

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Sunday, 26<sup>th</sup> March 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. Dr. Ameer Sultana
5. Shri Amanpreet Singh
6. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
7. Dr. Baljinder Singh
8. Professor B.S. Ghuman
9. Dr. B.C. Josan
10. Professor Chaman Lal
11. Dr. Dalip Kumar
12. Professor Dinesh K. Gupta
13. Shri Deepak Kaushik
14. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
15. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
16. Dr. Gurmit Singh
17. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
18. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
19. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
20. Dr. Harjodh Singh
21. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
22. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
23. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
24. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
25. Dr. Jagdish Chander
26. Shri Jarnail Singh
27. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
28. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
29. Dr. Neeru Malik
30. Professor Navdeep Goyal
31. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
32. Dr. N.R. Sharma
33. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
34. Shri Naresh Gaur
35. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
36. Dr. Parveen Goyal
37. Shri Prabhjit Singh
38. Professor Rajat Sandhir
39. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
40. Professor Ronki Ram

41. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
42. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
43. Professor R.P. Bambha
44. Ms. Surinder Kaur
45. Professor Shelly Walia
46. Shri Sanjay Tandon
47. Dr. S.K. Sharma
48. Shri Sandeep Singh
49. Shri Sandeep Kumar
50. Dr. S. S. Sangha
51. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
52. Shri Satya Pal Jain
53. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
54. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
55. Shri V.K. Sibal
56. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.)                      ...                      (Secretary)  
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Shri Ashok Goyal
2. Ms. Anu Chatrath
3. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
4. Dr. Amod Gupta
5. Dr. Amar Singh
6. Professor Anita Kaushal
7. Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary ,Education Minister, Punjab
8. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
9. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
10. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
11. Professor Deepak Pental
12. Justice Harbans Lal
13. Dr. Harsh Batra
14. Shri H.S. Dua
15. Shri Jitender Yadav, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
16. Smt. Kirron Kher
17. Dr. K.K. Sharma
18. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
19. Professor Pam Rajput
20. Shri Parmod Kumar
21. Professor Promila Pathak
22. Shri Parimal Rai
23. Shri Punam Suri
24. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
25. Shri Raghbir Dyal
26. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
27. Dr. Subhash Sharma
28. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma

29. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
30. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
31. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
32. Shri Sanjeev Kumar Bandlish
33. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
34. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab
35. Shri Varinder Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor apologized for having kept the members waiting for 5 minutes as it was due to so many calls being received by him related with the Convocation.

S. Tarlochan Singh said that the Convocation was very well organized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Chancellor's address has got permeated all across the globe and he could not resist taking up the calls from the people.

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

1. 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 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.
2. The state-of-art video conference facility has been created under Chandigarh Region Innocation and Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) in the Central Instrumentation Laboratory (CIL). This facility has been partially funded from MPLAD grant made available by the former Member of Parliament, UT, Chandigarh and former Union Minister Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, an alumnus, PU as well as a senior member of P.U. Senate.

This was applauded with clapping by the members.

3. Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar, PU, met Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary, Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Higher Education/School Education, Government of Punjab, and has given her an update on University's concerns with the Government of Punjab. Shri Vikram Nayyar, Finance and Development Office, PU, is pursuing University's financial concerns with the officers of University Grants Commission, and has had planned to visit UGC to meet the concerned Joint Secretary before March 31, 2017.

A joint meeting has also been sought with MHRD and UGC officials as a follow up of deliberations in Punjab and Haryana High Court on March 15, 2017.

4. MHRD is expected to release Rs. 20 crores for the Colleges of UT Chandigarh from the RUSA funds. However, the request of PU Campus for 20 Crores from the same budget head has been disfavoured by the UGC. A letter has been sent to MHRD requesting them to desist from excluding the requirement of PU on the premise that the PU is not an institution belonging to any of the States of India.
5. Nobel Laureate, Professor Roger Kornberg, Standford University, USA, will visit Panjab University, Chandigarh to inaugurate 5<sup>th</sup> DST Inspire Internship Camp as Chief Guest on April 26, 2017. During his stay on the Campus, Professor Kornberg will also be the Chief Guest at Pharmaceutical Science Convocation and Pharmaceutical Science Oration.
6. Dr. Savita Chaudhary, Assistant Professor in the Department of Chemistry, has been selected for the Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award for the Session 2014-15. Government of Haryana will honour her with a cash award of Rs. 1 Lakh, a citation and trophy.
7. Dr. Rohit Sharma, Chief Coordinator, Cluster Innovation Centre (CIC) in Biotechnology has been sanctioned a grant of Rs. 20 Lakhs under Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) by the Fresenius Kabi Oncology Limited (FKOL), Gurgaon to Bio-incubator, Panjab University for establishing a Microbiology Laboratory to assist young minds to give their ideas in practical shape. They have also agreed to fund two of the projects incubated at Bio-incubator, selected by Ms. Mariella Gobbi, Managing Director, FKOL, on her visit to Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology, PU at Punjab Start-up Fest 2.

**RESOLVED:** That:

- (1) felicitation of the Senate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Dr. Savita Chaudhary, Assistant Professor in the Department of Chemistry, on having been selected for the Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award for the Session 2014-15;
  - (ii) Dr. Rohit Sharma, Chief Coordinator, Cluster Innovation Centre (CIC) in Biotechnology on having been sanctioned a grant of Rs. 20 Lakhs under Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) by the Fresenius Kabi Oncology Limited (FKOL), Gurgaon to Bio-incubator, Panjab University for establishing a Microbiology Laboratory to assist young minds to give their ideas in practical shape
- (2) the information contained in Vice Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, be noted and approved.
- (3) Action Taken Report on the decision of the Senate dated 17.12.2016 as per **appendix** be noted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the March meeting is very important. It is a statutory meeting that they must hold before the financial year ends so that they could attend to the matters related to the next year's finances. He knows that all of them are here for the Convocation held yesterday and back to back for the Senate meeting today. It is a little bit of burden on everybody but they have to have it before the financial year closes.

**II.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-1** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-1.** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4) 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 posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>
1.	Dr. Amrinder Pal Singh (Mechanical Engineering) (w.e.f. 08.07.2014)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(i))</b>		
2.	Dr. Monika Randhawa (Physics) (w.e.f. 04.04.2015)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(iii))</b>		
3.	Dr. Kuldeep Kaur (w.e.f. 02.01.2016)	Education
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(vii))</b>		
4.	Dr. Sarabjit Singh (w.e.f. 16.10.2014)	School of Punjabi Studies
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(x))</b>		

- 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 have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that there are number of items in which promotion has been proposed. The only point is that a certificate has been given that “it had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations,

2010". He requested that if something has been referred to, it should be attached with the papers to bring in transparency.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that most of the people are experienced and they know how much paper work is there. It is okay, fine, they would do it. In future, they could give a link to such information. It has to be written as it is a statutory requirement.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that it is needed in order to maintain transparency.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the transparency has not been compromised and he (Shri Sibal) should use such words cautiously.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that it is okay, but it is required at least for the information of the members as some of the members might not know the requirements.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that if the documentary proof is not attached, how could one verify and calculate the points.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a job which is to be performed by the Screening Committee and all that has to be checked at the level of the Syndicate. Now, the matter before the Senate is for ratification. They could not have that great deal of scrutiny at this level. If there is a that great deal of scrutiny at this level while the Senate meeting is in progress and there are lot of agenda items, it would become difficult. If they have concerns of all these things, they could verify it from the records.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that in the last meeting of the Senate held on 17.12.2016, it was discussed to promote digital India. It has already been said by the Chief Justice of India and the Hon'ble Prime Minister, why they do not adopt it and send huge agenda in paper form. It is his first term in the Senate and lot of agenda papers have been stacked in this almirah. If the laptop is there and it is being used, they could send the agenda through e-mail and a text message could be sent on the registered mobile number regarding the meeting. It would make the members aware and the data would also be saved, time and energy would also be saved. This would also save the environment. Why do not they follow it?

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should understand that the University is committed to implement the digital things but it could not be done instantaneously. They have a staff that is not bit literate. It would take a while before everything is digitalized. They tried to get into a mode that all this could be provided on desktop computers but it would take a while. There is no lack of commitment on the part of the University to go to the digitalized stage. These things would happen by and by.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that an initiative in this regard has to be taken. The Vice-Chancellor had also said in the last meeting of the Senate that the increments would be granted but till date it has not happened.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Goyal) is again digressing. He requested not to relate one thing to another. This is no way of conducting the affairs of the University which has so many items on the agenda. He requested to raise such issues in the zero hour and allow to conduct the meeting as the time is very precious.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-1 on the agenda**, be approved.

**III.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-2** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-2.** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 8000/- 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:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>
1.	Dr. Shuchi Gupta (Physics) (w.e.f. 17.07.2015)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology (Physics)
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(ii))</b>		
2.	Dr. Gurinder Singh (Physics) (w.e.f. 18.07.2015)	P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(iv))</b>		
3.	Dr. Deepak Kumar Rahi (w.e.f. 14.10.2012)	Microbiology
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(vi))</b>		
4.	Dr. Mamta Rani (w.e.f. 07.09.2014)	University School of Open Learning
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(ix))</b>		
5.	Dr. Navreet (w.e.f. 03.11.2014)	Public Administration
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(xi))</b>		
6.	Ms. Mandeep Kaur (Information Technology) (w.e.f.25.11.2015)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(xii))</b>		
7.	Dr. Arvind Kumar (ECE) (w.e.f. 26.09.2013)	} University Institute of Engineering & Technology
8.	Mr. Sumit Budhiraja (ECE) (w.e.f. 23.09.2015)	
9.	Mr. Jaget Singh (ECE) (w.e.f. 22.12.2015)	
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(xiii))</b>		

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>
10.	Dr. Aditya Angiras (w.e.f. 03.11.2014)	V.V.B.I.S. & I.S. Hoshiarpur
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(xiv))</b>		

- 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.

**IV.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-3** on the agenda were read out, viz. –

**C-3.** That Dr. Naveen Gupta be placed in Lecturer (Senior Scale), in the Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (1996), w.e.f. 04.05.2006, in the pay-scale of Rs.10000-325-15200 at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**NOTE:** The letter of placement in Senior Scale has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 2(v))**

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the item before them is the placement of Dr. Naveen Gupta in the senior scale in the Department of Microbiology w.e.f. 4.5.2006. On this date, there is no senior scale existing as w.e.f. 1.1.2006 new scales have been implemented where there is Grade Pay. In the other items also, the new scales have been mentioned. He did not understand as to why the old scale is being given. The old pay scale is not in existence.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are all procedures. Those who are in the old scale, they would be promoted as per those scales and then it would be translated into the new pay scales.

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



**V.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-4** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-4.** That Dr. Puja Ahuja be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. 01.10.2015, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 7,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
- 1 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 21.01.2017 Para 2(viii))**

**VI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-5.** That following persons be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against their names:

**(i) Department of Chemistry**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Date of Birth</b>	<b>Date of Joining</b>	<b>Proposed date of confirmation</b>
1.	^Dr. (Ms) Sonal Singhal	Associate Professor in Inorganic Chemistry	1.4.1975	28.10.2015	27.10.2016
2.	^Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary	Associate Professor in Physical Chemistry	22.1.1977	28.10.2015	28.10.2016
3.	Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur	Associate Professor in Organic Chemistry	7.2.1977	29.10.2015	29.10.2016

**^ In case two or more persons join on the same date in different departments, their seniority be determined on the basis of date of birth, the person who is senior in age will be senior, provided the Selection Committees are different. Accordingly date of confirmations has been proposed as mentioned above for consideration.**

**(ii) Department of Zoology**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Date of Birth</b>	<b>Date of Joining</b>	<b>Proposed date of confirmation</b>
1.	Dr. (Ms.) Harpreet Kaur	Associate Professor	30.9.1963	03.11.2015	03.11.2016

**(iii) Department of Hindi**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Date of Birth</b>	<b>Date of Joining</b>	<b>Proposed date of confirmation</b>
1.	Dr. Ashok Kumar	Associate Professor	13.5.1970	27.11.2015	27.11.2016

**(iv) Department of Education**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Date of Birth</b>	<b>Date of Joining</b>	<b>Proposed date of confirmation</b>
%1.	Dr. Jatinder Grover	Associate Professor	12.07.1976	27.11.2015	27.11.2016
%2.	Dr. Satvinderpal Kaur	Associate Professor	09.09.1973	09.12.2015	9.12.2016

**% In order of merit****(v) University Institute of Engineering & Technology**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Date of Birth</b>	<b>Date of Joining</b>	<b>Proposed date of confirmation</b>
@1.	Dr. Naveen Aggarwal	Associate Professor	09.02.1979	28.10.2015	28.10.2016
@2.	Dr. Ajay Mittal	Associate Professor	16.11.1979	23.11.2015	23.11.2016

**@ In order of merit****(vi) Centre for Nano Science & Nano Tech.**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Date of Birth</b>	<b>Date of Joining</b>	<b>Proposed date of confirmation</b>
1.	Dr. Sunil Kumar Arora	Associate Professor	06.10.1966	30.10.2015	30.10.2016

**(vii) Department of Biochemistry**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Navneet Agnihotri	Associate Professor	21.08.1966	27.11.2015	27.11.2016

**(viii) (a) Department of Physics**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	*Dr. Bivash Ranjan Behera	Professor	01.06.1972	28.10.2015	27.10.2016
2.	*Prof. Vipin Bhatnagar	Professor	15.09.1969	28.10.2015	28.10.2016

\* in order of merit

**(viii) (b) Department of Physics**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	#Dr. Ashok Kumar	Associate Professor	30.07.1964	06.11.2015	05.11.2016
2.	#Dr. Sunita Srivastava	Associate Professor	20.10.1962	06.11.2015	06.11.2016

# in order of merit

**(ix) Department of Anthropology**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Kewal Krishan	Associate Professor	24.11.1973	26.11.2015	26.11.2016

**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 21.01.2017 Para 42)

**VII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-6.** That Mrs. Renuka B Salwan be appointed as Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+ Grade Pay of Rs.6600/- plus allowances admissible under the University rules, against the leave vacancy, purely on temporary basis, initially for the period of six months or until the person holding lien joins back the University, whichever is earlier.

- NOTE:**
1. A summary bio-data of the selected candidate is enclosed.
  2. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualification laid down for the post.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 2)**

The Vice-Chancellor said that Mrs. Renuka B Salwan has not yet joined and sent a communication that she would join from 1<sup>st</sup> April after getting relieved from the previous position on 31<sup>st</sup> March.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is a very good decision as the Vice-Chancellor has appointed a person for the post of Director Public Relations in a very short period. Could they think of extending her term of appointment?

