** That execution of Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Indian Academy of Sciences, Bengaluru and Panjab University, Chandigarh, regarding Refresher Course in Experimental Physics, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 38)

I-111. That Agreements for Internship and Academic Faculty Exchange under the Memorandum of Understanding between Faculty of Science/Biochemistry, Panjab University and Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada, be executed.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 31)

I-112. That the Vice-Chancellor, (as authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 1/15/28 & 29.05.2016) (Para 6) (Item No.12) has allowed the addition in the eligibility conditions for M.Sc. (Biochemistry) (Two year course) (Semester System) newly introduced in the affiliated Colleges of P.U. in Regulation 2 at page 132-133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-15) be made, and given effect to in anticipation of the approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/Publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(xiv))

I-113. That –

- (i) The orders of the Vice-Chancellor, passed in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, with regard to allowing a special fee of Rs.55,000/- to Shri Ajay Sood, advocate in the criminal case titled State vs Ms. Pooja Bagga & Others, to meet with the Audit Objection, be ratified; and
- (ii) Vice-Chancellor be authorised to allow the special fee in special cases (e.g. where the University is having huge financial implications etc.) before any court of Law.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 7)

I-114. That minutes dated 19.07.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to evaluate the applications of students from Law Courses for transfer from one Institute to the other within the Panjab University System of Institutions, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 32)

I-115. That minutes dated 22.06.2017 of the committee regarding the requests of certain Education Colleges to allow them to start M.A. (Education)/other courses, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 36)

I-116. To note and approve the status report regarding loss and reconstruction of record of Accounts Department in consequence to the incident of fire dated 14.05.2017.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(xiii))

I-117. To note the e-mail dated 19.06.2017 received from OSD to Vice President of India and Chancellor, P.U., and the reply already sent to him vide letter dated 16.06.2017, with regard to the clarification and follow up

actions regarding Professor V.K. Chopra (Retd.) and issue arising out of his submissions, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 25.02.2017 (Para 17).

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(xiv))

- I-118.** That the minutes (Item No. 1 & 2) dated 19.04.2017, of the Committee, under the Chairmanship of Dean of Science Faculty comprising the Chairpersons of Science departments (as per authorisation given by Faculty of Science), be approved.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 23)

- I-119.** To note letter dated 20.06.2017 sent in partial supersession to letter No. 1333-34 dated 15.3.2017 to The Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education), Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi, regarding amendment/ additions/ deletions in various Regulations relating to pension appearing at pages 180-191 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(xvi))

- I-120.** To note two letters dated 19.06.2017, regarding Financial support to Panjab University, Chandigarh, addressed to Secretary, University Grants Commission, New Delhi and Additional Chief Secretary Finance, Government of Punjab by Dr. K.K. Tripathy, Director, MHRD.

NOTE: A copy of the above said letters have been sent to the Fellows, P.U. through e-mail on 21.06.2017.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(xviii))

- I-121.** That the Vice-Chancellor has approved minutes dated 04.07.2017 of the Committee, constituted to discuss creamy layer status of backward class candidates.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 43(xiii))

- I-122.** To note the unsigned letter of all research scholars and students of Centre for Public Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh endorsed by a Senate member.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 41(xix))

- I-123.** That –
- (i) the concern and anguish of the Syndicate be conveyed to Principal-cum-Professor of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U., Chandigarh on the letter written by him to the Vice-Chancellor.
 - (ii) the photograph of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge be installed in the entrance area at appropriate place as per proposal sent to the Dental Institute.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 16)

I-124. That temporary affiliation to newly proposed Institute, namely, Institute of Management, DAV College Campus, Sector-10, Chandigarh (under DAV College Management, New Delhi), for M.B.A. course 1st year (60 seats), for the session 2017-2018, as recommended by the affiliation Committee dated 17.07.2017 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor as authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9) be granted subject to the fulfilment of the following conditions:

- (i) the requirement of land for the proposed Institute be got separated from the master plan of land allotted to DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh;
- (ii) that for the current session the admissions be made on the basis of CAT score;
- (iii) the four teachers transferred from the DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh to the proposed Institute be treated on deputation for a period of six months;
- (iv) the process for appointment of required faculty be initiated.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 21)

I-125. That Principal I.S. Sandhu be assigned the duty to look after the affairs of the constituent College at Ferozepur and Principal and Principal N.R. Sharma for the Constituent College at Dharamkot in addition to their own duties.

NOTE: That recommendations of the Committee dated 17.11.2016, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor be approved. The same committee would further look into the issue of deputation on appointment as Principal for 5 years in a College.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 28)

I-126 To note the interim report of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding facts or errors which occurred in conduct of examination, for session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2017 Para 37(xii))

I-127. That –

- (i) the enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba be accepted. Syndicate noted that three persons were pronounced guilty, however, penalty can be imposed only one of them namely, Shri P.K. Ghai, in the present circumstances. Shri P.K. Ghai is directed to deposit an amount of Rs.10,382/- in the University account being the then cost of 12 drums of bitumen and with this the case be closed.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 8)

- (ii) current market rate of 12 drums of bitumen and current market rate of transportation, of the cost at that time as mentioned at (i) Rs.8817/- on account of short receipt of 12 drums of bitumen from Mathura to P.U. Store and (ii) Rs.816/- i.e. excess amount paid for the non-transported 12 drums of bitumen, be recovered in equal share from each of the three persons indicted by the Enquiry Officer.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 18)

- I-128.** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to take the decision on the additional amount to be paid to Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate and Legal Retainer of Panjab University per hearing after the first three dates, for defending the University in the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 10)

- I-129.** That the amount claimed by Shri Girish Agnihotri, Sr. Advocate by way of six legal fee bills dated 20.10.2016 (for the main case) and subsequent dates, i.e., bills dated 01.11.2016, 09.11.2016, 12.12.2016, 16.01.2017 and 06.03.2017 total amounting to Rs.69,750/-, in CWP No. 18745 of 2016 titled Court on its own motion V/s P.U. in the Punjab & Haryana High Court, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 31)

- I-130.** That permanent affiliation to Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, Kala Tibba, Abohar, subject to the appointment of required number of regular teachers, as recommended by the Sub-Committee dated 10.05.2017, and endorsed by the affiliation Committee dated 05.07.2017, be granted.

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2017 Para 37)

- I-131.** Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9), the Committee in its various meetings, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses/subjects for the session 2016-17/2017-2018, as under:

Sr. No.	Date of the meeting of the Committee	Name of the College	Name of the Courses/ subjects	Session for which the temporary extension of affiliation is granted
1.	14.03.2017	Guru Nanak College Ferozepur Cantt. (Punjab)	B.A. I, II & III (Sociology), M.A. I (Sociology)-one unit, M.Com. I-40 seats, M.A. I & II (Punjabi)-one unit. Further the committee observed that the college be asked to inform the University, what step were taken such as advertising the posts of Assistant Professors, seeking panels from the	2016-2017

			University, conducting interviews etc. by the College for the courses M.Sc. (IT), M.A. I & II (History), M.Sc. I & II (Mathematics), BCA I, II & III, B.Com. I, II and III and PGDCA and then the affiliation of the remaining courses be granted.	
2.	14.03.2017	Chandigarh College of Engineering & Technology, Sector-26, Chandigarh	(i) B.E. (Computer Science & Engineering)-63 seats (ii) B.E. (Electronics & Communication Engineering)-63 seats (iii) B.E. (Civil Engineering)-63 seats & (iv) B.E. (Mechanical Engineering)-63 seats.	2017-2018
3.	14.03.2017	Government Home Science College, Sector-10, Chandigarh	Post Graduate Diploma in Child Guidance & Family Counseling	2017-2018
4.	07.04.2017	Post Graduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh	(i) M.Phil.-Physical Education (ii) M.Sc. Chemistry-I & II Year (iii) M.A. Punjabi I & II year (iv) BCA-I, II & III (2 nd Unit) & BBA-I, II & III (2 nd unit) (v) BBA-I, II & III (2 nd unit)	2017-2018
5.	07.04.2017	Syon College, Abohar-152116 (Punjab)	The committee recommended that since the college has partially complied with the conditions, so the college be granted temporary extension of affiliation for the said courses: (i) B.A. I & II (English) (C &E), Punjabi (C&E), Elective Hindi, Physical Education, History, Economics, Sociology and Political Science, (ii) B.Com. Part I & II (one unit)	2016-2017
6.	05.05.2017	BAM Khalsa College Garhshankar Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A.-I (Fine Arts)-E and (ii) B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.-I(4 years integrated course). Further, the temporary extension of affiliation for the remaining subject/courses i.e. M.Sc.-II (Physics) one unit, M.Sc.-II (Mathematics) one unit, B.A.I (Music Vocal)-E shall be granted after the appointment of faculty members in the respective courses as recommended by the Inspection Committee in its report dated 4.3.2017.	2017-2018