The Vice-Chancellor said that let her join and they would see those things as the time progresses. Right now, they are in a situation that they have a DPR who stands relieved up to the end of June 2017. Let her join and they would see how the things progress. If the DPR comes and joins on 1<sup>st</sup> July.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that as per his knowledge, the DPR has asked for further extension of leave. She is a good person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have not tested her and let her join and perform, let them test her competitiveness.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that she might think for joining for three months.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now there is no such proposal. The proposal at the moment is just approving the appointment.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6** on the agenda, be approved.

**VIII.** 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 term of appointment of Professor Anil Monga, Centre for Police Administration, as Dean of Alumni Relations, be extended for another one year w.e.f. 01.03.2017, under Regulation 1 at page 109 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 6)**

**IX.** Considered the recommendations of the Board of Finance (**Items C-8 on the agenda**) contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 13.02.2017 (Items 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7), as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 (Para 3):

**Item 1**

That –

- (I) (a) the Budget Estimates of 2017-18 as per Appendix-I, II (Budget Part-I & II) and appendix III be approved;
- (b) all the departments/centres/institutes and offices shall ensure to economize the non-salary expenditure at least by 5% in the financial year 2017-18;
- (c) the rates of checking/D-coding of (OMR) answer books be enhanced from Rs.2 to Rs.2.5 per answer book from the session December, 2016.
- (II) the decision of Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 regarding enhancement in the rates of remuneration of teachers for evaluation of answer sheets, be ratified.

**NOTE:** The Maintenance Budget has been prepared as per the recommendations of the Estimate Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, keeping in view the projections already submitted to the MHRD/UGC vide letter No. 22/R/DS dated 13.01.2017 (Appendix-).

**Item 2**

That Dr. Khuswinder be appointed as Assistant Professor on temporary basis for one year only in the Department of Chemistry against the vacant sanctioned post w.e.f. 01.03.2017 under Regulation 5 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I (2007) page 111 (Appendix-).

**Item 4**

That one time honorarium of Rs.10000/- be sanctioned out of the budget head 'General Administration-subhead Unassigned/Unforeseen' to Professor S. K. Singla (Retd.), Department of Biochemistry for his contribution in compilation/uploading of data for National Institution Ranking Framework (NIRF) of MHRD/UGC, India.

**NOTE :** The above honorarium has been recommended by the Director Internal Quality Assurance Cell stating that the Panjab University has been participating in the NIRF. Data for the same is collected from various departments and branches of the University. Most of the departments could provide data only at the last moment. At that stage the Vice-Chancellor advised that expert advice

and help be obtained from Prof. S.K. Singla who had retired from the Dept. of Bio-Chemistry. Prof. S.K. Singla discharged their duties for 10 days of work from 1.11.2016 to 15.11.2016.

### **Item 6**

The decision of Vice-Chancellor for award of contract of security services to PESCO be ratified in pursuance of the notification of Government of Punjab, Department of Defence Services Welfare dated 12.06.2014 (Appendix-\_) 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 conditions:

- i) 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;
- ii) The term of present contract shall not be extended and before the expiry of present contract, a cost analysis shall be made to determine whether to outsource these services and if the services are to be outsourced, then University shall invite the open tender from all eligible agencies.

### **Item 7**

Noted and ratified the decision of the Senate dated 9.10.2016 vide Paragraph XLVII (R-31) for sanctioning the payment of honorarium at double the rates (Appendix -)in following cases:

- (i) the supporting staff as well as Centre Superintendent who had performed outstation duties during P.U. (CET) 2016 examination.
- (ii) the staff members who had performed duty for more than 12 hours during the CET Exam-(UG) held in 2016.
- (iii) the staff who may have to perform duty for more than 12 hours in any entrance test of the Panjab University (effective from 11.06.2016).

***Financial Liabilities : Rs.25,000/- approx.)***

**((Minutes of Board of Finance dated 13.02.2017 available in separate volume))  
(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 3)**

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item relates to the minutes of the Board of Finance or the recommendations of the Board of Finance which have been processed through the Syndicate and brought here. The financial situation of the University continues to be in a

little flux. They are aware that they had a special meeting of the Syndicate where they had passed a resolution. The budget, i.e., the data, details which are in front of them, are all of a nature that there would be an element of uncertainty attached to it. Normally, the budget things are financial matters as per the Government of India financial practices. The financial matters, prima facie, should not have any level of uncertainty. But the time that they are passing through, there is a tentativeness of all these things. The tentativeness, he did not need to repeat it as they are all well aware of it, has crept in because there is some rethink going on as India is evolving. They used to do a budget exercise in the sense that the March meeting of the Senate was the most important meeting to determine what would be the budget estimates, what would be the revised estimates, who would contribute what, etc. etc. But all this started to change as Government of India stepped in to look after the University in 2011. Then certain algorithm was proposed and that algorithm underwent a small change in the sense that they have to conform to the Central Government pattern where the budget is presented in the month of February. So, when the budget is presented in the month of February, the budget estimates of various Ministries have to reach the Government of India well in advance. The Government of India has a practice of having the budget estimates reached to them by the end of December and the budget estimates of the Government of India depend on what are the revised estimates of the Government of India for a given financial year. While the budget is presented, in that financial year based on the revised estimates of the Government of India, they decide the budget estimates for the next year. In the case of University, they are still in a transition stage, in the sense that when they present their revised estimates to Government of India very year, they are unsure of how the budget would be balanced in that financial year because the Government of India has not been declaring to the University before hand as to what would be their contribution for the next year. In the absence of these figures, the budget which is presented, it again suffers from that inadequacy. It is tentative, it is inadequate to that extent, that this year's inadequacy stands multiplied or get added up because in the previous two financial years they have not balanced the books. They are in a very uncomfortable situation that the books do not stand balanced for the previous year". Books are expected to be balanced only for the current financial year. How the books would be balanced in the next financial year, that is a matter of Courts. Justice Saron has said that before the next hearing on 17<sup>th</sup> April, all the stakeholders ought to get together and resolve the matter for the next financial year. He said that he has sought a meeting with the MHRD so that the whole year does not pass in acrimony. They should have these things settled before even the first instalment of the next financial year is released. They desperately need the first instalment of the next financial year in order that, they could commence the next academic session 2017-18 in peace. They have to pay salary to everyone by July otherwise the process would not proceed further. So, they need a meeting with MHRD/UGC, otherwise as they had only Rs.176 crores last year. Whether they would get even that Rs.176 crores next year, even that assurance is not there from anywhere. They are asked to comply with certain thing and they are well aware that they have complied with. There is a correspondence related with the deliberations in the Court. The Hon'ble members are well aware of that and it is in that scenario that this budget is being presented. Whatever is being presented, it is based on the projections that they have made to the UGC and the MHRD, and while making these projections, the representatives of the MHRD were present there but whether they would be able to convince their parent bodies. Whether the UGC representative would be able to convey the circumstances under which they have made the statements, whether the MHRD representative would be able to convince the MHRD officials about the numbers. Only the time would tell. As of now whatever they have, it is in the background that the Think Tank had said that in order to comply with the directive of the Central agencies, Panjab University should continuously be enhancing its income in the background of the expenditure enhancing. So, the Think Tank had said and they had promised that they would enhance the income in 2016-17 @ 20% of the figures of 2013-14 when the University was transferred from the plan budget to the non-plan budget. Then they said that in 2017-18 it would be

25% again based on the figure of 2013-14 and again 25% in 2018-19 but based on the figures of 2013-14. It is not that they have said that they would enhance the income by 20% of the previous year. The expenditure is enhancing at a certain rate. So what they promised and this is what they all have decided that they would never have the University's income enhancing at a rate slower than the rate of increase in the expenditure. This is all that they could do to match the inflation. But when the additional burden would come in the form of a new Pay Commission or some additional burden because the Government of India decides to improve the service conditions of Central Government employees and they also want to match with that. So, all those additional things require additional income. All these requirements have to be met. So, all the stakeholders must sit together and address it. At the moment, all the projections that the expenditure is increasing at a certain rate, they have given certain assurances that they would increase the income in a certain way. At the moment, they are not committing themselves more than what they have said. The Central Government is saying that if the University needs extra grants, it should do such and such things, all that is a matter of negotiation. As of now, the Senate is the final authority to decide the affairs. The Senate has taken no decision to remove such and such thing. They have taken no such decision as of now. The matter is being discussed. At the moment, they have proposed that they would increase the income in a certain way and the projections have been made only to that extent. So, it is an incremental budget as to what the utilization would be in the previous financial year. Since in the previous financial year, the Government of India had agreed to balance the books. This year, there is a commitment to balance the books. So, next year's budget is a small incremental increase in tini-mini things over the last year.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that there was an issue also in the Vice-Chancellor statement, but he did not speak about it. The lecture by the Chancellor was very inspiring and he had said that there should be space for freedom and dissent in the University. He would request the House that they should start such things from this House itself. Everyone should listen to every member attentively. He would also like not to be interrupted and should be listened whether something suits or not and they should keep in mind what the Chancellor had said. He has no knowledge of the economics or not much knowledge about the finance. But he would talk on matters related with common sense. As it is flashed on the screen, for example, they are increasing the remuneration for the OMR sheets and also for the teachers. He is also a teacher and also evaluates the answer sheets for which he gets the remuneration. Since they had called a special meeting to discuss the current financial situation, they would have to look at all these things carefully. If they have money, they could increase the remuneration from Rs.2.50 to Rs.4/-, there is no issue. But if they are not having the money, if they face a crisis for the payment of salaries and even then they are increasing the remuneration for evaluation of answer sheets from Rs.18 to Rs.20, they are not stopping such things. However, it was not his focus but since it was being flashed on the screen, that is why he was referring it. Secondly, as the Vice-Chancellor has told that all the matters related with the budget are tentative and they are holding a meeting to overcome it, it is very good. He had earlier also said and the letter is also in the knowledge of all of them which ACS (Finance), Punjab has written to Shri Vinaysheel Oberoi, which has been provided to them, it is clearly written in the letter that the "Punjab Government is already releasing Rs.20 crores annually to the Panjab University and is not in position to further enhance the grant due to State's critical financial position. You are requested to enhance the grant to Panjab University annually and to also bear the share of State of Punjab too". Last time also he had said that it is a right opportunity that if the Punjab Government is ready to say that the Central Government should pay the share of Punjab Government also, which it is already paying 92% of the deficit of Panjab University. As the Vice-Chancellor has said that the Registrar has met the Education Minister and they would meet the Chief Minister also. If they talk with them in this direction that with the present structure, with the present Senate, with the present Colleges, which Shri Satish



Chandra, an officer, has written, if the same is written from the Punjab Government that they have no objection to it if the whole funding of the University is done on the central level. He had also talked with the Vice-Chancellor in this connection for which he could not get the reply and then he submitted a resolution for which a legal opinion was asked by him, he thinks that it is a wrong precedence. If they wanted to pass a resolution that the Senate of Panjab University wants that keeping in view the heritage of the University, about which there is a write-up also in The Tribune by Professor Chaman Lal and all are aware of it. When Professor Murli Manohar Joshi became HRD Minister, the first thing he did was that he made the University of Allahabad as a Central University, this fact could be verified. They would have to understand this thing. Some of the members, last time, had given the suggestion that the fee should not be increased. He has read the minutes of the Syndicate also which had lot of deliberations on the issue. He would like to give an example from page 3 of Budget Estimates 2017-18 (Appendix-I), the income from the tuition fee in respect of Department of Hindi for the year 2014-15 was Rs.1,32,334/- and the estimated income for the year 2017-18 is Rs.15 lacs. Similar is the case with the Department of Indian Theatre whose income for the year 2017-18 has been estimated to be Rs.2.5 lacs from Rs.35,179/- in the year 2014-15. Similar is the case with other Departments also. He is in favor of it that they must be realistic and also they should talk with the students keeping in view their income. Where they want to resist the UGC, they may do it. If the UGC has asked to freeze the recruitment, they even had said that no new recruitment would be made. Would they kill the students by burdening them with the increase in fee which is being enhanced from Rs.1.35 lacs to Rs.15 lacs within a period of 4 years. So, they should give a serious thought to it. Secondly, if by doing so as the Vice-Chancellor has said, if no solution comes out as the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission is just to be implemented on the suggestion of the UGC Committee. It is right that the estimates are tentative. They would have to have a direction and would have to arrive at a consensus. As they say that the private universities are also charging higher fee which the students are paying. It is right that they charge higher fee from the students having SUVs. He has read the minutes of the Syndicate wherein it has been said that the teachers should minutely verify each form on the income criteria, it is a lengthy process. There could also be more complications in this regard in future if they make separate categories. Last time, he had said that they should peep into their inner self also as they are taking the fee concession for their own wards. Whether they have done away with that concession? Do they want to reduce the expenditure in this way as they are having an annual salary of Rs.10 lacs as is mentioned that they have to reduce their non-salary expenditure by 5% but they are enhancing it. He would just like to request that if ultimately they want to save the Panjab University, as he has been saying since the year 2008, that they all should take steps.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that the Vice-Chancellor has given them a background and has wisely refrained from creating a situation of crisis or presenting a situation of crisis which actually is against but it is wise not to talk of a crisis and has wisely refrained from using the term deficit which they have been using earlier. But in the minutes of the Board of Finance, it is mentioned again. In fact, he would not use the term, state of flux, uncertainty, these are euphemisms. The fact is that, once again, they have before them the budget which estimates the assured income of only Rs.271 crores and expenditure of Rs.515.6 crores. It leaves blank the column which is supposed to list where the balance is going to come from. If they look at page V of this Appendix-I, the last column, the estimates for 2017-18, the income is estimated at Rs.271 crores, there is a column of Maintenance Grants, which is blank. He is not sure of the reasons for keeping it blank. According to him, they should not think, as the Vice-Chancellor has said it is uncertainty. Now, uncertainty is there but they should have not have uncertainty in their minds. The Senate could not act irresponsibly. According to him, they should refrain from approving the budget which identifies the expenditure of Rs. 515 and the income of Rs. 271 crore and is silent on the sources from which the balance would come. There is a reason for that but let

they justify their running away from their responsibility. The Senate has a responsibility to manage the University. Last time, in an effort to remove this uncertainty or lack of clarity in their minds or in the minds of those who are responsible for providing resources, they have adopted a resolution in which they have clearly put the responsibility, the statutory obligation of the Central Government for ensuring that the University is provided with adequate resources, whether directly by them (Central Government) or via various State Governments which now they have only two, or via the UGC. The Senate has pronounced itself and also identified the projected grants from various sources as income. His suggestion is to remove the sense of uncertainty from their minds and hope that thereby they would manage to remove any uncertainty in the minds of those who are really responsible for providing these resources. His suggestion is that they do not leave that column blank, they do not describe maintenance grant something apart from income because in the resolution which they had adopted last time, they have asserted that under the Act and in terms of the resolution framed under that Act, the responsibility for providing these resources rests with the Central Government and that grant from whichever sources they come, are their income and therefore, these should be listed as such. If the uncertainty remains in the minds of those who would eventually be charged with the responsibility of providing that income, that uncertainty should not remain in their minds. Let the Senate pronounce itself and let the message go forward, the Senate sent a very strong message last time, another strong message be sent this time. He had suggested an amendment, which has no change in the content of the budget, this is not the occasion or the forum to do that. Therefore, the column of income for the year 2017-18 should be exactly the same as the estimate of expenditure for 2017-18. This is a departure from the earlier practice but it does not change anything in terms of the legal provisions. As the Vice-Chancellor has mentioned that there have been changes in the minds of the Central Government or those responsible for governing it since 2011 and the entire matter is in the state of flux. Let them rethink. If they (Government) want to make changes, those changes could not be made unless they amend the statutory provisions of the Calendar. If the Government wanted to change the regulations, it is fine. They are entitled to do that because those who control the purse strings, want to be able to determine the method, the procedure, the legal obligation. But until and unless the Act and the regulations under it are altered in a way, the legal position remains as they had reflected and adopted in the last session. Therefore, he has suggested this amendment and would be happy to hear from the Finance and Development Officer whether it is consistent with that as he is not an expert on that.