7.	05.05.2017	G.K.S.M. Govt. College, Tanda Umar, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.Sc. (Agriculture)-4 years integrated course (ii) B.C.A. I & II (One Unit) (iii) B.A.I/B.Sc. I & II (Computer Science) one Unit (iv) PGDCA	2017-2018
8.	05.05.2017	Baba Kundan Singh Memorial Law College Jalalabad (East), Dharamkot Distt. Moga (Punjab)	LL.B. (3 years course)-60 seats, B.A. LL.B. (Hons.)-5 years integrated Course-60 seats and B.Com. LL.B.(Hons.)-5 years integrated course, 60 seat, subject to submission of attested copies of the proceedings of the selection committee and approval of Bar Council of India.	2017-2018
9.	05.05.2017	G.G.D.S.D. College, Hariana, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Sc. I (Agriculture)-4 years integrated course (one unit)	2017-2018
10.	05.05.2017	Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Civil Lines Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.A. I, II & III (Computer Science)-E, B.C.A.-I, II & III (one unit), B.Com. 1 st year (3 rd unit), M.Sc. 1 st year (Chemistry) (one unit) & P.G.D.M.C., subject to the conditions that the compliance report of the Inspection Committee by 31.05.2017.	2017-2018
11.	08.11.2016	Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City	(i) B.Voc. 2 nd year in Global Professionals in Beauty & Aesthetics (ii) B.Voc. 2 nd year in Hospital Administration & Management (iii) B.Voc. 2 nd year in Textile & Fashion Technology (iv) B.Voc. 2 nd year in Software Development, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2016-2017
12.	07.04.2017	DAV College, Hoshiarpur	B.Com. II (Second unit)	2017-2018
13.	05.05.2017	Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Civil Lines Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i) B.A. 1 st , 2 nd & 3 rd year (computer Science)-E, (ii) B.C.A.-I, II & III year (one unit), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee / Affiliation Committee be complied with by 30.06.2017.	2016-2017

14.	05.05.2017	Shukdeva Krishna College of Education for Girls, Ferozepur Road, V.P.O. Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (Three units i.e. 150 seats each)	2016-2017
15.	05.05.2017	Kalgidhar Institute of Higher Education, Kingra Road, Near Danewala Chowk, Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib	B.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each)	2016-2017
16.	05.05.2017	G.G. S. College of Education, Vill. Theri Bathinda Raod, Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib	B.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each)	2016-2017
17.	05.05.2017	Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial College of Education, V.P.O. Dhudike, Tehsil & Distt. Moga (Pb.)	M.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (one unit i.e. 50 seats each)	2016-2017
18.	05.05.2017	Baba Mangal Singh Institute of Education Barnala Road, Bhugipura, Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats). Further, the Principal of the College was advised to fulfil all the condition as imposed by the Inspection committee in its report dated 12.10.2016 and send the compliance by 31.07.2017, failing which the admission in the 1 st year of B.Ed. course for the session 2017-2018 will not be allowed.	2016-2017
19.	05.05.2017	Satyam College of Education, V.P.O. Ghall Kalan, Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units 100 seats each)	2016-2017
20.	07.06.2017	Post Graduate Govt. College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh	P.G. Diploma in Chemical Analysis	2017-2018

21.	07.06.2017	Guru Nanak College, Killianwali, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	(i) M.A.-I & II (Hindi)-one unit each (ii) M.A.-I & II (History)-one unit each (iii) M.A.-I & II (Punjabi)-one unit each (iv) PGDCA-40 seats and (v) New Course-M.Com.-I (one unit), subject to appointment of one Assistant Professor in the subject of Commerce on regular basis and send the authentic proof of the same by 04.07.2017.	2017-2018
22.	07.06.2017	Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City-152002 (Punjab)	M.Sc. II (Zoology), subject to the submission of joining reports of Assistant Professors on regular basis and temporary extension of affiliation also granted for M.Sc. II Botany, subject to the condition that the college will make temporary arrangement till the appointments on regular basis are made and the college will send approval cases within 15 days. Further, as the college has not appointed any faculty for M.Sc. II (Cosmetology & Health Care) (2 nd unit) extension of affiliation is not granted for the said courses for the session 2017-2018.	2017-2018
23.	07.06.2017	Post Graduate Govt. College for Girls, Sector-11, Chandigarh	(i) M.Sc.-I (IT), (ii) M.Com-I (One unit) (iii) B.A.-I (Fashion Designing)-Elective), (iv) M.A.-I (Fine Arts)-one unit	2017-2018
24.	07.06.2017	Govt. College of Commerce & Business Administration, Sector-50, Chandigarh	(i) B.Com.-I, II & III (ii) B.B.A.-I, II & III (iii) B.B.A.-I (2 unit) (iv) M.Com. I & II (v) B.C.A.-I (one unit), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee if any.	2017-2018
25.	07.06.2017	M.M.D. D.A.V. College, Giddarbaha, Distt. Sr. Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	M.A.-I & II (History)- one unit each and (ii) M.A.-I & II (Punjabi)-one unit each to the said college, subject to submission of attested copies of the proceedings of the selection committee, proof of purchase of books and salary statement of the staff members by 30.06.2017.	2017-2018
26.	07.06.2017	Dashmesh Girls College, Chak Alla Baksh, Mukerian Distt.	(i) B.A.-III (Fine Arts), (ii) B.A.-II (Fashion Designing), (iii) B.A. B.Ed.-2 nd year (4 year integrated course), (iv) B.Sc.-I (Fashion	2017-2018

		Hoshiarpur	Designing) (v) M.A.-I (Punjabi)-60 seats and (vii) M.A.-I (Political Science)-60 seats, subject to the condition that the College will send the joining reports of the teachers and the position of Assistant Professor in English will be re-advertised and submit the compliance by 4 th July 2017.	
27.	07.06.2017	G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A.-III (Fashion Designing), the principal of the college was requested to send the joining report in respect of the teacher appointed for teaching B.A.-I (Sociology) Classes and the post of Assistant Professor in the subject of Political for teaching M.A. (Political Science) be advertised and the same be filled by 4 th July, 2017.	2017-2018
28.	07.06.2017	Sai College of Education, Sardulapur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year (100 seats for each year)	2017-2018
29.	06.06.2017	Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College for Women, Village-Kamalपुरa, Tehsil-Jagraon, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Com. 3 rd year (one unit), subject to fulfillment of the conditions (if any) as listed in the Inspection Report and the College will follow the instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Government/NCTE/UGC.	2017-2018
30.	05.05.2017 & 06.06.2017	Khalsa College for Women, Sidhwan Khurd, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i) M.Sc. 1 st year (Mathematics) (one unit) (ii) M.Sc. 1 st year (Physics) (one unit) (iii) B.A. B.Ed. 1 st year (4 year integrated course) (one unit), (iv) B.Sc. B.Ed. 1 st year (4 year integrated course) (one unit) & (v) P.G. Diploma in Mass Communication, subject to fulfillment of the conditions as listed in the Inspection Report and the College will follow the instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Government/ NCTE/UGC.	2017-2018
31.	07.06.2017	MCM DAV College for Women, Sector-36, Chandigarh	(i) B.A. III (Police Administration) & (ii) M.A.-I (Hindi)	2017-2018

32.	22.06.2017	DAV Post graduate College, Sector-10, Chandigarh	To admit 280 students instead of 350 students in B.Com.-1 (1 st semester) and 60 students in M.Com. Instead of 80	2017-2018
33.	07.06.2017	GGS DAV College Centenary College, Jalalabad (W)-152024, (Punjab)	The college has allowed to admit 280 students instead of 350 students in B.Com.-I, subject to the condition that the college will send approval cases of the selected Assistant Professors, balance sheet and salary statement for the session 2015-16 within 15 days.	2017-2018
34.	22.06.2017	Government College Zira, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	B.Com. I	2017-2018
35.	05.07.2017	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College of Education V.P.O. Sukhanand Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. course (Two units-100 seats) and New Course M.Ed. course 1 st year (one unit-50 seats), subject to submission of authentic proof regarding filling up the required faculty as per Inspection Committee report latest by 31.07.2017 and the College also comply with all the conditions as per recognition order regarding grant of new course-M.Ed. (one unit-50 seats) issued by the NCTE vide No. NRC/ NCTE/ Recognition/2016/147856-88 dated 02.05.2016.	2017-2018
36.	05.07.2017	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education Vill. Their Bathinda Road, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib	B.Ed. course (two units-100 seats), subject to submission of authentic proof regarding filling up the required faculty and other conditions as per Inspection Committee report latest by 31.07.2017.	2017-2018
37.	05.07.2017	MCMDAV College for Women, Sector-36, Chandigarh	To admit 40 students in M.Sc. Chemistry I & II	2017-2018
38.	05.07.2017	Post Graduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh	M.Com. I (One unit)	2017-2018