The Vice-Chancellor while responding to Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that, at the moment, the matter before them is the recommendations of the Board of Finance. All that he (Ambassador Chadha) is saying about leaving the column blank, it meant that they just say that it is the desired income from the Centre and they could put that number and balance the books. But eventually, it would remain a desired income and other than that there is no change. That desired income would actually accrue or not that would be known hopefully by 17<sup>th</sup> April by which time, there is the next hearing in the High Court. Justice Saron has still not uploaded his observations. He had said many things in the Court. Shri Satya Pal Jain is here who was present along with him in the Court. The observations have not been uploaded on the website. He did not know what Justice Saron has recorded or going to record, but it is not yet uploaded. At the moment, they are supposed to go back on 17<sup>th</sup> April with some understanding how this number is to be filled. But before agreeing to this whether the Central Government desires more deliberations and at the moment the Government might say that the number is only a default number and the default number is either Rs.176 crores or the previous year release of grant which is Rs.197.7 crores. They could balance the books by putting a desired number. He did not know what is it in a concrete way Ambassador I.S. Chadha is saying that they could force the situation on the Central Government. At the moment, forcing the situation is not a solution, dialogue is the only solution.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that the concrete message that he is sending is reflect their desire, their expectations in black and white as part of the budget.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have sent the resolution and reminded the Central Government of its responsibility.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that let they implement then.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that technically they approve the budget and the deficit be conveyed to the Central Government for reimbursement. After that the negotiations start and if there is a shortage then they could come back to the Senate with a message that this is not acceded to. So, they adjust the expenditure accordingly. The Board of Finance has applied its mind, has given the figures and they approve it and send it to the Central Government that this is the income and this is the expenditure and the deficit would be met by grants from the Government. After that the Government might have discussion with the Vice-Chancellor and could say that they would not meet so much expenditure and then if necessary, he could come back and say that the Government has agreed to so much. At the moment, they should not say that it is tentative. This is to be conveyed that it is the expected deficit and according to the 1966 Act, the deficit has to be met by the Government.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this issue is not the first time when they are having it on their agenda. This issue of finance and deficit was always and every time at the end of the financial year and at the beginning if they could see the records. He did some homework on this over the last 10 years. Now the question comes why this crisis came. Now they know that they have to balance the books and it is must and Ambassador I.S. Chadha's view is pragmatic and Professor R.P. Bambah has rightly said it. As the Vice-Chancellor said that the desired income, they could make it, the masters also know it. But the issue that they have to ponder over is a responsibility of the Senate as Ambassador I.S. Chadha said, is rather more critical. They have seen that their budget provision has certain ratio in which contribution have to be made. That ratio is very much there. Some changes have taken place over the years. Now, they have also seen that in the University they have these many posts at different levels, and there is the finance that they need for the infrastructure, etc.. Now the question comes are they going away from that with much expectation, or is the authority which is giving them the funds is going away from its commitment. This is the first question to be put into place. If they (University) are at fault, they could not be excused, and if they (Governments) are at fault, they could make them realize that the Government is at fault. After going through the 10-year data, it was found that the University is not at fault. Because they have not, at any point of time, Professor R.P. Bambah is a very senior member of the Senate and the Vice-Chancellor is very much there, they could confirm that they have never filled all the posts of Professors, Readers or Lecturers at any particular time. Many of the posts were not filled up. Secondly, they never tried to make exaggeration in the claims that they need to put forward at any point of time because they never give the scales beyond the prescribed limits, they never gave increment to the teachers or non-teaching staff which were beyond the limit. So, where did they fault. The only thing that they are being accused of many times is that they are very much hard to the students. This is not the reality as Dr. Gurmeet Singh said. Rather, from the very beginning they never tried to enhance the fee at par with others, because they are a public University, they thought of it. So, the concern for the public was very much there. They were told by the funding agency that they are not doing certain things to which they have explained their own position. For 10 years, they did not enhance even a single penny. Now, at this moment, they are all concerned with the issue of resolving the crisis. There is no difference in opinion between here and there. All of them are concerned. Maybe they are making their opinion in the way which might not suit linguistically to each other, but all of them are concerned. So, today if they have to take the Chancellor's view to start first at

their House, they should also think that they should not squabble among themselves unnecessarily. With the beginning of it, they started making an issue. No, they have to think of it as to where they are going because the Government is united but they (members) are not united. The Government says that how the funds could be generated and says that if Lovely Professional University, Desh Bhagat University and other Universities could survive, why this University, which is a heritage University, could not survive on its own. So, they have no answer. The Government says that why the University is having so much employees, then there is no answer. They could tell that this is a University which is serving the society and the budget is there and tell as to where they have faulted. If there is an increase in amount for checking of the OMR, they know that many College teachers come to do it and why they should think that they are wasting their time because it is a small amount in the capitalist world. They should avoid it but even avoiding it is not proper. Now, at this moment, they have to balance the books. But at the same time, they must be very much clear that the University has a right for financial assistance which is not an assistance which is a commitment for which the University was established. On this account, they could make a proposal, but they could not say that Punjab Government is giving only Rs.20 crores, 92% funding coming from the Centre, so let it be a Central University. The Centre would also ask that if they provide the funds, then there would be a commitment that they have their own way that the other partners are not ready. The question is not of finance. The question is that Panjab University is also of a prestige, let him use the word, that it is political also. They could not do this. He knew that the last time, as Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal is here, he would not like to say something which is provocative, that when they got the letter from the Punjab Government, there was a provision that why the Panjab University would be made a Central University. Shri Bansal was helping very much. But 21 MLAs from Punjab who were in the opposition, wrote a letter that it is against the interest of Punjab. But at the last moment, the thing was not approved. Again they are saying that that they become a Central University. They would have to see as to what is the political game, what is the political system. So, they have to go above the politics and have to find the solution. He hoped that they could find some expenditure system and some thinking would come out as they are having members from the Centre, Punjab Government representatives, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Shri Satya Pal Jain are there and this University is also theirs and they are their followers. So, they could do this. He hoped that they could do it.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that first the internal resource mobilization is a must for them because they could not skip it. He is repeating the earlier point that the fee structure should be based upon the paying capacity of the student. Secondly, they should also bring in value for money that if they are charging more and more fee from the students, then business as usual approach in teaching and research would not work. If they are charging more and more fee then they have to change the teaching and research approaches so that the quality is also improved and only then the students would come to seek admission in the University. They have to have a positive correlation between internal resource mobilization and improvement in the quality of teaching and research, only then the things would deliver. One way traffic would not work.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he was avoiding participating on this technical point. The discussion has started on a wider scale. Either they take this discussion just at this point of time so that it is not repeated. This issue has erupted again. Since Professor Ronki Ram has spoken in detail and if he is allowed, he could also put across certain suggestions in this regard. He would not touch the technical point. In fact, he was in agreement with Ambassador I.S. Chadha who has articulated in a very good manner. He would have a technical point and would also like to agree that it should be shown as deficit budget and how it has to be filled that remains a question. The desired income issue is there but it has not been filled up, he would suggest that it should be filled up. The Vice-Chancellor has

said that it should be filled up as the desired income. Whatever are the technical views, the budget estimate has to be put on record. It is a deficit budget but how it has to be met whether by the State Government or the Central Government or by whatever other means. According to him, it would come again when the issue of fee would come. It should be delinked from the emotional and political aspect of the University. Last time what happened which has just been told that the Chief Minister of Punjab had given his consent to turn Panjab University into a Central University, but later on, as Professor Ronki Ram has pointed out, on the 21 MLAs insistence, the letter was withdrawn. He was not there at that time but he could assess that, at that time also the issue was turned into an emotional and political issue which should not have been. If Bihar and Jammu & Kashmir could vie for having two Central Universities, how Punjab loses if Panjab University also gets the Central status. There is nothing to lose. The only thing is because of Chandigarh being a disputed territory or they could say that territory of Punjab but not awarded to Punjab till now, that is why some people thought that if Panjab University becomes a Central University, then Punjab's claim over Chandigarh would get hurt. This was not the case. If it had been explained properly in a reasonable manner, it should have been understood that the name of Panjab University could not be changed. Secondly, some conditions could also be incorporated. One condition which could be put is that all five heritage Universities under the Indian Universities Act, 1904 be put at par. The two Committees that they are going to form to negotiate with the Punjab Government as well as Ministry of Human Resource Development/UGC, those Committees first should draft certain reasonable options. One option may not work. If the option is that Panjab University becomes a Central University, then it creates problems. If Panjab University becomes a Central funded University, then also it creates problems. They should put up certain options to negotiate with the Government. These five universities are heritage universities and it is the moral responsibility of the Central Government to preserve that heritage. The Panjab University got split in 1947 and again in 1966, it has gone through double tragedy, in 1947 because of country's partition and in 1966 since Punjab was formed, then it becomes a State University. It has gone into double complication. Something was being taken care of. The first point for both the Committees is that the heritage status of the University along with other Universities be ensured. Dr. Gurmeet Singh has given a right example of Allahabad University. Allahabad University has gone through two phases not one. It was a Central University, made into a State University, then again made a Central University. So, it has gone through two phases. The second point is that for Punjab Government particularly, the Central University status does not harm the interest at all if they put it in a reasonable manner. Panjab University remains Lahore's Panjab University continuing at Chandigarh. Punjab's claim does not at all get affected. Secondly, to ensure that its heritage status is maintained, whenever Central University is formed, the Statutes and Acts must be preserved. When the Central University takes over a University, all the Statutes would get revised and put under a Central Act. There are Central Universities which have their own Statutes like the Jawaharlal Nehru, Aligarh Muslim University and Banaras Hindu University. So, Panjab University must also have its own Act, as is being confirmed from Lahore. So, this is one condition even when it is made a Central University, the Act and Statutes must be preserved. Secondly, the Punjabi language and culture would not be harmed in any manner, which was an issue last time, this should be part of the second condition. With that, if not, then Punjab Government should be given an option because they wanted to get rid of the financial liability. Then, the Punjab Government should itself propose to the Central Government to make it a Central University only to get it centrally funded however, its heritage status has to be preserved. So the Statutes and the Acts are not to be changed. No harm would be done to the Punjabi language and culture and history. These are 3-4 options on which the Committees should negotiate with the Government. The danger which Professor Ronki Ram is suggesting is also here that if MHRD wanted to control it, they would like to change the Statutes and Act and bring it more and more under the direct control of MHRD and UGC. He is sorry but it is his

considered opinion that the present MHRD and present UGC is bent upon harming the University rather than expanding its knowledge and this thing has happened in many universities. This precaution they have to take that they might not be harmed as the Vice-Chancellors come and go. It should not be linked to the choice of the Vice-Chancellor, University is an institution. The interest of the institution is the primary thing. Whosoever has been appointed as the Vice-Chancellor, he/she should take care of it. When the issue of fee would come, then the example of Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University would be given and why not give the example of JNU, AMU, Allahabad or BHU where the fee is much less than the present fee of Panjab University. So, these are all things which have a kind of package. So, let the Committees frame certain guidelines. The best thing is that now this issue of Panjab University has come, the most significant issue has to be resolved in one way or the other. That is why he wanted to pose a question. He has brought a condition wherein the High Court is involved, the Ministries are also involved, Punjab Government is also involved. So, let them negotiate in a very wise and reasonable manner to get it resolved in the best interest of the University.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he could not attend special the meeting of the Senate held on 16<sup>th</sup> March and this was also reported in the newspapers with photographs of those who could not attend the meeting. He just wanted to clarify that he had told the Vice-Chancellor the same day on which the meeting was fixed that there is a case in the Jharkhand High Court on 17<sup>th</sup> March. He started from Chandigarh on 16<sup>th</sup> March and reached there at 5.30 a.m. This was the reason that he could not attend the meeting otherwise it never happens that he did not attend the meeting of the Senate. This issue is a matter of discussion in the University. As Professor Chaman Lal, Professor Ronki Ram and Ambassador I.S. Chadha have said, he did not see any big dispute in this. It would be better if 5-8 persons, by putting themselves above politics, in the interest of the University and leaving aside their personal interests, go both to Capt. Amarinder Singh and also talk to the MHRD Minister and the UGC. It should not be that different teams visit the different places, but the same team should visit both the places otherwise there could be gap in communication between both the Committees. He would like to point out that there have been many occasions in the University when the persons putting themselves above political interest, he remembers late Shri Gurdial Singh Dhillon and Shri Jagannath Kaushal, they have been continuously in the opposition, he belongs to hardcore RSS-BJP since 1976, whenever any such occasion came they used to sit together and used to talk wherever needed. He would like to say this in the beginning and at the conclusion also. What is the root cause of the crisis that they are facing? Before the year 2009, 60% of the grant to the University was given by the Central Government and 40% by the Punjab Government. Thereafter, the pattern changed. The grant from the Central Government used to come through U.T. Chandigarh Administration and the grant from Punjab Government used to come directly from Punjab Government. By and by the pattern changed and the grant which was coming through Ministry of Home Affairs come through UGC and the Punjab Government said that it would not be able to provide more than Rs.20 crores. This system kept going on. He did not doubt the integrity of the persons who had adopted this system. At that time, Dr. Man Mohan Singh was the Finance Minister and Prime Minister and he must have done in the best interest. But it seems that there might be some lacunae in that or there is some problem in the implementation. Now such a situation has come that the Punjab Government is not interested to give its Rs.20 crores share as just now Dr. Gurmeet Singh has read a letter which was filed as an affidavit in the High Court by the Finance Secretary of Punjab during the hearing of the case. At that time the previous Government was going on and the new Government took after 2-3 days of that. He has seen that even if the Government changes, whether it is of Shri Parkash Singh Badal or Capt. Amarinder Singh, the stand of the Government, by and large, remains the same. It has never happened that with the change of the Government, the stand of the Government changes. In the letter, it has been written by the Punjab Government that they are not ready to

provide even Rs.20 crores and request that all this money should also be given by the Central Government. As one of the members has said that if Punjab Government does not give the grant of Rs.20 crores, but it should let Panjab University become a Central University. It is very easy to say but very difficult to do. They should not forget the political aspect of it. They are having the Chief Minister and Education Minister of Punjab as members in the Senate. The Advisor of U.T. Chandigarh is also a member. Both the ruling parties of Punjab are not in favor of Panjab University becoming a Central University and have never given a clearance in this regard. Secondly, he had said this thing in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor in the High Court. Even the non-teaching employees are not in favor of Panjab University becoming a Central University. There are some complications. If Panjab University becomes a Central University, as the ratio of teaching and non-teaching in Central University is 1:1.1 whereas in Panjab University presently the ratio is 1:3.3. It clearly means that in future if Panjab University is declared as a Central University, they would have to retrench/retire at least 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the non-teaching employees. They should try to understand that if they talk of the Central Act. Professor Chaman Lal is saying right that wishful thinking is a right thing. Panjab University Act is a unique Act. He is not passing strictures or casting aspersions on anyone. When in the year 1975-75, the emergency was imposed, no election was conducted starting from Panchayat to any other body, it was only the Panjab University which conducted the election for the Registered Graduate Constituency, he was also elected for the first time, Sunder Lal was from BJP and Rajinder Singh was the President of the Council. The Panjab University Act is a unique one, however, he agrees that some changes are required in the Act. They should also think about the pros and cons if they are thinking of getting the central status for Panjab University. According to him, it does not seem easy that the problems of the University would be solved once it is declared as a Central University, as is being said. Secondly, as it was said about filling up the blank column in the budget document. He did not think that it does not make any difference whether the column is filled up or not. Basically, the major portion of the grant-in-aid is received from the Punjab Government and the Central Government. The case was heard in the Hon'ble High Court on 15<sup>th</sup> March and Justice Saron had dictated the order in the Court itself but has not been uploaded, there might be many reasons as sometimes when the Steno types the order, there might be some mistakes. Secondly, most of the Judges also visit the District Courts for inspection during the month of March. It might be that the order must have been signed. The suggestion given by him should also be kept in mind. The UGC, at one time in the case, had said that they had asked some clarifications from the University. The University replied those clarifications and the reply has been sent to the UGC and Ministry of Human Resource Development. Justice Saron has asked the UGC that the proposal regarding the expenditure to be done by the University should be examined. After the examination by the UGC, the MHRD should think over it and whatever is the consensus both the UGC and Ministry of Human Resource Development, the same be placed before the Court on 17<sup>th</sup> April. Justice Saron has requested the Punjab Government also to examine the issue whether it would give only Rs.20 crores. Out of the 193 Colleges affiliated with Panjab University, 173 are located in Punjab while only 20 Colleges are located in Chandigarh. Justice Saron had said that the Punjab Government did not want to give the grants but wanted full control over Panjab University. There is no objection over it. He requested that the University should take up the matter with the Punjab Government to enhance its grant. He had talked about the ratio. He would like to clarify the norms of the UGC and Government of India. Mainly the dispute arose on this issue that the UGC is giving 15% enhancement in grant to other Central Universities but not to Panjab University. The argument of the University is that since the UGC is giving 15% enhancement to other Central Universities, the same should also be given to Panjab University. But the argument of the UGC is that the enhancement is given only to Central Universities and Panjab University is not a Central University. This matter would come up before the High Court on 17<sup>th</sup> April.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is not the issue because the enhancement is also being given to Tata Institute of Social Sciences.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that this is the argument of UGC and the argument of the University is that since the enhancement is being given to other Central Universities, the same should also be given to Panjab University. This matter is pending there and the matter is sub-judice. The Vice-Chancellor had talked about the nomination. There was a discussion that there is not much participation of the UGC or MHRD in the working of the University. The nominees of the UGC/MHRD were invited in the last meeting. He informally suggested to them that since 34 persons are nominated on the Senate and out of this number, DSW, President, PUTA, President of Non-Teaching Employees are also nominated. In future, the Chairman of the UGC could also be nominated on the Senate as earlier Mr. R.S. Chitkara was nominated. The Secretary or any other officer of the MHRD could also be nominated. This could effectively coordinate the things and they could know the working of the University. He would conclude by suggesting that in the year 2009 the pattern of funding change, the details of the UGC budget have been chalked out and has become a part of the UGC. The crisis is being faced for the last 2-3 years. The next date of hearing in the Court is 17<sup>th</sup> April. They would have to think over it on their own instead of blaming the Punjab Government or the Central Government. Now the Governments at the Centre and the State are of opposite parties. Political blaming each other would not solve the problem. 5-7 members should take up the matter seriously with both the Governments. There is no use if the issue is reported in the newspapers. According to him, there might not be a good solution through the Court also. The Judges have taken up the matter on their own and he would like to thank the Judges that they are trying to sort out the matter. The Member of Parliament, Mrs. Kirron Kher has also talked with the Minister and the Secretary. The matter should be sorted out through dialogue and it should not be made a political issue. If it is politicized, it might benefit the political persons but would harm the University.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he just wanted to know whether they have a data that in the centrally funded Universities what is the percentage of the income of the total income generated by the Universities.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that it varies from University to University.

Professor S.K. Sharma enquired whether there are universities which are generating more percentage income than the Panjab University to which the Vice-Chancellor said, 'no'. Continuing, he said that this is the point that they have to stress over there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the Centre says universities of the Centre, then the IIT also becomes a University, IIM also becomes a University and the Centre says that they have asked the IITs to enhance the income, asked the IIMs to double up the fee. Since the Centre has asked these institutions to enhance the fee, similarly, the Panjab University should also enhance its income. The argument of the UGC is that Panjab University is not earning the same income which Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are earning and say that the per student expense of this University is more than the per student expense other universities. For example, the UGC could say that Panjab University is asking Rs.200 crores and look at the number of students in the campus and not looking at the students all across. The University is having 15000 students out of which 3000 are Ph.D. students. The UGC says that as the Central Government gives an amount of Rs.1.33 lacs per student to Panjab University and say that there is n't any State University in India in which the State Government gives Rs.1.33 lacs per student. He could not argue against this. He argued everything else. These are the kind of things that when one goes there, he is in a minority of two and surrounded by 30 persons and they talk that language. When



one goes away from the meeting, they (UGC) prepare the minutes as they deem appropriate. What could they do? This is what the UGC has given in the Court now that for the average per student expense in Panjab University is far greater than their peer institutions in their neighbourhood. What is the fee that the PU students pay, they are giving half of the fee. Out of Rs.500 crores that the University needs, what are they promising, it is just Rs.271 crores as internal income. The remaining amount of Rs.229 crores, they are asking the Governments to pay. What is the number of students studying on the Panjab University campus, it is 15-17 thousand what is the expense per student. The per student expense to Government of India is more than Rs.100000/- per year. So, this is the subsidy. In the background of this subsidy, if the students are asked to pay a little bit extra fee, what is it that the students are being asked to pay. The University is asking the students that the fee should be increased at a rate at which the expenditure of the University is increasing. The Centre would like to freeze this number. Today, this amount is given and after today, this is the block grant given to Panjab University and take this block grant, as if it is stagnant for next five years. They (Centre) would come back to the revision of this block grant at the end of five years and would not look at the block grant every year. The Centre could say that so much grant is given to the University and it should be satisfied with it and balance the books for next five years as it could. The University is an autonomous governing body which looks after all its affairs and takes pride in the fact that it is a peoples' University and has already generated an income. So let this peoples' University generate income on its own given the background, that this is the block grant given to it with a promise and it would remain frozen from one Pay Commission to the other Pay Commission. This is the kind of the language that the Centre would talk. They have to think all aspects of it. They have to have solutions to every kind of crisis that they face. They also want to preserve this House should remain as representative. This is the demanding aspect of the University. That is why yesterday during the convocation address he read out what Lord Ripon, the Viceroy of India, had to say in 1882. Why this House is given a representation that the entire society is represented. This is their University. They have chosen to have a University the way they desired, and they have to find their own solutions.

Professor S.K. Sharma enquired as to whether they have calculated as to how much they are spending on the affiliated Colleges as the ratio of 1:1.1 is for the campus only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Centre is not committed to pay for the expense of the affiliated Colleges of Punjab. That is the responsibility of Punjab. Shri Satya Pal Jain has rightly said that they would have to seriously think over all the dimensions and that also by a single Committee and not that one Committee would talk with the Punjab Government and the other with Central Government. He is happy that they are talking this thing in the open and in front of the media so that to the society per se this information is going that they are all serious and are not letting anything to be put under the carpet.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that last year a lot of discussion had taken place. They should start increasing by 5-10%. The seats in the Department of Gandhian Studies have been increased from 29 to 40, and the House was pleased to note it. In the Department of Mathematics, the number of seats is less. Wherever there is a possibility, the 5-10% seats should be increased. Where there are 30 seats in a department, they could increase this number to 40 for which no additional infrastructure is required. The increase in seats could result in an increase of about 5-10% more income. Last year, they did implement it. Still, they have time and by forming a Committee, the seats could be increased in some of the departments which would result in increase in income.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that as regards the query of Professor S.K. Sharma that how much they are spending on the Colleges, he would like to tell that they are not

spending anything on the Colleges rather Panjab University is earning from the affiliated Colleges.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that are they counting as to how much staff is required to run the Colleges.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it appears that the whole thing is stuck up for many years between the University, State Government, UGC and the Central Government. It is very well for the Vice-Chancellor to say that he tried to convince the 30 people who were against him who did not listen to him. But it is not the end of the matter and it is the duty of the Vice-Chancellor as well as all of them to convince the Government and if the Government is not convinced then surely there is something in their argument which the University is not looking at. They could not get away by saying that. If some issue has been stuck for such a long time, there is something between the parties. To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that he did not accept. He (Shri Malhi) suggested that there should be a Committee of people who are above these things who should look at it dispassionately and start something whatever it is related with the ratio of 1:1.1 or 1:1.3 or 1:3.3, stick on to that and had several things which the UGC did not want to do, it is not being made a State University or a Central University and there are such objections to it. But there are points which the other sides like MHRD, Punjab Government and UGC are also making. Let an independent Committee of the Senate look at their points as well, put themselves in their shoes, why they are acting like this, they are not mad people. They must surely have some points, why they are acting like this. There might be something wrong the University is doing. So let them look at it dispassionately and take a fresh as to how to take the University forward and do not close any option. Do not close the option of reducing the non-teaching staff, do not close of option of making it a Central University, do not close the option of making it a State University. Let them look at all options fairly and then come up with a recommendation and that recommendation could be put to the Senate.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that he would like to expand what Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma has said. On page V of the budget Income of Panjab University for the year 2017-18), the income from the examination fee is about Rs.136 crores, that is more than half of the entire income of the University of Rs.271 crores. The major chunk of this fee comes from the affiliated Colleges and private students. On page IV (expenditure side), the expenditure on the conduct of the examinations is only Rs.37 crores but to this they could add the salary component of the establishment. If they look at these figures, it comes out clearly that major chunk of the revenue for the University comes from the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor while responding to it said that they should dispel all these misgivings once for all and must be put to rest. This is the University, a University campus plus the Colleges. It is not appropriate to think one divorced from the other. This University as they started to recommence in independent India had its income entirely from the Colleges. There was no income, almost nil, from the campus part, there was no campus part of the University at all. The University departments were made of handful of teachers, single digit number, on behalf of the University. Rest of the people were drawn up from the Colleges and that is what the departments were the entire income was from the Colleges. But the University if it has to evolve as an institution, has to evolve where the dissemination knowledge and pushing up frontiers of knowledge have to go on simultaneously. If it does not happen, the University would not be a University. The students passing out from each and every College have to be given opportunities for further education and the University campus was created to provide an opportunity for further education. The entire campus belongs to the Colleges of Punjab. At one time, the Colleges of Punjab were the Colleges of whole of the north-west of India. Changes have occurred, Punjab has been reorganized, so many universities have opened, regional centres have been converted into independent

universities, Panjab University regional centres have been converted into the universities, Patiala was supposed to be the residential campus, so on so forth. So, this University, the way it has evolved, it has evolved with the sanction of this House. And, what is this House? This House has representation of the entire society. This House has a larger representation from the Colleges part, then it is from the University Campus part. But they could not exist divorced from each other. So, it is not appropriate to think that this income is from the Colleges and it would be spent on the Colleges. If they have to do that, then they are just an examination body and not a University and they would not be counted, they are a non-entity in India. They are a heritage University. They are a national institution. There is no dividing line, not even an imaginary dividing line between College and Campus. So, it is not appropriate even to pose this question and defend one position vis-à-vis the other position. The two positions should not be debated at all. This is what they have to convey to the Centre also. This University located in the U.T. Chandigarh would lose its entire heritage and lose its connectivity to the College education part. They want the universities to be unified, why were the universities thought of. If the universities were thought of in 1854 in the context that education from school education to the University has to be thought in a unified way. This is why the universities were considered logical extension of the end of the school education. The College entrance examination became the school board examination. The Colleges were larger in number. There was a centralized body. The centralized body has now the highest part of the higher education done for the best products of the Colleges to be brought together and taught. That is why Panjab University at Chandigarh was supposed to be a residential University and they started building the hostels first, they did not build anything else. Which are the first buildings that came up on the campus, it is the hostels. For whom the hostels were built, these were for the best of the graduates coming from the Colleges to gain admission to this University on merit. This is why they are giving 325 Ph.D. degrees. Look at the statistics of the Ph.D. students. 40% of those students have affiliation from Punjab. He is not saying only the territorial part where their Colleges are located. 40% of the students are from Punjab, 35% from Haryana and Himachal, 20% from U.T. So, who are these products, these are the products which have come out of the Colleges. Everything that happens in the campus passes through the governing body and the governing body of this University is not made up of the campus part only. Let them not try to divide and talking on sub-division is not proper at all.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there is a brand value of Panjab University which the Colleges and the University enjoy. Without this brand value of Panjab University, according to him, there would be a big setback to the education in Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. G.S. Khush was a student of the College, he was never a student of the campus, but he adds to the brand value.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu wanted to clarify that he was just giving the figures and nothing else.