39.	05.07.2016	DAV College, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	(i) B.C.A.-I, II & III-one Unit each and (ii)B.Com.-I, II & III-one Unit each, subject to submission of authentic proof regarding filing up the required faculty per Inspection Committee report latest by 31.07.2017.	2017-2018
40.	05.07.2016	HKL College of Education, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	B.Ed. course (Two units-100 seats), subject to the condition that one more seat of Assistant Professor in education be filled up within fifteen days.	2017-2018
41.	05.07.2017	Baba Kundan Singh College, VPO Muhar, Ferozepur (Punjab)	(i) M.A. I Music (Vocal), (ii) B.Com. 3 rd year (one unit) courses, subject to the condition that the college will appoint three Assistant Professors immediately and send compliance of selection by 31.07.2017.	2017-2018
42.	05.07.2017	Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.A. I (Sociology) Further, the college was advised to fill up the post of Assistant Professor in the subject of Political Science for teaching M.A.-II (Political Science) and submit the authentic proof regarding filling up the posts latest by 31.07.2017, thereafter, the grant of temporary extension of affiliation for M.A. II (Political Science) shall be granted.	2017-2018
43.	05.07.2017	Post Graduate Govt. College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh	(i) Advanced Diploma in Disaster Management, (ii) Diploma in Cosmetology (iii) Certificate Course in Music (Vocal) & Music (Instruments), subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 11.04.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
44.	05.07.2017	Sri Guru Har Rai Sahib College for Women, Chabbewal Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A. I, II & III (English G & E), (ii) B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit) (iii) PGDCA (one unit) (iv) M.Com.-I and II (one unit) and (v) B.Sc. I (Fashion Designing)-one unit, subject to the condition that the college shall re-advertise the posts of balance required regular faculty as per recommendations	2017-2018

			of the Inspection Committee dated 8.4.2014 and fill up the same latest by 15 th September 2017.	
45.	05.07.2017	Dasmesh Girls College of Education, V.P.O. Badal Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	M.Ed. course (one unit-50 seats), subject to submission of authentic proof regarding filling up the required faculty as per Inspection Committee report latest by 31.07.2017.	2017-2018
46.	05.07.2017	Dasmesh Girls College Badal Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Com. I (one unit), subject to submission of authentic proof regarding filing up the required faculty as per Inspection Committee report latest by 31.07.2017.	2017-2018
47.	05.07.2017	Guru Gobind Singh Girls College, Gidderbaha Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	(i) B.A. I, II & III- English, Punjabi, Hindi, History, Political Science, Physical Education, Economics & Mathematics, (ii) B.A. I, II & III (Computer Science)-40 seats each (iii) B.Com.-I, II & III-one unit each & new course (iv) M.A. I- Punjabi (one unit), subject to re-advertise the balance posts of required faculty as per Inspection Committee report dated 11.02.2017 and fill up the same.	2017-2018
48.	17.07.2017	Kenway College of Education, Abohar-(Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. course (four units-200 seats), (ii) M.Ed. course (one unit-50 seats), subject to fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee immediately.	2017-2018
49.	17.07.2017	M.D. College of Education, Abohar-(Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. Course (Three units-150 seats), subject to fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee.	2017-2018
50.	17.07.2017	Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City-152002 (Punjab)	(i) M.Sc. II (Zoology), (ii) M.Sc. II (Botany) and (iii) M.Sc. II (Cosmetology & Health Care) 2 nd Unit, subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee immediately. The affiliation committee further recommended that the college was advised to appoint one additional Assistant Professor in Zoology and Cosmetology at the earliest on regular basis and intimate the	2017-2018

			Panjab University.	
51.	17.07.2017	Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector-26, Chandigarh	(i) BCA-I, II & III (3 rd unit) & (ii) M.A. Economics I & II. Regarding M.Sc. Chemistry I & II & M.Sc. Physics the committee decided that the college is advised to advertise the posts of Assistant Professors in chemistry & Physics and seek the panel from the University. The college is advised to appoint Assistant Professor on regular basis only. Till that the college is advised not to admit any students in M.Sc.-I Physics.	2017-2018
52.	17.07.2017	Mai Bhago College for Women Village & P.O. Ramgarh, Ludhiana-141123 (Punjab)	(i) B.Com. I, II & III course	2017-2018
53.	17.07.2017	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College, Sukhanand, Moga	(i) B.A.III Fine Arts (One unit) (ii) M.Com.-II (one unit) , subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 09.06.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
54.	05.07.2017	DAV College for Girls, Garhshankar, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Com. 2 nd year (one unit)	2017-2018
55.	17.07.2017	Ramgarhia Girls College Miller Ganj, Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i) B.A. 1 st (Human Rights & Duties- E) (ii) B.Sc. 1 st year (Non-Medical) and (iii) M.Com. 1 st year (one unit) courses	2017-2018
56.	17.07.2017	Malwa college, Bondli, Samrala-Ludhiana	Advance Diploma in Information Technology, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 11.03.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
57.	17.07.2017	Guru Teg Bahadur National College, Dakha, Distt. Ludhiana	(i) B.Com. 1 st , 2 nd & 3 rd (one unit) and (ii) M.A. 2 nd year (Sociology)	2017-2018

		(Punjab)		
59.	17.07.2017	Guru Nanak College for Girls, Tibbi Sahib Road, Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	<p>M.Com. I & II-one unit each. Regarding B.Sc. III (Fashion Designing), M.Sc.-I (Fashion Designing) and M.Sc.-I Physics, the college has received the panel from the University and the Principal of the College was advised to conduct the interview by 04.08.2017 and intimate to this office.</p> <p>Regarding grant of temporary extension of affiliation in the new course i.e. M.Sc.-I (Physics), the following committee members will re-visit the college.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professor Navdeep Goyal, Fellow 2. Principal H.S. Gosal, Fellow <p>Further, the Principal of the college is advised not to make admission in the courses/subject i.e. M.Sc.-I (Fashion designing) and M.Sc.-I (Physics) for the session 2017-18 without prior approval of the university.</p>	2017-2018
60.	17.07.2017	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College, Sukhanand, Moga	(i) B.A. III Fine Arts (one unit) (ii) M.Com. II (One unit), subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 09.06.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
61.	17.07.2017	Sant Hari Singh Memorial College for Women, Chella Makhsuspur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	<p>Post Graduate Diploma in Fashion Designing.</p> <p>Further, the temporary extension of affiliation for the remaining subjects/courses i.e. (i) B.A. I, II and III (English) (General & Elective), Hindi, Economics, Political Science, History, Punjabi (General & Elective), Home Science, computer Science, Physical Education) (ii) BCA-I, II and III (one unit) (iii) B.Com. I, II and III (one unit) for the session 2017-18 shall be granted after the appointment of faculty</p>	2017-2018

			members in the respective courses as recommended by the Inspection Committee in its report dated 07.04.2017.	
62.	17.07.2017	Government of College of Arts, Sector-10, Chandigarh	(i) MFA-1 st & 2 nd year (ii) Special Advance Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impairt and Mentally Challenged persons, subject to the condition that the college is required to appoint Assistant Professors as recommended by the inspection committee and inform the Panjab University accordingly.	2017-2018
63.	17.07.2017	Sant Baba Hari Singh Memorial College of Education, Mahilpur Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year (100 seats for each year), subject to the condition that the college shall re-advertise the post of Principal.	2017-2018
64.	17.07.2017	R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City-152002 (Punjab)	M.A. I (English)	2017-2018
65.	17.07.2017	Syon College, Abohar-152116 (Punjab)	B.A. I, II & III, B.Com. I, II & III, B.Com. I (2 nd unit) and M.A. Courses, subject to fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee immediately. Further, the affiliation Committee has recommended that granting of affiliation to B.Sc. (Agriculture-1) will be considered after revisit of the Inspection Committee.	2017-2018
66.	17.07.2017	D.A.V. College, Hoshiarpur	Communicative English-certificate level (Add-on course), subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 12.06.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
67.	05.07.2017	S.D.P. College for Women, Daresi Road Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Com. 1 st Year (3 rd unit), M.Com. 1 st year (2 nd unit) and B.A. B.Ed. 1 st Year (Four Years integrated course)	2017-2018
68.	07.08.2017	Shree Satya Sai B.Ed. College, Village-	B.Ed. Course (Two units-100 seats)	2017-2018