Professor S.K. Sharma that it does not take into account what is in the income from the University examinations and how much is the expenditure.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no point on debating it.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he was listening to the debate for a very long time. Sometimes, there seems to be a feeling that all of them are not on one side. Half of the time is taken by the debate between the Chair and the members. The Speaker of the Lok Sabha does not speak. To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that he is not the Speaker. Continuing, Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Vice-Chancellor has to run the administration and the members have not to perform this duty. The members come to attend the meetings in about

1-3 months and provide their views. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to take the views which are the best ones and use the same. It is just a suggestion from him and if the Vice-Chancellor likes it, he could use it. Most of the time is devoted on the debate. He would rather like that all the members of the House by coming together should fight for this cause and it is not a fight between the members and the Chair. Secondly, the Vice-Chancellor must remember that he had also talked to the Finance Minister who said that all the matters of the University are to be taken through UGC. He had personally, as also some other members of the party, talked with the MHRD Minister. There are some issues, whether related with the accounting or auditing, which perhaps the University is not able to represent properly or there is a difference between the perception of the MHRD and the University, whether it is related with the income or the expense. The experts from the University should talk with the experts of the Ministry of Human Resource Development. After all, there seems to be some communication gap. Every Government whether at the Centre or the State would like that the education system should be better. The Vice-Chancellor must remember that while talking in the Board of Finance, he (Shri Tandon) had put up a point that whatever is the expenditure of the University on the Punjab Colleges in terms of the total expenditure on whatever is the number of the institutions or the students. As has just been said, the University is not incurring any expenditure on the Punjab Colleges. But whenever they go to the Punjab Government, they should have a data as to what is the expenditure and what is the involvement on the Colleges of Punjab. They could point out to the Central Government that such is the enrolment of the students in the University. If they present the issue in such a way, it could get some benefit from both the sides. As the issue of making Panjab University a Central University came up, he requested that a Committee of 3-5 persons be formed and they should see all the plus and minus points making Panjab University a Central University. This issue has been coming up time and again. This Committee should discuss this issue with the Central Government, in the House and also with the employees and if some positive response is there, they could discuss the same in the next meeting and could move forward in this matter. The second issue is related with the enhancement of income. For that, if there could be some specialist persons who could work on it, they should work only on the issue of enhancing the income. If they could enhance the income without putting burden on the students, they should work towards that. Last but not the least, an issue related with the digital agenda was taken up. Regarding that, he would request that if the agenda is sent through e-mail, it would be convenient for the members, numbering about 90. They should try it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had tried to spend time on the budget and hoped that she would be permitted to express herself. It relates to the budget estimates for the year 2017-18. She would like to have certain clarifications and probably the Finance and Development Officer would be able to do that. When they calculate the expenditure on the salary, do they include only the filled-up positions or all the positions.

It was clarified that it is only for the filled-up positions.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said if they look at the expenditure and income of University School of Open Learning (USOL), the expenditure is higher than the income. Does it mean that the USOL is not giving any income to the University as the income is Rs.15 crores and the expenditure is Rs.17 crores.

It was clarified that it is right.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that what is the component of Hostel funds what funds are included in it (page 7 of Appendix-I). Does it include all the hostels including the International Hostel and the charges of the mess and the canteens?

It was clarified that mess is not a part of the University in terms of neither income nor expenditure.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that on page 10 in the Consultancy Fee, she had also pointed out in the last meeting of the Senate, an income of Rs.48,131/- is shown in the year 2015-16 and in the year 2016-17 the original income is Rs.1 lac and revised income is Rs. 50,000/- and in 2017-18, they have made it Rs.1 lac. On what basis are these estimates?

It was clarified that there is a separate CIIPP Cell. There is a separate head for that and all the income received through the Cell has been shown. There are small consultancy projects which are part of the revenue income and that has been depicted.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to how it has gone from Rs.48,000/- to Rs.1 lac.

It was clarified that when the budget is prepared, it could not be anticipated as to how many research projects would be there. It is based on the maximum earning of Rs.73541/-. So taking that, they are anticipating that they could earn around Rs.1 lac.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is very strange if they look at the consultancy projects, it is a very long list.

It was clarified that those are sponsored research projects and schemes of various funding agencies.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that under the Budget Head 'Building & Infrastructure Account' (page 71), the expenditure related with the construction of Academic Staff College Guest House existing Golden Jubilee Guest House. She pointed out that whenever guests or the examiners come, they say that the room for them be not booked in the Golden Jubilee Guest House. It is so unclean, so ill-maintained. If they are making an expenditure on this, they have to see the upkeep also as it is in such a bad state. The examiners request for change in the date of viva, but do not like to stay in the Golden Jubilee Guest House. It is a serious issue. Secondly, the expenditure on the construction of Guru Teg Bahadur Bhawan has been shown at 2-3 places.

It was clarified that whenever there is a big project, then the amount is sanctioned in phases. Some amount has been sanctioned in first phase, then in the second and then in the third phase. The budget head is the same.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that under the same budget head (Sr.No.23) Renovation in the V.C. office-cum-Conference Hall, the expenditure is Rs.7,70,703/- and it is Rs. 39,90,200/- on the VCCR (Sr. No.40), the total comes to more than Rs.47 lacs. Similarly, when they are giving the nomenclature of these items, somewhere it is written as construction of a road, somewhere it is written as internal roads, what is internal road (Sr.No.32). Was it a renovation or a construction?

It was clarified that sometimes the budget is approved as general budget like internal roads. The expenditure is made depending on the specific location by the Committee.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that when they look at the budget, there should be transparency. She could not know as to how much money is spent on renovation of the road or on carpeting of the road or construction of the road.

It was clarified that there is a space constraint in this document. These are part of record and the same could be provided.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in future, they have to be more particular because in every item, there is a difference and it seems that it has been done deliberately.

It was clarified that it could be corrected.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is one example that she has given as somewhere it is written as renovation of the road, somewhere internal road. What is the internal road? Similarly, on page 75 Estate Fund, it is very strange that in the rent of shops and booths, the market value is coming down from Rs.3 crores in 2014 to Rs.2.5 crores in 2017-18.

It was clarified that in the year 2014-15 and 2015-16, lot of arrears were recovered from the shops.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to what is the 'others' on the same page, as it is a huge amount.

It was clarified that this income from the renting of lawns.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that an \* should have been put and the details should have been written. That is transparency. On the point of the income on investments, they have come down from Rs.80 lacs to Rs.30 lacs.

It was clarified that whenever there is an investment for 3 years, the interest of that amount would come in one year, and then on accrual basis, on annual basis, it would be a lesser amount.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she was surprised that in the last Senate, she had requested for some information some of which she has received yesterday, she had requested the Registrar for the balance that lies in different budget heads, apart from that the FDRs.

It was informed that everything is there in the documents.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested whether the Finance and Development Officer could help her find this information.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could do after the meeting.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she gets nothing after the meeting and she gets no response.

It was informed that each and every information had been given.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the information includes the short term deposits, for instance, which have also come down, but it does not show the total FD amounts like Development Funds, Sports Funds, Hostel Funds, Estate Fund.

It was informed that everything has been provided.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had also asked the information related with the different scams, for instance, the pension scam, Kulwant Singh scam, what they have done for that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter is of zero hour.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is a financial crisis. The Registrar in the letter says that this information may be obtained from the concerned quarters. Which are the concerned quarters? As a Fellow, she is asking for some information. Let them be objective and self introspective. If this is the attitude, they could not celebrate what Shri Hamid Ansariji had said yesterday.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to talk about two things. One thing is that when they talk about the share of the Punjab Government is Rs.20 crores. On the other hand, when they look at what is being spent by the University in the State of Punjab, they are having 5 Centres. To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that he should stick only to the budget part. They had discussed the budget a little bit in the meeting of the Board of Finance also. Obviously, these are the estimates only and now they are at the end of the financial year. The Vice-Chancellor had initially pointed out and he also believed that the books are going to be more or less balanced at the end of the financial year. Obviously, the previous deficit is almost zero. On the other hand, there is some sort of increased liability in the sense that in the previous budget, they have accounted for the retirement benefit particularly of the teachers who have not yet retired because of the Court cases and if that continues, it is alright. But if the court decision comes against those teachers, that head is going to enhance tremendously.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are matters of microscopic and they could attend to the same when it comes.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the maintenance grant, they have mentioned the Punjab Government and UGC additional grant. His submission is that as hon'ble member Shri Satya Pal Jain has mentioned that they are having 172 Colleges in Punjab and 20 Colleges in Chandigarh. In Chandigarh, they are having Government Colleges, Medical College, College of Architecture, Engineering College and College of Art. According to him, they should also initiate their efforts to have maintenance grant from U.T. Administration and that would definitely help. He is not saying that what type of amount they could achieve, but definitely this maintenance grant should also be from the U.T. Administration keeping in view the Colleges' status which are there in Chandigarh of all fields.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that the U.T. Administration is Central Government and it is very clearly written that when they changed from the Ministry of Home Affairs path to the other path, the liability of the Central Government remains the same. It is only the path which has changed. Whatever their total grant is, it is for salaries plus 18% of other expenses. When they present this Rs.500 crores budget, it is for salaries plus 18%. Of that 18%, they are also asking the Centre to meet. It is not that the Centre is looking after the salary component of the budget. So, the Central Government, in an indirect way, is attending to the needs as well. So, the Centre is doing all this. All that they could ask is that it does not include things like that they need a 66 KV substation, an underpass to go from Sector 14 to Sector 25. Such things which are part of the city being modernized, they are a part of the city. The traffic in the part of the Panjab University is also a part of the city of Chandigarh. All those things which are related to infrastructure as the whole city is going to be a smart city apparatus everywhere. Whatever happens in that city, that they have to implement in Sector-14 and 25. So, that money should come out of the city's budget. That is a genuine thing to say. The current Advisor has accepted that the power needs of the University should be met from the city, they being a part of the Chandigarh area of Union Territory. So, that has to be taken in a different way.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that two days back, there was a media report that Haryana Chief Minister wrote to the Vice-Chancellor that Colleges of Panchkula be affiliated with Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not received any such letter.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he realized that they are really at a disquieting juncture and have very enormous challenges to face and after listening to the debate for the last one hour, he still felt that they have not really come to a roadmap. Academic discussions are good and these would contribute in some way or the other. But they need to really look at the remark of the HRD Minister who says that the University has not spent the money wisely and do not manage the funds wisely.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not received any such communication and they should not go by what the newspapers report.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the implicit message that they have got from the UGC and other places that they have to spend the funds wisely, they need to see where they have spent unwisely. Therefore, after all this argument and a little preface to it, whether the Minister has said it or not but he could see that the intention is really there to ensure that they begin to work towards some kind of a financial status where they do not depend on the Centre. It means that there is an urgency in creating a certain kind of fund so that they could be self sufficient. Therefore, the roadmap that he could see before him after this discussion and they must come to a roadmap because this kind of academic discussion could really go on. According to him, the roadmap is that a team goes off to Delhi and camps in Delhi to convince the bureaucracy there of this kind of situation that they are facing. It seems to him that they (Centre) are not very clear of what kind of financial strains the University is in. What is the problem because all the time they are being told that they are not spending wisely. Actually, they have to convince the Centre that this is the only way that they could spend and their expenditure is very genuine, that they have been wise in it and that this is the problem that they face. Convincing the bureaucracy at the Centre is one of the major problems. If they could actually put across the problem to the bureaucracy, they could then come to the solution. Secondly, they should continue their battle for the Central University. It has been continuing for the last 10 years or so. They need to do that, beat around it and continue with that until the task is achieved, which he did not think is very near. They are not close to it and that could be a battle for many-many more years when they get it as a Central University. Thirdly, he sincerely felt that if there are 190 Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, let them also ask the Colleges to contribute in some way or the other by which they could move out of this kind of financial situation. Lastly, regarding the generation of funds in the University. They have been talking about it but, according to him, there is no serious thought that has gone into it. They have not begun to implement. There are really certain kinds of schemes by which they could enhance the funding of the University, the finances of this University. For instance, a gentleman came for viva from Mumbai the other day. He flew and flew out and it cost about Rs.25,000/- to the University. Are they really ready to do something about that? Are they going to ensure that if there is an external examiner and the visit is going to cost the University Rs.25,000/- could they not charge it from the candidate? Or is it done in certain kind of charity for the students that they get the Ph.D. degree without really spending any money? He is just giving a little example. He is very conscious of the fact that there is construction bungling. The Committee that the Vice-Chancellor has decided to form, it is a wonderful thing to do and there should be a Supervisory Committee to see that the funds are spent judiciously, such that the funds are not wasted at all. It is very important that the penalties that are given to the students who go on year after year seeking for extension should be enhanced. The idea of fee for extension for submission of Ph.D. thesis is only Rs.500 or Rs.1000, why it could not be Rs.10000/-. Lastly, let them concentrate and find a roadmap by which they could generate funds. Let it not be an academic clot. A Committee should be appointed and that Committee should actually go into it.



Principal N.R. Sharma said that this issue is going on for a long time. First of all, he felt sorry that the set-up of the House is in a very democratic way and is having members belonging to multi-tasking, multi-talented, politics, academic, medical and law. It is also being heard that all the decisions in Panjab University are finalized by the Syndicate and the Senate which are the administrative bodies. When it comes to accountability, he feels that all the members think that the accountability rests upon only on the Vice-Chancellor. All those who raise question marks, think that perhaps the crisis is due to the Vice-Chancellor. As Shri Satya Pal Jain has spoken, an appropriate reply came. The members from both the political parties are members of the House like Shri Satya Pal Jain and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. There are academic persons also sitting in the House. Even person from foreign services is also here. A formal Committee should be formed. There have been special meetings and they are also discussing the issue since morning. The Committee should be assigned the duty to convince the Government, as it is not a duty only of the Vice-Chancellor. It is the duty of the Senators to approach the Government and convince as they all are part of this body. Secondly, there has been a long time and they would have to enhance the fee nominally. They have been rigid on this issue somewhere. The fee should not be hiked instantaneously but nominally as just now the Vice-Chancellor has presented that the fee hike is scientifically calculated. The UGC would also raise such type of questions. Lastly, they should try to curtail some of the expenditure. The Committee should also be authorized to provide the details as to which expenditure is to be curtailed down. He feels, being a member of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor has fought on the issue and beyond that it would also not be possible for the Vice-Chancellor. He is updating the members that whatever letters have been received and if they see those, they could see that the Vice-Chancellor also has a limitation. It is the duty of all the members that they should take this issue as an issue of all of them and communicate with the Centre and the State.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that he has been listening to all the discussion since morning. There is a financial crunch. He has been taking part in many meetings of the Senate and the issue of financial crunch is going on for the last few years. As Shri Satya Pal Jain and Principal N.R. Sharma have rightly said that there should be involvement of all the persons for having a liaison with the Central Government and Punjab Government. It is right. But, according to him, all of them give the suggestions in the Senate that all should be involved. But, if they see practically, all members are not involved. A Joint Action Committee was formed on the issue of financial crunch. He is talking about the smoothness of the budget. On the issue of financial crunch, the teaching and non-teaching staff came together and all the employees involved in it and started showing their resentment. Letters were also written. Even the non-teaching staff wrote a letter to UGC Chairman on 2<sup>nd</sup> of last month, but there is no reply from the UGC. A letter was also written to the UGC Chairman to give a time to meet the delegation of the teaching and non-teaching staff. He would like to request the Senate that all the Senate members should also involve themselves on this issue, every employee should also involve himself/herself. If the Vice-Chancellor alone has his own limitations, there are limitations of others also and they could do some unlimited work also. He would also request Shri Satya Pal Jain that at present the signature campaign being run by the non-teaching staff would also reach them. He would like to request all the Senators also that since the employees are showing their concern on the financial crunch and a dharna is continuously on since March 9, no member of the Senate took pains to come to the Dharna. However, Professor Keshav Malhotra visits the dharna site at least once a day for which he is thankful to him. They should show their resentment to the Government. He said none of the Senate members had visited the dharna site and did not ask to why the dharna is being organized. All know about it that there is a financial crunch. He would request Shri Satya Pal Jain, Shri Sanjay Tandon, who was earlier present in the House, that a delegation of the employees be taken to the MHRD or UGC and the

resentment be shown. They would request that a delegation on this issue be sent through the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that so many persons in the University have been leaders at the national level. They have been looking after the financial and administrative interest of the University and have been saving it from any kind of problem. He recalled that when Dr. Man Mohan Singh was the Prime Minister and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Shri Kapil Sibal remained the Finance Minister, Railways Minister, Home Minister and Science Technology Minister and they had a political will for the University that the University should not face any kind of crisis. Shri Satya Pal Jain has also played a constructive role even through MPLAD. He feels that what the bureaucracy at the Centre is doing today, it is the same bureaucracy and it does not change and acts according to the political leaders and the Government as per the thinking and the direction given to them. He would like to say, that in today's political scenario, the people in power should come forward and the others should also cooperate with them. There was a news item that an amount of Rs.140 crores is being released. It looks very good that with the help of the local MP, the grant is being released. But, it seems that there is nothing concrete. He feels that the political will is a must. He requested that the HRD Minister and other State Ministers and the UGC Chairman should visit the University, meet all the persons and have discussions. He agreed with Shri Satya Pal Jain whose approach is that all should be together, if they adopt that approach, they could bring the University out of the financial crunch. He remembers that when the issue of pension was under crisis, they had a very long agitation on this issue, but then Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal arranged a meeting with the Prime Minister, Dr. Man Mohan Singh and the file was moved and the final decision was taken within a period of 4-5 days. He would again request Shri Satya Pal Jain, Mrs. Kirron Kher, Shri Sanjay Tandon to use their good offices, they being the worshiper of this temple of learning should help in this matter and the credit of it would go to those members which would be welcomed and it is the need of the hour. Generally, it is seen that the political leadership has a sensitive role to play and do it in the same spirit. There might be differences of opinion but that does not matter. But at this stage, all the persons in power should lead by coming together and make efforts for collective work. Today, there is a need of the political leadership and the political will and the bureaucracy adapts the same way. If Capt. Amarinder Singh or Shri Manpreet Singh wanted, who are running the Government, to help the University, they could find some way out. There are some other persons belonging to Congress party who could be useful and supportive in this matter. According to him, the solution of this issue could be found politically. As is being said that they should collect revenue from other sources also, is a right thing. But in reality, the universities could be run with the help of the Governments and not with the increase in fee and putting burden on the students. So, it is necessary that the political leadership should play a historical role in saving the University. Today, there is one Vice-Chancellor and tomorrow some other could come and the University should continue functioning. Therefore, it is necessary to bring the University out of this crunch. He would like to add on another item that they had seen an experiment about 5-7 years ago that the security of the University was outsourced but that experiment failed and it was withdrawn. He requested that they should find ways to expand the present regular security. Since the security is a very delicate issue, it is not good to outsource the security to private agency and they need direct employees who would be responsible and accountable. There are thousands of students both boys and girls and it is the question of their security for which there is a need of the direct control of the University over the security and not outsourcing or for an individual's profit. The outsourcing should not again be done and some other way out be found that the already existing security is strengthened.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when they talk that a lot of discussion has taken place in which only academic things have been discussed and not the final discussion

whether he has talked or any other hon'ble member, it is the responsibility of all of them. If something has not been discussed, they all should think over it as to why it has not been discussed. If it is said that an expenditure of Rs.20,000/- has been spent on the viva of a candidate and that is to be taken from the candidate, then it seems that they are discussing some other things. If it is said that they are charging only a fee of Rs.500/- for delay in the submission of thesis, there could be some reasons due to which the candidate might not be able to submit the thesis within time and if the fee is enhanced to Rs.50,000/-, it would harm the students. Then it could also be said that there are superannuated teachers in the University and that is also a burden and why it is so due to which the re-employment would have to be stopped. They should be very much moderate in that.

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed Shri Chander Gaiind, IAS, the representative of Punjab Government who had just arrived to attend the meeting. He briefed the representative that they were discussing the budget of the University and there is a concern that they are not able to receive the grants from the Punjab Government commensurate with the rate of increase of the expenditure of the University. After all, there are several components of the income of the University, the grant of the Punjab Government is also a part of it. There are two issues that they have with the Punjab Government. One is the freezing of the grant to a figure of Rs.20 crores and in particular freezing since 2013-14, which is year when the Centre started to release the grants to the University from the non-plan budget. So, the year 2013-14 is a kind of base year and they have put in a request to the Punjab Government that keeping that as a base year, to enhance the Punjab Government's grant at the same rate at which the University is raising its income. They have pointed out that they are enhancing the income of the University at a rate of 12.75% and the expenditure is going at 12.5%. So, they have put a request that let the Punjab Government give the University enhanced figure every year by roughly that percentage. There is roughly an inflation of 8-9% and marginal increases. Since, most of it, they are using for paying the salaries, if some component would not contribute the difference in an appropriate ratio, the University would have a deficit and there would be a crisis. So, this request was put to the Punjab Government and the Punjab Government has expressed its inability to enhance it and has stated that the Central Government should bear this expense also. So, they do not understand under what circumstances the Punjab Government wrote that and how could the Punjab Government give up its responsibility towards the Colleges located in the territory that is allotted to Panjab University. The Punjab Government has not said that they would decrease the grant for Punjabi University, Guru Nanak Dev University to zero. Why the grant to Panjab University is reduced to zero. They are running 3 regional centres in Punjab, running a rural centre in Punjab. In addition to the Punjabi University whatever they are doing, they accepted the request of Punjab Government under a Central Government policy to run Colleges in the rural area of Punjab which was the responsibility of Punjab Government. The Punjab Government, in their own wisdom, thought that this task should be done by Panjab University and the three universities agreed. So, they have 4 Constituent Colleges which the University is running on the request of the Punjab Government. Last year, they were asked to add two more Colleges to it. In principle, they are now running 6 Constituent Colleges on the plea of the Punjab Government. To administer these Colleges, they need to incur the expenditure at the headquarters as they also incur expenditure in so many other ways. They are only seeking from Punjab Government a written assurance, MoU that whatever expenditure is to be incurred on these Colleges, the Punjab Government must give its commitment that it would continuously give that. They have received no such commitment. They are not receiving the money for these 2 Colleges. They have various issues vis-à-vis Punjab Government. They have apprised the new Education Minister of their concern, at the moment orally. They have not put any requirement in numbers, but they have conveyed it. Since he (Shri Chander Gaiind) has come today, if he could help clarify the position of the Punjab Government to the other colleagues, it would be helpful.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that as per the Panjab University Act, the Chief Minister, Education Minister and the DPI Colleges of Punjab, similarly the Advisor and the DPI Colleges of Chandigarh are the ex-officio members of the Senate. The DPI Colleges of Punjab and Chandigarh have another privilege that in addition to the Senate, they are ex-officio members of the Syndicate also. So, through the DPI, they should request the Chief Minister of Punjab and the Administrator, U.T. that both the DPIs should attend the meetings of the Syndicate and the Senate. They could also request the Chief Minister of Punjab, who is an able and seasoned person, as also the Education Minister to attend the next meeting as they are talking about taking a delegation to them, they (Chief Minister and the Education Minister) could come and have discussions. He requested Shri Chander Gaiind to ensure the presence of the DPI so that if they attend the meetings, the sentiments of the House could be conveyed to the Government through them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Chander Gaiind) has come entirely on his own. They acknowledge his initiative.

Shri Chander Gaiind said that he has already given in writing that the infrastructure and the pay, etc. of the Constituent Colleges would be borne by the Punjab Government in which appropriate grant is mentioned.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that perhaps it might not be in the notice of Shri Chander Gaiind that the Finance Secretary of Punjab Government has filed an affidavit in the High Court on 15<sup>th</sup> March. He is having a copy of that which he could provide in which the Finance Secretary, Punjab has written that the earlier grant of Rs.20 crores that they were providing and it would be better if the Central Government gives that grant also. A copy of that is also available with Dr. Gurmeet Singh and it could be provided. When Shri Surjeet Singh Barnala used to be the Chief Minister, at that time there was one independent MLA by the name of Mr. Dogra and 2-3 Colleges were opened during that time. Thereafter 1 College near Moga and three other Colleges were opened on the request of the Punjab Government. At that time, the Punjab Government had given an assurance that they would bear all the expenses of these Colleges. But the latest position is a different one. Therefore, they should see the file so that it is not embarrassing and the Government might also not back out from its responsibility. The Government is always a Government, the Chief Ministers might change.

Shri Chander Gaiind said that the MoU has been sent to the Finance Department which he is pursuing and he would also request the Finance and Development Officer to pursue the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how the Finance and Development Officer could pursue it.

Shri Chander Gaiind said that they would ensure that the Finance and Development Officer is helped.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since March 31 is approaching and it would be difficult for them to balance the books in the absence of the funds.

Shri Chander Gaiind said that the new Government has taken over and they should also meet the Chief Minister.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has sought the appointment but the Chief Minister is very busy.

Shri Chander Gaind said that he would try to arrange the meeting with the Chief Minister within 2-3 days and it would be better to meet him as some of the decisions are taken at the higher level.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that the Vice-Chancellor started with two issues. One issue is that they could also ask the Punjab Government whether this University could become a Central University.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he would like to ask, as a special meeting is being held on the budget. When it comes to the Government, as the Punjab Government has to give the grant of Rs.20 crores and has not given any reason for not releasing the grant, whether they have asked the reasons for it from the Punjab Government. The Punjab Government should give the reasons for not releasing the grants, otherwise they could look for some other solution. They are passing on all the burden on the students by increasing the fee. But the Government, which is an elected Government, should give the reasons for not releasing the grants.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Chander Gaind) could not answer it.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that then who would give this answer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the delegation of the Senate would go to meet the Hon'ble Chief Minister, who is the ex-officio member, it would be better to pose this question to him. They could not put Shri Chander Gaind in uncomfortable position with such questions and they could take his help in the matter.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is being said that a delegation be formed, do such and such thing, but the matter has to be sorted out by actual working. What is being done? There are Governments of different political parties and one party says that the other party is not doing it and vice-versa. Then who has to take the final decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this House has to think and do all these things.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he is the youngest member of the Senate and all the others are senior to me him and very experienced. If they want to find out a solution to any problem, that could be done by sitting together and is not a big issue. They would have to find a way out to the problem and follow that. They have not yet decided as to which path is to be followed.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that they have a delegate from the Punjab Government who has briefly told that the action is in plan. They all are expecting a positive response from the Punjab Government as the University needed badly and it is their right that the constitution says. As Shri Satya Pal Jain and Professor Ronki Ram have said that there might be linguistic differences. If negative words are coming, there might be a pain behind. She requested Shri Chander Gaind to convey to the Punjab Government to think about the needs and the rights as well of Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired from Shri Chander Gaind as to why the money from RUSA has not been given to the University.

Shri Chander Gaind replied that it was due to the election code of conduct.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not linked with the election code of conduct. But the Punjab Government says that if an MoU is signed with the Panjab University, then the MoU would have to be done signed with Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University

also. Why the Punjab Government does not sign the MoU with those universities also? It is a new experiment. It is the responsibility of the State Government and the Government in its wisdom gave this responsibility to the 3 State Universities to enhance the gross enrolment ratio and sub-contracted the job that let these Universities run these Colleges in a healthy way. It is a very good thought. No State Government in India has done. Punjab Government is to be complimented as it thought of it in a very innovative way. But now, this has to be made a success. To make it a success, if it means signing an MoU with the three universities and creating a small sub-body which would oversee the overall progress of these new Colleges so that there is not unevenness. In some parts of Punjab there are Colleges running while in the other part, it is not so. The service conditions of these Colleges should also be similar and it should not be such that there is a different salary structure. These are not the right things. He appealed Shri Chander Gaiind that when he goes back, he should convey to the present Government that this thing should be looked in a unified way and if it means signing of 3 MoUs, get these signed. All the Vice-Chancellors or former Vice-Chancellors are together, create a small sub-body which oversees this.