		Karaiwala Tehsil- Gidderbaha Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)		
69.	07.08.2017	D.A.V. College of Education, Fazilka-152123 (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course (two Units-100 seats), subject to fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee.	2017-2018
70.	07.08.2017	National Degree College, Chowarianwali, Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	(i) B.A. Part I, II & III (English (C&E)), Punjabi (C&E), Mathematics, History, Political Science, Physical Education, Sociology, Hindi, Computer Applications, Economics E subjects), (ii) B.C.A. Part I, II & III (iii) B.Com. course (one unit). The principal of the college has been advised to re-advertise the posts and fill up the vacant posts and inform the Panjab University accordingly.	2017-2018
71.	07.08.2017	J.D. College of Education, Bathinda Road, Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	B.Ed. course (Two units-100 seats)	2017-2018
72.	07.0-8.2017	Bawa Nihal Singh B.Ed. College, Bawa Nihal Singh Street, Kotkupra Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. course (Three Units-150 seats), subject to the condition that College shall appoint Assistant Professors on regular basis as per recommendations of the Inspection committee report dated 26.04.2017	2017-2018
73.	07.08.2017	Nankana Sahib College of Education, Ludhiana, Punjab	B.Ed. 1 st year & 2 nd unit (100 seats), subject to the condition that the college was advised to conduct the interview and submit the proceeding with the copy of the appointment letter and joining report.	2016-2017 & 2017-2018
74.	07.08.2017	Mata Gurdev Kaur Memorial Shahi Sports college of Physical Education, Jhakroudhi, Samrara, Ludhiana	(i) D.P.Ed. – 1 st & 2 nd year and (ii) Post Graduate Diploma in Yoga Therapy. Further, as already intimated vide this office letter No. Misc. A- 5/7581 dated 13.07.2017 the college has been allowed to continue D.P.Ed. (two year course) for the session 2017- 2018 till the course is	2017-2018

			undertaken by the SCERT, Punjab	
75.	07.08.2017	Shukdeva Krishna College of Education for Girls, V.P.O. Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course (Three units-150 seats)	2017-2018
76.	07.08.2017	Guru Gobind Singh College for Women, Sector-26, Chandigarh	(i) M.A. English-I & II (ii) M.Com. I & II (iii) M.Sc. IT-I & II (iv) M.A. Sociology-I & II, (v) M.A. Economics-I & II (vi) B.C.A. I, II & III, (vii) B.Com. I, II & III 8. B.A.-I, II & III (Functional English) (ix) B.Sc. I, II & III (Non-Medical), (x) B.Sc. I, II & III (Computer Science) and (xi) B.Com. I (4 th unit), The college has also been advised to fill the positions as imposed by the Inspection Committee for M.Com. & B.Sc. Non-Medical.	2017-2018
77.	07.08.2017	Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Abohar (Punjab)	B.Com. 3 rd Year (additional unit)	2017-2018
78.	07.08.2017	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education Giddarbaha Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb)	(i) B.Ed. course (Three Units-150 seats) (ii) M.Ed. course (50 seats) Further, the chairman of the Governing Body of the College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/9807-9914 dated 21.8.2017 to appoint Principal and remaining faculty as per inspection committee report dated 15.04.2017.	2017-2018
79.	07.08.2017	Shaheed Ganj College for Women Mudki, Distt. Ferozepur-142060 (Punjab)	(i) B.A. I, II & III (English (C&E)), Punjabi (C&E), Mathematics, Economics, Sociology, History, Political Science, Computer Science, Physical Education, (ii) B.C.A. (iii) B.Sc. (Non-medical) semester-I-IV. The College has also been advised to re-advertise the posts of Principal and Asstt. Professors, conduct the interview and fill up the vacant positions and submit the reports to Panjab University accordingly.	2017-2018

80.	07.08.2017	Lala Jagat Narayan Education College, Jalalabad (W), Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. course (Two Units-100 seats). The college has also been advised to conduct the interview and submit the Selection Committee meeting proceedings and joining report to Panjab University immediately.	2017-2018
81.	07.08.2017	Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector-26, Chandigarh	Religious and Sikh Studies as an elective subject in B.A.-1 st year	2017-2018
82.	07.08.2017	Guru Ram Dass B.Ed. College, Chak Room Wala, Jalalabad (W) Distt. Fazilka (Pb.)	(i) B.Ed. Course (Four Units-200 seats), (ii) M.Ed. Course (one unit-50 seats), subject to fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee.	2017-2018
83.	07.08.2017	Government Rehabilitation Institution for intellectual Disabilities, Sector 31, Chandigarh	(i) B.Ed. Special Education (Mental Retardation)-1 st & 2 nd year and (ii) M.Ed. Special Education (Mental Retardation) 1 st & 2 nd year, subject to the condition that the college is advised to get the posts fillup through UPSC/PU.	2017-2018
84.	07.08.2017	Mata Sahib Kaur Girls College, Talwandi Bhai, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	(i) B.Sc. Non-Medical Part II (ii) B.Sc. Medical Part II However, as far as grant of affiliation of remaining following courses is concerned, the Affiliation Committee has desired that appointment of teachers be made as per the recommendations of the Inspection Committee: (i) M.A. I (History), (ii) B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) Part II (iii) B.A. Part I, II & III for subjects as English (C &E), Punjabi (C&E), History, Sociology, Political Science, Mathematics, Economics, Computer Science, Physical Education, Hindi, M.A. Political Science, PGDCA	2017-2018
85.	07.08.2017	Managing Committee Rayat College of Law Railmajra, Nawanshahar SBS Nagar, Punjab	(i) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Years Integrated Course (two units)-120 seats, (ii) B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Years Integrated Course (one unit)-60 seats. However, the college has been advised to fill up the vacant positions immediately and send joining reports to Panjab University accordingly.	2017-2018

86.	07.08.2017	GGS D.A.V. Centenary College, Jalalabad (W)-Fazilka (Punjab)	B.Com. I Subject to the appointment of regular teacher and send proceedings, appointment letters and joining reports to the Panjab University immediately	2017-2018
87.	07.08.2017	Maharaja Ranjit Singh College, Burjan Bye-Pass, Malout-Abohar Road, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	(i) B.A.-I, II & III-English(C) & (E), Public Administration, Political Science, Physical Education, Mathematics & Computer Application (ii) B.Com. I, II & III-one unit each (iii) B.C.A.-I, II & III- Two units each (iv) PGDCA-40 seats (v) M.A.-I, II- History-one unit each and (vi) B.Sc.-II & III Agriculture- one unit each, subject to the condition that the College shall appoint the vacant posts of Assistant Professor on regular basis as per recommendations of the Inspection Committee reports dated 21.03.2017. Further, temporary extension of affiliation in B.Sc. I (Agriculture) course has not granted for the session 2017-2018, as the college has dropped this course from the session 2017-2018	2017-2018
88.	07.08.2017	Babe Ke College of Education VPO Mudki, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	(i)B.Ed. course (Four units-200 seats) (ii) M.Ed. course (one unit-50 seats), subject to fill up the vacant positions and submit the proof of proceedings of the selection committee and joining reports to the Panjab University accordingly.	2017-2018
89.	07.08.2017	Babe-Ke College of Education, V.P.O. Daudhar Tehsil & Distt. Moga (Pb.)	(i) B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each) and M.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (50 seat each) (ii) B.Ed. Course (Two Units-100 seats) and M.Ed. Course (One Unit-50 seats) The College has also been advised to re-advertise the vacant posts as per recommendations of the Inspection Committee report dated 20.04.2017, immediately and also inform to this office.	2016-2017 2017-2017

90.	07.08.2017	Dev Samaj College for Women, Sector-45, Chandigarh	M.Com-II (3 rd & 4 th semester) Regarding B.Sc. I (Non-Medical), the affiliation committee has decided not to granted temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2017-2018, as they could not appoint teacher inspite of facts that many eligible candidates were available still they could not reach on consensus.	2017-2018
91.	07.08.2017	Maharaja Ranjit Singh College, Burjan Bye-Pass Malout, Abohar Road, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb)	(i) B.A.-I, II & III English (C &E), Public Administration, Political Science, Physical Education, Mathematics & Computer Application (ii) B.Com. I, II & III- one unit each (iii) B.C.A.- I, II & III- Two units each (iv) PGDCA-40 seats, (v) M.A.-I & II- History- one Unit each and (vi) B.Sc. I & II- Agriculture- One Unit each	2016-2017
92.	07.08.2017	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girl College, Sukhanand, Moga	(i) B.A. I, II & III (Computer Application) one unit each (ii) B.Sc. I, II & III (Computer Application) –one unit each (iii) BCA-I, II & III one unit each (iv) M.Sc.-IT-I & II, one unit each (v) M.Sc. II (Mathematics) one unit (vi) B.Sc.-I (Fashion Designing)-one unit (vii) B.Sc. I (Agriculture) one unit, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 09.06.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
93.	07.08.2017	Govt. College, Hoshiarpur	(i)B.Sc. (Agriculture)-4 years course (ii) PGDCA (one unit) and (iii) B.C.A.-I, II, III (one unit), subject to the condition that the college shall appoint the Assistant Professors on regular basis as per recommendation of the Inspection committee in its report dated 10.5.2017 immediately.	2017-2018
94.	07.08.2017	SMS Karamjot College for Women, Miani Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i)B.Com. I, II and III (one unit) (ii) B.C.A. I, II and III (one unit), (iii) M.A. I & II (Punjabi)-one unit and (iv) M.A. I & II (Music Vocal)-one unit, subject to the condition that the College has been advised that re-advertisement be given,	2017-2018

			teachers be appointed and inform the Panjab University accordingly.	
95.	07.08.2017	Guru Nanak Colleg of Education, Dalewal, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year (200 seats for each year) and M.Ed. course-1 st year (50 seats), subject to the condition that the college shall appoint the faculty members on regular basis as per the recommendations of the Inspection Committee in its report dated 13.05.2017, immediately.	2017-2018
96.	07.08.2017	S.G.G.S College of Education Beghpur Kamlooh Distt. Hoshairpur	B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year (200 seats for each year)	2017-2018
97.	07.08.2017	Khalsa College, Garhdiwala Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.Sc.-II (Agriculture)-4 years course and (ii) M.Com.-II (one unit) course, subject to the condition that the college shall appoint the Assistant Professor in Agriculture on regular basis by following the proper prescribed procedure laid down by the University, immediately, failing which the affiliation for B.Sc. (Agriculture) shall be withdrawn for the next session. Further, the affiliation committee has not granted temporary extension of affiliation for M.Sc. I (Chemistry)	2017-2018
98.	07.08.2017	BAM Khalsa College, Garhshankar, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) M.Sc. II (Physics) one unit (ii) M.Sc.-II (Mathematics) one unit (iii) B.A.I (Music Vocal)-E course Further, principal of the college has been advised to re-advertise the vacant posts and inform the Panjab University, Chandigarh, immediately.	2017-2018
99.	07.08.2017	Guru Nanak Khalsa College for Women, Shamchaurasi Distt.Hoshiarpur	(i) B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit for each year)-one unit (ii) B.A. I, II & III (one unit for each year) and (iii) PGDCA-40 seats, subject to the condition that the college shall appoint the faculty members on regular basis as per the recommendations of the Inspection committee in its report dated 25.08.2016, immediately.	2017-2018

100.	07.08.2017	Govt. Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh	DM Cardiology (New course) (Two students per year), subject to condition that the college will obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI before making admissions to the said course.	2018-2019
101.	07.08.2017	Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector-26, Chandigarh	M.Sc. Chemistry I & II The affiliation committee has also decided not to grant temporary extension of affiliation for M.Sc. Physics	2017-2018
102.	07.08.2017	Mata Baljinder Kaur Memorial Kaler International College, Samadh Bhai, Moga	(i) B.A. I, II & III English-C (Two unit each) (ii) English-E (one unit each) (iii) Punjabi-C (Two unit each) (iv) Punjabi-E (one unit each) (v) Mathematics (vi) Economics (vii) Physical Education (viii) Hindi (E) (ix) Political Science (x) Sociology (xi) History (one unit) (2) B.Com. I & II (one unit each) (3) B.Sc. I (Agriculture), subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 02.06.2016 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.	2016-2017
103.	31.08.2017	Mata Sahib Kaur Girls College Talwandi Bhai Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	(i) B.Sc. Non-Medical (ii) B.Sc. Medical (iii) B.Sc. Fashion Designing (iv) B.A. I, II & III (v) M.A. Political Science (vi) PGDCA Course, However the affiliation committee has not granted temporary affiliation to M.A. I (History) course for the session 2017-18.	2017-2018
104.	31.08.2017	Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College for Women, Jhar Sahib, Ludhiana	M.Com. 1 st year, subject to the condition that they will re-advertise the posts and send the proceeding of the selection committee to Punjab University within 15 days.	2017-2018
105.	31.08.2017	D.M. College, Moga	B.A. I, II & III (Sociology), B.A./B.Sc., I, II & III (Computer Science)-40 seats each, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 28.08.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018

106.	31.08.2017	Guru Nanak College for Girls, Tibbi, Sahib Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	(i) B.Sc.-III (Fashion Designing)-40 seats, New course M.Sc. I (Physics)-one unit (ii) M.Sc. I (Fashion Designing)-one unit and M.Sc. II (Fashion Designing)-one unit	2017-2018
107.	31.08.2017	G.G.N. Khalsa College, Ludhiana	(i) Advance Diploma in Journalism (ii) Diploma in Bank Management, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 18.08.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
108.	31.08.2017	Khalsa College, Garhdiwala Distt. Hoshiarpur	M.Sc. I (Chemistry)-one unit, subject to the condition that the College shall appoint the Assistant Professor/s in chemistry on regular basis by following the proper prescribed procedure laid down by the University, immediately and shall submit the proceedings of the Selection Committee, Appointment Letter and Joining report in respect of the appointed candidates.	2017-2018
109.	31.08.2017	Sant Hari Singh College for Women, Chella-Makhsuspur Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A. I, II and III English(General & Elective), Hindi, Economics, Political Science, History, Punjabi (General and Elective), Home Science, Computer Science, Physical Education (ii) BCA I, II and III (one unit), and (iii) B.Com. I, II and III (one unit), but the principal has been advised to re-advertised the vacant posts, appoint the teachers and send the proceedings within 15 days.	2017-2018
110.	31.08.2017	Rayat Bahra College of Law, Bohan Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.A.LL.B. (1 st and 2 nd year (5 years course)-120 seats	2017-2018
111.		Waheguru College, Fazilka Road, Backside Priya Enclave Colony, Buraj Mohar Road Abohar-152116	The Chairman of the Affiliation Committee in anticipation of the Affiliation Committee has granted (i) B.A.I & II English (C&E), Punjabi (C&E), Hindi, Public Administration, Political Science, Economics, Fine Arts, Physical Education, Mathematics, Sociology, Computer Science,	2017-2018

			History (ii) B.Com. I & II (iii) B.Sc. I & II (Agriculture), subject to condition that they will appoint faculty as per Inspection report by 31 st December, 2017 and joining report of faculty members and further, subject to fulfillment of the conditions as listed in the Inspection Report and the College will follow the instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./NCTE/UCG.	
112.	31.08.2017	Kamla Lohita Sanatan Dharam College, Subhash Nagar, Daresi Road, Ludhiana (Punjab)	Master of Entrepreneurship and Family Business (1 st & 2 nd year) & (ii) B.A. III Computer Science-E, subject to fulfillment of the conditions as listed in the Inspection Report dated 15.04.2017 and the College will follow the instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./NCTE/UGC. Further, the college is advised to re-advertise the posts and inform the Panjab University within 15 days. The college is required to deposit late fee Rs.1,00,000/- as late fee for Master of Entrepreneurship and Family Business (1 st & 2 nd year) & (ii) B.A. III Computer Science-E.	2017-2018
113.	31.08.2017	Guru Nanak Khalsa College for Women, Gujarkhan Campus, Model Town, Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.A. 1 st year (Journalism & Mass Communication) E-40 seats, subject to fulfillment of the conditions as listed in the Inspection Report dated 17.03.2017 and the college will follow the instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./NCTE/UGC.	2017-2018
114.	31.08.2017	Jyoti B.Ed. College, Fazilka - 152123 (Punjab)	B.Ed. course (Two units-100 seats), subject to condition that the college should conduct the interview and appoint the faculty within 15 days.	2017-2018
115.	31.08.2017	Syon College, Abohar, Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	B.Lib course (one unit)	2017-2018
116.	31.08.2017	MBBGRGC Girls College of Education Mansowal	B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year (one unit for each year)	2017-2018

		Distt. Hoshiarpur		
117.	31.08.2017	S.D. College, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.B.A. I, II and III (one unit for each year) and (ii) B.C.A. I, II and III (one unit for each year). But they are advised to conduct the interview, appoint the teachers and send the information to the Punjab University within 15 days.	2017-2018
118.	31.08.2017	JSS Asha Kiran Special School and Teacher Training Jahan Khelan, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Special Education (1 st and 2 nd year) 30 seats	2017-2018
119.	31.08.2017	Rayat Bahra College of Education, Bohan Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year (100 seats for each year)	2017-2018
120.	07.08.2017	Mahraja Ranjit Singh College, Burjan Bye-Pass Malout-Abohar Road, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib(Pb.)	(i) B.A.-I, II & III-Punjabi (C), Economics & History, subject to the condition that the college shall appoint the vacant posts of Assistant Professors on regular basis as per recommendations of the Inspection Committee reports dated 21.03.2017 and 12.04.2017, immediately and also inform to this office.	2017-2018
121.	31.08.2017	Dev Samaj College of Education, Sector 36-B, Chandigarh	M.Ed. course 1 st year & 2 nd year (50 seats)	2017-2018
122.	31.08.2017	Guru Nanak College, Moga	M.A. (Economics) I & II with strict warning to the Guru Nanak College, Moga to be careful in future regarding affiliation of the courses.	2016-2017
123.	31.08.2017	Dev Samaj College for Women, Sector 45, Chandigarh	B.Sc.-I (Non-Medical)	2017-2018
124.	23.10.2017	Mata Ganga Khalsa College for Girls, Manji Sahib Kottan Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i) B.Sc. 1 st year (Medical) (ii) M.Com. 1 st year (one unit) & (iii) M.Sc. 1 st year (Fashion Designing) (one unit), subject to fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the Inspection Report dated 6.4.2017 and the college will follow the	2017-2018