Shri Chander Gaiind said that it is a new thing with a new thought. That is why the matter has gone to the Finance Department. As soon as it is approved by the Finance Department, they would do it. Let them meet the Chief Minister. He would present the case of the University to him and could expedite it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the money from RUSA was also not given while the Punjab Government had distributed about Rs.100 crores to other universities of Punjab. Why the Panjab University has been left from that?

Shri Chander Gaiind said that he would look into the RUSA funds issue also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Punjab Government is left with some money under RUSA, since 4 days are left before 31<sup>st</sup> March approaches, some money should be given from that fund. Panjab University is having regional Centres, like the one at Kauni, they would pat them and make these Centres as model institutes. He would also propose that the Government College, Hoshiarpur which was made a Constituent College to recommence the University be handed over to Panjab University to be run as a Constituent College with a separate MoU that this is a College of national importance and heritage and Panjab University, a national University, would look after it and they would see that this College located in Punjab is a heritage institution of national importance. As the Presidency College Calcutta is a University, Cotton College is a University at Guwahati, Government College Lahore is a University, FC College, Lahore is a University, Khalsa College has opened its own University, so, Government College, Hoshiarpur eventually also must emerge as an autonomous College for which a substantial grant is required. They need Rs.20 crores to rejuvenate the Government College, Hoshiarpur.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the affiliated Colleges have not been given even a single penny which was earlier promised.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Chander Gaiind to get the grant released from the Government and they would deliver.

Shri Chander Gaiind said that let the Finance and Development Officer come to him and he would ask the DPI as to what is the problem.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the matter should be sorted out as the Government has changed and it might not be that the persons are transferred and the matter comes to a standstill.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that since two members had said that there was a news report to which the Vice-Chancellor had responded that he has not received any communication. Similarly, there was a news about grant of Rs.140 crores, he requested the Vice-Chancellor to clear whether any communication in this regard has taken place which was responded by the Vice-Chancellor in negative. Secondly, as two of the members had raised a question that every time they talk of enhancing the fee to come out of the financial crunch. It is not a long run way out. If they try to make a comparison with Lovely Professional University, that University could not be compared with Panjab University because it is being run to serve the public purpose and not with a profit motive. One of the views was that they should ask for liberal grants. It is a good initiative that the representative of Punjab Government has come to attend the meeting who has assured that there is a possibility of having a meeting of the Vice-Chancellor with the Chief Minister before 31<sup>st</sup> March. The regular faculty has not been appointed in the Constituent Colleges (4 already running + 2 new). This also may be taken up.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he would not take much time as a lot of time has been spent on this issue. He has definite view on this issue. He thought that whatever he has said that should not be taken as a political. That is why he did not want to talk. First the issue started when both the sides refused the grants in the ratio of 40:60). This ratio was fixed after giving a thought and was in accordance with the Act that the pattern of funding could be dealt directly, but that has become a history. Now, it has come to notice, as told by the Vice-Chancellor, that the Punjab Government in the High Court has even refused the grant of Rs.20 crores whereas Punjab Government should have given a grant of about Rs.80 crores if the ratio of 40:60 was there. According to him, a new Government has been formed. It is right that the Governments are in continuity. But when the incumbents change, there is a need to make those incumbents aware about so many issues. Whatever the earlier Government had done on 15<sup>th</sup> March and if they ask the new Government after a week that why it was not done earlier, that is not justified. Now they should present their case through the team. As has been suggested that the same team should visit both the Governments, it is up to the Vice-Chancellor. There could be two separate teams also. Wherever one feels comfortable and could get results, there is a need of such persons to go there as ultimately it would be in the interest of the University. If two separate teams could go and look for a way out of the issue, according to him, it would not be a bad thing. As he has earlier said that he did not want to say much on this issue, he is seized of the matter like anybody else. According to him, without any authorization as a citizen of the country and as a person who is intimately connected with the University and in the welfare of the University, he must also make his efforts. He would try on his personal level. He has experienced it that in the past also they have been successful and have to be successful. The University is a very important University and it belongs to all of them. He entirely agreed with the Vice-Chancellor on the point that they should not try to divide it between Punjab and Chandigarh. The University is above all these issues. Most of the students to the Panjab University campus come from Punjab and Haryana whereas the number of students of Chandigarh is less. They have not to divide it like that. They are constructing so many hostels and spending money on the construction, this all is being done for Punjab and Haryana. The Punjab Government has till date not said, any Government for that matter, that there are students from Haryana also, they would not give the grants. He would also like to put on record that the Centre in itself is nothing. If the Centre has created Central Universities in different States, the Centre meets all the expenditure on those universities. There is a need to put forward this point in that perspective and he is sure that the Vice-Chancellor would do it. Rather, he agreed with some of the members that the Vice-Chancellor should not have taken initiative. It is a pitiable condition that the Vice-Chancellor of a University has to run around for some amounts here and there. It should not have been so. It should be the responsibility of others that they should on their own release the grants, whether it is the bureaucracy at the Centre or the State, whether that

leadership is at the Centre level or of the State, it is their responsibility more, as the Vice-Chancellors come for sometime to perform their duty. It is for them to put their case and after that they could expect from other platforms as the University is now facing crisis. It is pathetic as the statements which the Vice-Chancellor has to give in the Courts and the position is like that of daily-wagers who live for day-to-day, the University is living month-to-month. The grant is released for a month and again they have to beg for that and the grant is released. Whatever are the issues, those should be sorted out separately. If there is a need to sort out the issue by coming together of the Central Government and the Punjab Government, that should also be done. There was a suggestion that the nominees of both the Governments should be present in the Senate. It is important that those representatives should take interest and it should not be such a case that due to some differences, some harm might not be caused to the University due to the attitude of "I don't bother". As of today, it is not a good picture and they are not seeing good prospects that the University would move upwards. If their all efforts and energy are devoted on the issue that how to arrange for the salary for the following month, it is not good. He would like to be recused for this that the Central Government is not playing its role for the social infrastructure, particularly health and education, and could not draw parallel with Lovely and other universities with the pay scales and the conditions of those universities, what are the placements of those universities as compared to Panjab University. The placements of Panjab University are far better than those of other universities and the students, settled everywhere, take pride in saying that they are the alumni of Panjab University. This, in itself, is a big thing. They should not compare with those universities. The Centre and the State, should play their role and it is their responsibility. The Centre has also reduced the grant in the education sector, whether it is a part of the GDP or is the total expenditure of the Central Government, a small cut has been imposed in education. It has also been said that 15% enhancement has been given to other universities whereas otherwise the money has been reduced. It is wrong that both the Governments are backing out from the Panjab University. There is a need for all to understand the responsibility of the University. They collectively appeal to both the Governments to perform their duty and accountability be fixed so that no wasteful expenditure is done. He would not mind that the representative of the Government should be here but there should be no interference in the working of the University. This University has a unique structure of its own, which today they are calling as an inter-State, but inter-State should not be taken as a centum of statelessness that it does not belong to any State, that is why the Governments are not doing anything. It should be made the University of a State. In some of the other States, there are two Central universities each, the same could be done here. This University could also be made a Central University and it should also be kept in mind that the employees are not harmed. As far as he remembers and he would like to cull out that material again that when earlier there was a consensus and only the declaration was to be made, at that time there was no such stipulation that such and such number of the Panjab University employees would be retrenched. There was no such proposal whatever. It was in the given circumstances as those prevailed then, they were supposed to be taken over by the Government of India as Central University. But whatever are the circumstances today, are in front of them. He rather appreciated everybody's intervention in the debate that everyone has given his/her good views and perhaps something good comes out of this debate. It is only 9 days that the new Government in Punjab has been formed. The Special Secretary of the Punjab Government has come and clearly told that the Vice-Chancellor should meet the Chief Minister. Others also who could play their role, whether from the bureaucracy or the political leadership, appropriate grant should be given to the University so that the people of Punjab and the Punjab Government could say that it is their own University. There is no relation of this with the future of Chandigarh. If they link it with that, perhaps, they deviate from their path, as has been done in the past. It is an irony that in the State, the Central Universities are being created, and say that Panjab University should not be made a Central University, there would be no danger to the Punjabi or the employees. He is of the definite



opinion that it should be made a Central University. As every University has its own unique, same is the case with Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor, while responding to the wonderful contributions by each one of the members, said that first the matter at hand formally needs their approval and this budget forms the basis of conveying to the Centre what are the needs of the University towards the income from the Centre as well as from Punjab Government. They would not use the word deficit and could say that this is the income due from the Government. With this little bit change of nomenclature, broadly there is a consensus that they move and convey the needs of the University to the respective Governments and convey their need to the Punjab Government to have a larger contribution from a fixed amount of Rs.20 crores. Secondly, they have already conveyed their resolution, one part of that resolution was that the Centre had looked at the University in the year 2010-11. That spirit must be respected and all of the members are saying the same spirit should remain and there should be no talk of any retrenchment here and there. The spirit which came in with a great deal of discussion, debate, the House must have also passed it. So, they do not relook at that at the moment. They should try to seek a solution from the Centre keeping that thing at the centre stage. They have, of course, to go back to the Court on 17<sup>th</sup> April and he would try, on behalf of all of them, to convince the Centre that a meeting should be held between all the stakeholders as early as possible. They would form a Core Committee to talk to the State Government as well as the Central Government. They would add more members to this Core Committee. The Core Committee would remain the same, may be few members be added when the Committee goes to Punjab Government, similarly when they go to meet the Central Government. But the Core Committee would remain the same to talk to both the Governments. They should pursue the Punjab Government that the Regional Centres, affiliated Colleges need developmental grants like the other Colleges of Punjab affiliated to the other universities receive developmental grant from RUSA. He requested the members to tell him if he has left out anything. This concludes this part. Whether he should say or not that Lord Rippon would have been very happy that the way they have fulfilled the responsibility that is assigned to representatives of the people of Punjab that they would attend to their own affairs and evolve the future of this University. No other University of India has a governing body like that they have. While they go and try to become a Central University, his personal recommendation is that the structure of the Senate should not be changed. They could have some changes here and there but the composition of this House and the way this House functions, the frequency with which this House functions, the way the Syndicate meets every month, the way everything is debated, they should not lose that basic governance structure of the University while trying to solve the financial matters because all of them sitting here have a certain pain for this University. He is sure that if the representatives of the Centre would come and they become a deciding authority, then right decision would happen. The representative should come and participate and it should not be that when they (University) send them (Government) the decisions, they could grant approval to some while not to the others. The Regulations of the University are languishing in the Centre and they should not add to that inconvenience. They should try to improve things and do not lose the independence and autonomy to people who change very frequently in Delhi. This House does not change that frequently. It changes quasi-statically as the system evolves. He told that the institution to which he belonged to for 40 years, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR), when it was accepted as a deemed University, the UGC signed an MoU and gave it in writing when Dr. S.K. Joshi was the Chairman of the Committee, said that other than putting some members in the academic council by the UGC, the rules and regulations of TIFR, the basic structure of TIFR, would not be changed as it is recognized as a deemed University. They have a special status like this and if they are asked as their needs are met as centrally funded institution, the basic structure of the governance of this University, should not be, by and large, disturbed.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should mention about the balance amount to be recovered from the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they not make those conditions and no hard line in the resolution at the moment. Whenever they visit the Government, they could talk about it. When he said that this is passed, the members said, okay.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that when they are talking of cutting the expenses, they are increasing the remuneration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the rates had not been revised for the last 5-7 years. This is just a small expense. The efficiency of the examination system should not be reduced by just economizing on few rupees.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Board of Finance (**Items C-8 on the agenda**) contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 13.02.2017 (Items 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7), as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 (Para 3), be approved.

**X.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-9 on the agenda**, was read out, viz. –

**C-9.** That the following proposal, pursuant to the interim directions issued by a Division Bench of the Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 in CWP No.25990 of 2016 (Dr. Rashmi Yadav Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved:

- (i) Dr. Rashmi Yadav, Deputy Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., Chandigarh may be allowed to continue to work as such after 31.01.2017 (the date on which she completes the age of 60 years) till the final outcome of the Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 25990 of 2016 (Dr. Rashmi Yadav Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh) in terms of interim directions issued by the Division Bench of the court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No. 1505 of 2016.
- (ii) She may be allowed to retain the residential accommodation allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions.
- (iii) Dr. Rashmi Yadav may be paid salary on the same conditions as the Vice-Chancellor has already ordered in the court case LPA No. 1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and others and connected LPAs as follows i.e. "the appellant teachers in the court case (LPA No. 1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahulwalia Vs. PU and others are 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 filled by them. The payments to all such appellants shall be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the undertaking as per enclosed *pro forma*.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 30)**

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he has gone through this item. It is based on the basis of consensus made by the University in the High Court on the basis of an earlier decision by the High Court relating to the teachers. This lady (Dr. Rashmi Yadav) is a Deputy Librarian but not a teacher. They have said in the High Court that the previous decision would apply on that and the High Court has been misled. So, there is a problem in it and ultimately when the notice is given to the University, this point would come out. According to him, the Lawyer did not brief properly and could not appreciate the thing. It is so obvious that when the judgment would arrive, it is for the teachers and not for the Librarians.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Librarians have a special role in the University system.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that if the High Court decision on teachers it does not apply to the Librarians and the whole basis of this order, which is an interim order, it could be vacated or modified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whenever the UGC releases the Pay Commission's recommendations for the teachers, Librarians are an integral part of those recommendations. The University teachers have never treated the Librarians as someone other than them. Librarians, Deputy Librarians are treated as a continuum of academic. The retirement age is 60 years and it is for teachers as well as Librarians. But in the Central Universities, it is 65 years for both.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that his experience in the UGC, both as a member and as a teacher, is that there is always a separate report for the teachers and the Librarians. It comes separate for the Administrative Officers like the Registrar and the Librarians. In the matter of retirement age, he remembered that when Mrs. Anand was retiring from the University, the question was whether she could get the extension or not and he had decided that she could not get the extension because she was not a teacher. At the moment, they are bound by the Court order. In the Court, they should have pointed out that the UGC itself makes a distinction between the teachers, Librarians and the Registrars. The report in the case of the Registrar also comes, but the retirement age is not the same as for teachers. Similarly, there is a difference between the Librarians and the Director of Sports. Now, of course, the High Court has given a decision and they are bound by it but they should discuss it with their Advocate and he could know where the actual position stands now.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he respectfully differs with it. They are not bound by the decision because it is based on a misleading statement. The facts given by the Lawyer were not correct and this aspect has not come out. If they wanted to do it independently, they could do it. But they could not do it on the basis of a Court order which has been procured on a misleading statement. So, they could get it modified and there is no issue. The Lawyer could inform the Court that this is what he has been told and the other decision could not apply to this and therefore, take a decision on merits, the Court would decide.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, any other opinion.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that before the year 2011, the Librarians, Deputy Librarians and the Assistant Librarians were not included in teaching. But, for the first time in the year 2011, they were included in the light of some rules of the UGC. Now, they are included in teaching staff in Panjab University. Before 2011, they were not even part of PUTA and not allowed to cast vote in PUTA election. Now they could contest the election of PUTA as they are the members of the teaching staff.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he entirely agreed with Dr. Ajay Ranga and as far as he remembers that was the position. The College and other Librarians were holding agitations for some time that they should be considered as part of the teaching and their demand was accepted. However, he is not having those details but according to him, the University modified its stand in the High Court. The background papers be got examined as to under what circumstances and in which context, the demand of the Librarians was accepted. They should take a decision after looking after all those things. But they should not take a decision in such a way that their viewpoint might not be represented here. They should not take such a decision which goes to the prejudice of the Librarians. According to him, they need to change their thinking. The Librarians and the Sports Directors play the same role in teaching as others play. He is not running down the teaching done by the teachers but other units also play an important role to develop the personalities of the students. There have been articles appearing for some time for grant of the facilities of the University which could not be granted due to paucity of funds. There is a need to pay attention to the Librarians and they should not run down this staff. He urged that the Librarians should be granted a status.

Professor Chaman Lal said that a Librarian is as much academic staff as the teaching staff is. An Assistant Librarian is equal to Assistant Professor, a Deputy Librarian is equal to Associate Professor and the Librarian is equal to Professor with the same pay-scale and with the same qualifications with the same conditions for promotion. Now the Librarians have to do Ph.D. for promotion. That is why, there should be no confusion about it and they are part of the academic staff. In Punjabi University and other universities, the Librarians are part of the Teachers' Associations. According to him, this should be clinched and there is no doubt in it as they are part of the academic staff and should be protected as such.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Librarians are part of teaching staff since the year 2011. The College Librarians are deprived of this benefit. He suggested that they should also be treated at par and should also have a voting right, if not in the present, but for the future, it could be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-9 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XI.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-10 on the agenda**, was read out, viz .

**C-10** That following person working as Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

<b>Name of the person, Designation/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Joining</b>	<b>Proposed date of confirmation</b>
Shri Vineet Punia Director Public Relations-cum- Editor, PU News, P.U., Chandigarh	22.05.2013 (F.N.)	22.05.2014

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 32)**

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Shri Vineet Punia is on leave and in his place someone has been appointed. Shri Punia had requested the leave for 3 years, if the University could consider it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter, at the moment stands discussed, let this person join, perform and they could see. It is premature to take a decision. Right now, this is the item under consideration and nothing else.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that it is just for leave vacancy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the extension in leave has to go through a channel and *suo moto* they could not do anything at this stage.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-10 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-11 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-11.** That the recommendations of the Screening/Selection Committee dated 16.11.2016 regarding promotion cases of Programmers/System Manager, be approved.

**NOTE:** The letters of promotion to the person have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 3)**

**XIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-12 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-12.** That the following Fellows be assigned to the faculties mentioned against their names:

Professor Deepak Pental CGMCP, Biotech Centre University of Delhi South Campus New Delhi-110021	1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Pharmaceutical Sciences
<b>(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 22)</b>	
Shri V.K. Sibal H.No.29 Sector-5 Chandigarh	1. Law 2. Languages 3. Design & Fine Arts 4. Business Management & Commerce
<b>(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 4)</b>	

**XIV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-13 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

**C-13.** That Gazette Notification No. 67 dated 8.3.2013 of Homoeopathic Central Council (Minimum Standards Requirement of Homoeopathic Colleges

and attached Hospitals) Regulations, 2013, received from Secretary, Central of Homoeopathy, No. 61-65, Institutional Area Opp. D Block Janakpuri, New Delhi-110058 vide letter No. F.12-15/2012-CCH/25910-26171 dated 13.3.2013 be adopted, as requested by Dr. P.K. Mittal, Vice-President of Governing Body of Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, # M-671, Sector 26, Chandigarh vide letter dated 8.11.2016.

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor has been authorized to form a Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate, for implementation of promotion policy as per the adopted Gazette Notification.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 5)**

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the item before them is consideration of the notification of the Central Council of Homoeopathy whereas the letter for adoption has been written by Dr. P.K. Mittal, Vice-President of the Governing Body, Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital (p.159) to adopt the notification from the date of publication, i.e., from the year 2013. From the discussion/decision of the Syndicate, it seems that the matter has been overlooked or the office did not bring it to their notice. The Syndicate has resolved to adopt the notification and further resolved to implement the promotion policy. He is having a copy of the letter written and signed by the Deputy Registrar to the College to implement the same. The Inspection Team had visited the College during the years 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 and thereafter the College had been granted the affiliation. Why they are considering the matter again? He just wanted to inform that whenever the Management changes, it wanted to show that the previous Management and the Principal have done nothing. The Regulations have already been adopted. In the year 2009, they had issued a circular that the University would not make any correspondence with any Management. In the year 2012, the same Dr. P.K. Mittal had been requested not to correspond directly with the University. If they had talked to the Principal, he would have brought it to their knowledge that the gazette notification had already been adopted. Since the gazette notification had already been adopted, now they could write to Dr. P.K. Mittal that the notification had already been adopted vide letter dated 5.4.2013 issued by the Deputy Registrar. As far as the further resolved point regarding constitution of a Committee for promotion is concerned, a Committee had already been constituted under the Chairpersonship of Dean of University Instruction and the Committee has been directed to frame the promotion policy on the lines of the Dental College. This item should be withdrawn and information be sent that they had already adopted the notification.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that the teachers of the Homoeopathic College are suffering in the absence of the promotions.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this case was done in 2013 as Shri Prabhjit Singh has said and this matter has now come. The question is that, he is sorry to say, the College has always been in trouble on one or the other issue. They know how much trouble was there with the people working in the College. He did not want to blame anybody there. But this matter has now come and it is not that easy that let the past be forgotten. The matter has come and they have to apply the mind on this and deal with it properly. They have to see that whatever in the past has been approved, the same had been done properly or not because these things are not ad hoc. They have to see that with the change of the head of an institution, if something is happening they could not say that something had been done during the term of a particular Principal. If the issue has come to them, they could think over it and have to apply a proper mind.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, he would look into the matter.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this was the reason why the item was withdrawn from the agenda of the Syndicate meeting dated 27<sup>th</sup> July/13<sup>th</sup> August, 2013 because the notification had already been adopted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get it checked.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized, on behalf of the Senate, to take decision in the matter.

**XV.** 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 recommendation (Item No. 21) of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 29.11.2016 that Administrative sanction and financial approval to give financial assistance to the driver of staff Car during any Inter-University Competition held outside Chandigarh per head per day, be given at par with the rates to the bus driver of the Directorate out of respective budget head, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 15)**

**XVI.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-15 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-15.** That the recommendations (Items No. 17, 2 & 5) of General Body of P.U.S.C. dated 19.12.2016, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 16)**

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

**C-16.** That Inductively Coupled Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometer (ICP-AES Make Jobin Yvon Model JY70 Plus) with accessories lying in lab No. 143-144 at Centre of Advanced Study in Geology in Department of Geology, P.U., be written off as the instrument is 28 years old and its Electronic card's components are spoiled, PS damaged, troubleshooting not feasible and not economical to repair.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 26)**

**XVIII.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-17 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

**C-17.** That recommendations (Sr. No. (ii)) dated 14.09.2016 of the Screening Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to screen the applications of the teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards till the date of capping on API score for promotion implemented in the University, be approved.

**NOTE:** The recommendations of the Committee dated 14.09.2016 at Sr. No. (i) with regard to promotion of Dr. S.P. Padhi, Department of Economics and Dr. Keerti Vardhan, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC (Mathematics), P.U. have already been approved by the Syndicate meeting dated 27.11.2016 (Para 24) and Senate meeting dated 17.12.2016 (Para XIII).

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 35)**

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that a period of 8 months has passed since the UGC template was issued. According to the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> amendment, no promotion has been made till date. He requested that it should be made time bound. In the category-II, marks are awarded for membership of various Committees. He requested that the membership of the Committees should be on rotation basis instead of making same person as a member of the Committees repeatedly. Due to this, there is a fear in the mind of some persons as to how they would be able to complete the required number of API score in this category as someone is not made a member of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is well taken.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that since Dr. Parveen Goyal has said that the promotions have already been delayed. He requested to get the matter expedited. There are some practical problems which the teachers are facing like some teachers could not apply in time or the process is not completed timely. Secondly, when a teacher had applied for promotion, some of the Departments take years together to complete the process of screening. Some of cases are cleared by the Departments within a period of 15 days while in other cases, the screening is not done for a year or so. He requested that a timeline be fixed for completing the process of screening.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-17 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XIX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-18 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-18.** That –

- (1) Secretary for the meetings of the Faculty of Science be appointed from amongst the members of the Science Faculty, as is being done in other certain Faculties, pursuant to the decision of the meeting of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016 (Current Discussion 3).
- (2) the same procedure be followed for other major Faculties (Arts and Languages);
- (3) for this year, Deans of respective Faculties be authorized to nominate Secretaries for the rest of the term and from the next year, the election of the Secretaries would take place as per rules.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 36)**



Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the resolved part is that the Deans would appoint the Secretaries on their own from the current session. He requested that they could implement it starting from the meetings of the Faculties scheduled to be held from 27<sup>th</sup> March.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not consider it as they are approving it just today.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the Syndicate had already taken the decision and it must have been implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-18 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19 on the agenda**, was read out, viz. –

**C-19.** That circular No. 3/21/16-3-Finance/505 dated 16.09.2016 of Joint Secretary Finance, Department of Finance, Government of Punjab, regarding not granting of Dearness Allowance and Medical allowance, to the pensioners/family pensioner, residing abroad after getting permanent citizenship, be adopted.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 37)**

Professor R.P. Bambah said that it could not be implemented retrospectively.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a Regulation 6.2 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I, vide which the Syndicate could take a decision. Therefore, the Syndicate has taken a decision in this regard.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that some of the persons have already been granted the benefit and it could not be implemented retrospectively.

It was clarified that it would be implemented prospectively and not retrospectively.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-20 on the agenda** was read and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-20.** That the following recommendations (i) and (ii) of the workshop conducted under the Chairmanship of the Dean Faculty of Law dated 11.07.2016, be approved:

- (i) that the split up of each paper for the newly admitted students of B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 years Integrated Course w.e.f. Academic Session 2016-17 be as under:

External Examinations	:	60 Marks
Internal Assessment	:	40 Marks

Mid Semester Test	:	15 Marks
Project/Assignment	:	12½ Marks
Presentation	:	12½ Marks

- (ii) that in case any reappear candidate/s appear/s in the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> semester, under old scheme, the 60 marks of external examination be converted into 80 marks for evaluation purpose.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 38)**

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

**C-21.** That the nomenclature of 5½ year B.E. (Chemical) with MBA being run by the Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be changed to 'Integrated B.E. (Chemical)-MBA' from the academic session 2017-2018.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 43)**

**XXIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-22 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-22.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 03.11.2016 constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 6) to examine the recommendation of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 regarding Chair in Category-1, be approved.

**NOTE:** That the list of persons to be appointed on these Chairs will be placed before the Syndicate.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 14)**

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the recommendation of the Committee regarding Chairs in category-1, it is mentioned that the persons would serve till the age of superannuation. Since they have a system of rotation of Headship of the Department for 3 years, according to him, the tenure of the Chairs should also be 3 years but not till the age of superannuation as far as Chairs in category-1 are concerned. A specific period should be mentioned and not till the retirement. A limit should be for 3 years so that they could have more diversity and innovation in a particular programme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it meant that if someone is appointed at the age of 54 years, the appointment could be for 3 years and the person should not continue up to the age of 60 years.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the time period for the Chairs should be for 3 years and instead of senior most person, there should be rotation among those persons who are Heads of Departments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no question of rotation in it and it could not be implemented.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that a Chairpersonship and Chair should not be given to the same person at one time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this could be the view of Dr. Ajay Ranga but it is not correct.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they could not take away the Chair from a person who is working as a Chairperson.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is saying so because there are some Chairs whose rooms always remained locked and the persons did not go their offices.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there might be some complications but the decisions should not be based on secondary complications.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it could be that some of the persons could get the Chair for 2 or 3 years and might not reach up to the age of 60 years. So, according to him, this very particular decision is absolutely right.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the only amendment that is being sought is that if somebody is appointed on the Chair at the age of 45 years, that person should not go up to the age of 60 years. That is alright.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in the list of the Chairs which has been circulated, there are some Departments where the Chair Professorship has been named after some renowned person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such a Chair is in the name of Shri K.L. Sehgal in the Department of Music but that is a Professorship which has been given that tag.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there is a Chair in the name of Baba Prithvi Singh Azad in the Department of Sociology. Similarly, in the Department of Political Science, he is taking that Professorship in the name of Shaheed Bhagat Singh but he is not occupying a Chair. He requested the administration to remove such Professorship from the Chair. So, it should not be a loss to the Department. If such a Professorship is there, they could not fill up the Chairs. They are having two posts in the Department which they could fill up.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be delinked.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he knows it that this decision has been taken by very respectable persons. Later on, Professor Shelley Walia has kept his critical views and he himself has taken completely very uncritical decision of making a senior most Professor of the Department for a Chair where he/she has nothing to do with it, that is an insult of the Chair. There are two categories of Chairs. One of the categories is real Chair where the lectures are delivered. The other category is of unprivileged Chairs. He could not understand the difference between Rajiv Gandhi Chair, a privileged Chair and Lajpat Rai Chair, which is an unprivileged Chair where the senior most Professor has to be appointed and for the other Chair, one has to fulfill certain conditions. It is a very irrational decision of designation the senior most Professor on the Chair. He would like to give the example from the literature. When a person is designated on Munshi Prem Chand Chair where a person's work is