			<p>instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University/ Punjab Govt./UGC.</p> <p>The affiliation committee further observed that new courses i.e. (i) B.Sc. 1st year (Medical) (ii) M.Com. 1st year (one unit) & (iii) M.Sc. 1st year (Fashion Designing) (one unit) started, but no teachers has been appointed. Now, under the present circumstances, the college will allow continuing 1st year, but if the college failed to fulfil the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee by 15th December, 2017, university Inspection will not be given for 2nd year of the courses. The University authorities will be compelled to shift the students to another college.</p>	
125.	23.10.2017	Moga College of Education for Girls, Near P.S. Sadar, GT Road Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Pb)	(i) B.Ed. course-1 st & 2 nd year (two units-100 seats each) (ii) M.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (one 50 unit seats each). Further the principal of the College has been advised to re-advertise the vacant posts of one Associate Professor and three Assistant Professors, immediately and fill up the same up to 15.12.2017 and also send the information to the University.	2016-2017
126.	23.10.2017	GHG Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.A./B.Sc. B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year (4 year integrated course)-50 seats (one unit) & B.P.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year (2 year course)-100 seats (2 unit), subject to condition to re-advertise the vacant posts immediately and report be submitted to the Panjab University by 15 th December, 2017 and the college will follow the instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University/ Punjab Govt./UGC	2017-2018
127.	23.10.2017	Sri Guru Ram Das College of Education, V.P.O. Halwara Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed.- 1 st and 2 nd year-50 seats, subject to condition to re-advertise the vacant posts immediately and report and report be submitted to the Panjab Univeristy by 15 th December, 2017 and further subject to the condition that the College shall fulfil all the conditions as	2017-2018

			imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.	
128.	23.10.2017	Nighingale College of Education, Pakhowal Road, Narangwal, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year-100 seats (one unit), subject to condition to re-advertise the vacant posts immediately and report be submitted to the Panjab University by 15 th December, 2017 and further subject to the condition that the College shall fulfil all the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.	2017-2018
129.	23.10.2017	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education for Women, Kamalpura, Tehsil Jagraon Distt. Ludhiana	B.Ed. course 1 st and 2 nd year (50 seats for each year). Regarding M.Ed. course 1 st year (one unit) the request of the college cannot be considered as the N.C.T.E. vide its letter No. 175726 dated 06 May 2017 has refused the recognition for M.Ed. 1 st year.	2017-2018
130.	23.10.2017	D.D. Jain College of Education, Kidwai Nagar Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year -100 seats, subject to condition to re-advertise the vacant posts immediately and report be submitted to the Panjab University by 15 th December, 2017 and further subject to the condition that the College shall fulfil all the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.	2017-2018
131.	23.10.2017	Baba Kundan Singh Memorial Law College, Jalalabad (East), Dharamkot Distt. Moga (Punjab)	(i) LL.B.(3 year course)-60 seats & (ii) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.)-5 year Integrated Course-60 seats. The Affiliation Committee has not recommended for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 year integrated Course-60 seats for the session 2017-2018, as the Bar Council of India has not granted its approval. Further, the Chairman of the College be advised to take joining of Dr. Dilip Kumar Pati, Principal of the College and send the joining report to the University.	2017-2018

132.	23.10.2017	Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur Cantt. (Punjab)	M.Sc. (IT)	2016-2017
133.	23.10.2017	Govt. College of Yoga Education & Health, Sector-23, Chandigarh	(i) B.Ed. Yoga (20 seats) (ii) Post Graduate Diploma in Yoga Therapy (25 seats) (iii) Basic Certificate course in Yoga Education (20+2*)(*foreign nationals) and (iv) Advance Certificate course in Yoga Education (20+2*)(*foreign nationals)	2017-2018
134.	23.10.2017	Baba Kundan Rural College of Education, Kulliwala, Jamalpur, Distt. Ludhiana Pb.	B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (02 unit) i.e. 100 seats, subject to condition that the college shall re-advertise the balanced 5 vacant posts immediately and report be submitted to the Panjab University by 15 th December 2017, failing which the P.U. will be compelled to take the decision as per P.U. rules & Regulations.	2017-2018
135.	23.10.2017	Shri Ram College, Dalla, Tehsil, Jagraon Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Com. 1 st , 2 nd & 3 rd year (one unit), subject to the condition to fill up the remaining posts immediately and report be submitted to the Panjab University by 15 th December, 2017 and the college will follow the instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University / Punjab Govt./UGC.	2017-2018
136.	23.10.2017	M.B.B.G.G.G. Girls College, Rattewal SBS Nagar, SBS (Punjab)	B.Com.-I & M.A.-I (Punjabi)	2017-2018
137.	23.10.2017	Bawa Nihal Singh B.Ed. College, Bawa Nihal Singh Street, Kotkupra Road, Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course-1 st & 2 nd year (three units-150 seats each). Further, the principal of the college is advised to re-advertise the vacant posts of four Assistant Professors, immediately and fill up the same up to 15.12.2017 and also send the information to the University.	2016-2017
138.	23.10.2017	Kamla Lohtia Sanatan Dharma College Subhash Nagar Daresi Road Ludhiana	B.A. 1 st & 2 nd year (Sociology)-E, subject to fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the Inspection Report dated 14.08.2017 and the college will follow the instruction/guidelines	2017-2018

		(Punjab)	of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC.	
139.	23.10.2017	B.C.M. College of Education Urban Estate, Sector 32-A, Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i)B.Ed. (Special Education-Learning Disability)-30 seats & (ii) M.Ed. 1 st and 2 nd year-50 seats (1 unit), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfil all the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.	2016-2017
140.	23.10.2017	Saint Sahara College of Education, Ferozepur Road Near Power Grid Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (two units-100 seats each)	2016-2017
141.	23.10.2017	DAV Post Graduate College, Sector-10, Chandigarh	B.A.III Computer Science-E, B.A./B.Sc. B.Ed. integrated course-1 st and 2 nd & M.Com.-I & II (Business Economics). The committee noted that the college has not started B.A.-2 nd year (Women Studies), B.A.-I (Police Administration) & B.Sc.-I Agriculture, hence no need for extension of affiliation for these courses for the session 2017-2018. As regarding B.A./B.Sc., B.Ed. integrated course-1 st year-additional unit the case is subjudice in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court. NOTE: The college has closed the one unit of B.Com.-3 rd out of allotted 5 units.	2017-2018
142.	23.10.2017	Post Graduate Govt. College, Sector-46, Chandigarh	BBA-1 st (1 unit), BCA-2 nd unit, B.Sc.-1 st (Non-Medical), as the college failed to fulfil the conditions imposed by the Inspection committee for the session 2017-2018 and the college is also advised to shift the students to another college in these concerned subjects.	2017-2018
143.	23.10.2017	Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur Cantt. (Punjab)	M.Sc. (IT)	2016-2017

144.	23.10.2017	Partap College of Education, Hambran Road Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. course-1 st and 2 nd year (4 units 200 seats) and M.Ed. course-1 st & 2 nd year (1 unit-50 seats), subject to condition to re-advertise the vacant posts and appoint Principal, one Professor in Education, 2 Associate Professor immediately and report be submitted to the Panjab University by 15 th December, 2017 and further subject to the condition that the College shall fulfil all the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.	2017-2018
145.	23.10.2017	Sri Guru Ram Das College of Education, V.P.O. Halwara, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed.-1 st and 2 nd year-50 seats, subject to the condition that the College shall fulfil all the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.	2016-2017
146.	23.10.2017	G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector- 32, Chandigarh	(i) B.Voc. Hardware & Networking-3 rd year (ii) B.Voc. Fashion Technology & Apparel Design -3 rd year (iii) B.Voc. Agri Business & Agrarian Entrepreneurship-3 rd year, subject to fulfilment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 15.12.2017 in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
147.	23.10.2017	GHG Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.A./B.Sc. B.Ed. (4 year integrated course) 1 st and 2 nd year-50 seats (one unit), B.P.Ed.(2 year course) 1 st and 2 nd -100 seats (2 units) & M.P.Ed. 1 st year (2 year course), subject to condition to re-advertise the vacant posts immediately and report and submitted to the Panjab University by 15 th December, 2017 and the College will follow the instruction/guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC.	2017-2018

148.	23.10.2017	Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozpur	(i) B.Voc. courses 3 rd year in Global Professional in Beauty & Aesthetics (ii) B.Voc. course 3 rd year in Hospital Administration and Management (iii) B.Voc. courses 3 rd year in textile & Fashion Technology (iv) B.Voc. course 3 rd year in Software Development, subject to fulfilment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee dated 15.12.2017 in its report failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.	2017-2018
------	------------	--	---	-----------

NOTE: A Committee comprising, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Parvinder Singh, DCDC, Professor Mukesh Arora, Principal H.S. Gosal, Principal Gurdip K. Sharma, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Dr. Dalip Kumar and D.R. Colleges (Convener) constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9) to check the inspection report/s thoroughly and verify their compliance/s and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, has granted/not granted affiliation/extension of affiliation to the above colleges.

I-132. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9), the Committee in its various meetings, has **not** granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses/subjects for the session 2016-17/ 2017-2018, as under:

Sr. No.	Date of the meeting of the Committee	Name of the College	Name of the courses/ subjects	Session
1.	22.06.2017	Guru Gobind Singh College for Women, Sector-26, Chandigarh	B.Com-I (4 th unit)	2017-2018
2.	05.07.2017	D.A.V. College of Education Fazilka-(Punjab)	The Committee after looking into the case on the subject (i) B.Ed. Course (Two Units-100 seats) has unanimously decided that from the proof attached by the College, it is clear that EPF being subscribed for 3 member/	2017-2018

			<p>employees seems to be sheer violation of rules/regulations of P.U./Punjab Government and this attitude of the college is not acceptable and also Assistant Professors have not been appointed by the college so far. Likewise, the college has failed to comply with the observation of the Inspection Committee during the last year. The Affiliation Committee has decided not to grant temporary affiliation for the year 2017-18 to the said college.</p>	
3.	05.07.2017	C.G.M. College, Village-Mohlan, Tehsil-Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	<p>The Affiliation Committee unanimously decided that the temporary extension of affiliation for (i) B.A. I, II & III- English (C), Punjabi (c) & (E), Hindi , Political Science, History, Physical Education, Economics & Sociology (ii) B.A.-I, II & III-(Computer Application)-40 seats each, (iii) B.Sc. I, II & III (Agriculture)-40 seats each, (iv) B.A. III (Music-Vocal)-15 seats, (v) M.A.-I & II- Sociology (one unit each) (vi) M.A. I & II Hindi-(one unit each) and new courses (vii) B.A.-I (Mathematics), (viii) B.Sc.-I (Medical), (ix) B.Sc. I (Non-Medical), (x) M.A.-I (Punjabi)-one unit and (xi) M.A.-I (History)-one unit has not granted to the college for the session 2017-18. Further, the Principal of the College is advised not to make</p>	2017-2018

			admission in B.Sc. (Agriculture) 1st year for the session 2017-18, however, the college is allowed to continue with 2 nd year and III year in B.Sc. (Agriculture) course.	
4.	05.07.2017	Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur Cantt. (Punjab)	The Affiliation Committee after looking into the case on the subjects (i) B.Sc. (Agriculture), (ii) M.A. (Sociology), (iii) M.Sc. (IT), (iv) M.Com., (v) M.Sc. (Mathematics) (vii) M.A. (Punjabi) (viii) M.A. (History), (ix) B.C.A. I, II & III (x) B.A. I, II & III (Sociology) has unanimously decided that the College has been advised to inform that re-visit of the Inspection Committee latest by 15 th July 2017 and is further advised not to admit any student for any new course/class till extension of affiliation be granted. The following members of the Affiliation Committee will visit the college to inspect infrastructure and appointment of faculty: (i) Principal H.S. Gosal, Fellow (ii) Principal I.S. Sandhu, Fellow (iii) Professor Mukesh Arora, Fellow (iv) Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow	2017-2018
5.	05.05.2017	National Degree College Chowarianwali, Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	The Committee after looking into the case on the subject i.e. (i) B.A. Part I, II & III (English) (C & E), Punjabi (C&E),	2017-2018

			<p>Mathematics, History, Political Science, Physical Education, Sociology, Hindi, Computer Applications, Economics, (ii) B.C.A. Part I, II & III (iii) M.A. (Hindi), M.A. (Sociology), M.A. (History), (iii) B.Com. course (one unit) and M.Sc. 1st Year (Mathematics) has unanimously decided as under:</p> <p>(i) The college be informed that the admission of Boys is not allowed from the session 2017-18</p> <p>(ii) Balance Sheets for the financial year i.e. 2015-16 be submitted</p> <p>(iii) The salary statement for the last six months of the teachers along with Bank certified and other proofs of salary be submitted.</p>	
6.	17.07.2017	National Degree College Chowarianwali, Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	<p>The Committee after looking into the case on the subject i.e. (i) B.A. Part I, II & III (English (C & E)), Punjabi (C &E), Mathematics, History, Political Science, Physical Education, Sociology, Hindi, Computer applications, Economics) (ii) B.C.A. Part I, II & III (iii) M.A. (Hindi), M.A. sociology, M.A. (History), (iv), B.Com. course (one unit) and M.Sc. 1st year (Mathematics) has unanimously decided that the college be advised not to admit any boy student in 1st</p>	2017-2018

			year of all courses. As affiliation committee has already taken a position in its meeting held on 5.5.2017 that the college be reconverted in a women college.	
7.	17.07.2017	Waheguru college Burj Muhar road, abohar-152116 (Punjab)	The committee after looking into the case on the subject (i) B.A. I, II and III English (C &E), Punjabi (C&E), Hindi, Public Administration, Political Science, Economic, Fine Arts, Physical Education, Mathematics, Sociology, Computer Science, History-E, Subject, (ii) B.Com. I & II (iii) B.Sc. I & II (Agriculture), (iv) B.Sc. I (Medical) and (v) B.Sc. I (Non-medical) courses has not granted affiliation to any course as the college was started last year, but till date only one Assistant Professor in Punjabi has been appointed. The Panjab University cannot allow the college to make admission in B.A. I, B.Sc. I for the session 2017-18 till the college appoints regular Assistant Professors as recommended by the Inspection Committee and inform the Panjab University accordingly.	2017-2018
8.		Maharaja Ranjit Singh College, Burjan Bye-pass, Malout-Abohar Road, Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	The College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc.A-4/7683-7700 dated 13.7.2017 not to admit students in the 1 st year courses. The college has also advised to inform the University after fulfilling all the conditions as recommended by the	2017-2018

			<p>Inspection committee in its report as stated above. The Inspection Committee will re-visit the college and then admit the students in 1st year courses only after grant of temporary extension of affiliation for i) B.A. I, II & III – English (C) & E, Punjabi (C), Public Administration, Political Science, Physical Education, Economics, Mathematics & History (ii) B.A. I, II & III (Computer Application)-40 seats each (iii) B.Com. I, II & III-one Unit each (iv) B.C.A. I, II & III- Two Units each (v) PGDCA-40 seats (vi) M.A. I & II- History-one unit each (vii) B.Sc. I, II & III- Agriculture-one unit each and new course (viii) B.A. I-Music (Vocal).</p>	
9.		G.H.G Khalsa College, Gurusasr Sadhar, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	<p>The college was required to submit the compliance report of the conditions imposed by the inspection committee dated 06.03.2017, immediately was informed vide Endst. No. Misc./A-8/8181-8196 dated 20.7.2017.</p> <p>The committee observed that there were certain conditions imposed on various courses i.e. B.A. 3rd year (Music)(Vocal) (E), B.Com. 3rd year (2nd unit), BBA 3rd year (one unit) for the session 2016-17. The college has neither complied with the conditions nor has applied for affiliation of the courses run by the college during the last year, for all these</p>	2017-2018

			courses i.e. B.A. (Music) (Vocal) (E), B.Com. (2 nd unit), BBA (One unit), temporary extension of affiliation is withdrawn for the session 2017-18.	
--	--	--	---	--

NOTE: A Committee comprising, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Parvinder Singh, DCDC, Professor Mukesh Arora, Principal H.S. Gosal, Principal Gurdip K. Sharma, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Dr. Dalip Kumar and D.R. Colleges (Convener) constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9) to check the inspection report/s thoroughly and verify their compliance/s and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, has granted/not granted affiliation/extension of affiliation to the above colleges.

I-133. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9), the Affiliation Committee in its various meetings has advised the following colleges to submit the compliance report on the observations made by the various Inspection Committee/s reports so that their cases could be considered for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session mentioned against each, as under:

Sr. No.	Date of the meeting of the Committee	Name of the College	Name of the courses/ subjects	Session
1.	05.05.2017	Saint Sahara College of Education, Ferozepur Road Near Power Grid Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	The Principal of the College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/6090-6107 dated 17.6.2017 to submit the compliance report on the observation made by the Inspection committee in its report dated 28.06.2016 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each).	2016-2017
2.	05.05.2017	Bawa Nihal Singh B.Ed. College, Bawa Nihal Singh Street, Kotkupra Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	The Principal of the College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/6049-6066 dated 17.6.2017 to submit the compliance report on the observation made by the Inspection committee in its report dated	2016-2017

			10.05.2016 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (Three units i.e. 150 seats each).	
3.	05.05.2017	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College of Education, Sukhanand Distt. Moga (Punjab)	The Principal of the College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/6029-6046 dated 17.6.2017 to submit the compliance report on the observation made by the Inspection committee in its report dated 31.03.2016 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each).	2016-2017
4.	05.05.2017	Guru Nanak Khalsa College for Women, Shamchaurasi Distt. Hoshiarpur	The college has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/6446-6461 dated 24.6.2017 to deposit the late fee of Rs.1 lac for the last two session and faculty be appointed as per the recommendation of the Inspection committee, which visited the college for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.A. I, II and III (Computer Application), B.C.A.-I, II and III (one unit) and PGDCA-40. If the college fails to comply orders of the University. A show cause notice under Regulation 11.1 be served upon. It is therefore, requested to comply with the orders of the Chairperson, failing which the college shall itself be responsible for the consequences.	2016-2017
5.	05.05.2017	Maharaja Ranjit Singh College, Burjan Bye-Pass Malout-Abohar Road, Malout	The Principal of the College was again advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/6523-6540 dated 27.6.2017 to submit the compliance report on the	2016-2017

		Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	observation made by the inspection committee in its report dated 19.04.2016, immediately to enable the office to proceed in the matter for grant of temporary extension of affiliation (i) B.A.-I, II & III-English (C) & (E), Public Admn., Pol. Sci, Phy. Edu., Mathematics & Computer Application (ii) B.Com. I, II & III-one unit each (iii) B.C.A. I, II & III -Two units each (iv) PGDCA-40 seats (v) M.A. I & II History-one unit each and (vi) B.Sc.- I & II-Agriculture-one unit each.	
6.	17.07.2017	Saint Sahara College of Education, Ferozepur Road Near Power Grid Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	The Principal of the College has been advised vide Endst No. Misc. A-4/8464-8481 dated 25.7.2017 to send the authentic proof of the same, so that their case for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Ed. course (two unit-100 seats) the session 2017-2018 can be considered.	2017-2018
7.	17.07.2017	Moga College of Education for Girls, Near P.S. Sadar, GT Road, Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Pb)	The college was required to appoint seven Assistant Professors and one Associate Professor on regular basis. Posts were advertised in two newspapers on 25.10.2016. The University Panel for the same was given to the College on 26.12.2016, but the college has not conducted any interview. Now, the college has again advertised the posts of faculty in the two leading Newspapers on 01.03.2017. The Principal of the College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc.A-	2016-2017

			4/8574-8591 dated 26.7.2017 to conduct the interview and appoint the faculty as per recommendations of the Inspection committee, so that their case for temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2016-2017 as well as 2017-2018 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for (i) B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (two units-100 seats each) & (ii) M.Ed. Course-1 st & 2 nd year (one unit-50 seats each) can be considered.	
8.	17.07.2017	Babe-Ke College of Education, V.P.O. Daudhar, Tehsil & Distt. Moga (Punjab)	The principal of the college has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc.A-4/8658-8675 dated 26.7.2017 to appoint the faculty as per recommendation of the inspection committee in its reports dated 21.09.2016 and 20.04.2017 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2016-2017 & 2017-2018, so that their cases of affiliation for the session 2016-2017 & 2017-2018 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Ed. course (Two Units-100 seats) and M.Ed. course (one unit-50 seats) can be considered.	2016-2017 & 2017-2018
9.	17.07.2017	Shukdeva Krishna College Education for Girls V.P.O.- Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Pb.)	The College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc.A-4/8483-8500 dated 25.7.2017 to intimate regarding the latest position for the selection of five Assistant Professors on regular basis as recommended by the Inspection committee in its report dated 29.04.2017, so that their case for grant of	2017-2018

			temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2017-2018 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Ed. course can be considered.	
10.	17.07.2017	Moga College of Education for girls, Near P.S. Sadar, GT Road, Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Pb.)	The college was required to appoint seven Assistant Professors and one Associate Professor on regular basis. Posts were advertised in two newspaper on 25.10.2016. The University panel for the same was given to the college on 26.12.2016, but the college has not conducted any interview. Now, the college has again advertised the posts of faculty in the two leading newspapers on 01.03.2017. The Principal of the College was advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/8574-8591 dated 26.7.2017 to conduct the interview and appoint the faculty as per recommendations of the Inspection committee, so that their case for temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2016-2017 as well as 2017-2018 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for (i) B.Ed. course- 1 st & 2 nd year (two units-100 seats each) & (ii) M.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (one unit-50 seats each) can be considered.	2016-2017
11.	05.05.2017	J.D. College of Education, Bathinda Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	The Principal of the College has been advised vide Endst No. Misc. A-4/5925-5942 dated 14.6.2017 to submit the compliance report on the observation raised by the inspection committee in	2016-2017

			its report dated 19.04.2016 for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each).	
12.	05.05.2017	Moga College of Education, Near P.S. Sadar, GT Road Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Pb.)	The Principal of the college has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/5887-5904 dated 14.9.2017 to submit the compliance report on the observation made by the Inspection committee in its report dated 29.09.2016. Status-quo to be maintained for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for (i) B.Ed. course-1 st & 2 nd year (two units-100 seats each) & (ii) M.Ed. Course-1 st & 2 nd year (one unit-50 seats each) for the session 2016-2017.	2016-2017
13.	05.05.2017	Babe-Ke College of Education, V.P.O.-Daudhar Tehsil & Distt. Moga (Pb)	The Principal of the college has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/5906-5923 dated 14.6.2017 to submit the compliance report on the observation made by the Inspection committee in its report dated 21.02.2016. Status-quo to be maintained.grant of temporary extension of affiliation for (i) B.Ed. course-1 st & 2 nd year (two units-100 seats each) & (ii) M.Ed. Course-1 st & 2 nd year (one unit-50 seats each) for the session 2016-2017.	2016-2017
14.	31.08.2017	G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya Distt.Hoshiarpur	The Principal of the College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-7/10865-10880 dated 18.9.2017 to conduct the interview appoint the teachers and send the information to the Panjab University within 15 days.	2017-18

15.	23.10.2017	Saint Sahara College of Education, Near Power Grid Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	The Principal of the College has been advised vide Endst. No. Misc. A-4/13825-13846 dated 09.11.2017 to appoint six Assistant Professors on regular basis and also complete the construction of multipurpose hall by 15.12.2017 and also send the information to the University. Further, the Affiliation Committee unanimously decided that the following Committee will re-visit the college on 01.12.2017: 1. Professor Navdeep Goyal, Fellow 2. Principal H.S. Gosal, Fellow 3. Principal I.S. Sandhu, Fellow 4. Professor Mukesh Arora, Fellow	_____
16.	18.07.2017	National Degree College, Chowarian Wali (Fazilka)	The Chairman of the affiliation committee after going through the representation made by the Principal has decided that the return of the students has been allowed for the session 2017-2018 as a special case. Further the college has been advised not to admit boys students for the session 2018-2019 without the prior permission of the University.	2017-18

NOTE: A Committee comprising, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Parvinder Singh, DCDC, Professor Mukesh Arora, Principal H.S. Gosal, Principal Gurdip K. Sharma, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Dr. Dalip Kumar and D.R. Colleges (Convener) constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9) to check the inspection report/s thoroughly and verify their compliance/s and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, has granted/not granted affiliation/extension of affiliation to the above colleges.

I-134. That

- (i) the matter related to C.G.M. College, Mohlan be referred to the Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University along with the relevant papers;
- (ii) the College be asked to submit status report in respect of teachers, staff and students since its opening;
- (iii) examination centre from the College be shifted to a suitable place;
- (iv) no new course be allotted to the College till a final decision in the matter;
- (v) to regulate the working of the Colleges, meetings with the Managements of the Colleges be held region wise;
- (vi) proper guidelines of the requirements for grant of affiliation be framed and provided to the Affiliation Committees

NOTE: The Syndicate has been authorised the Vice-Chancellor to constitute a Think Tank to suggest ways and means for the smooth functioning of the Colleges.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 24)

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR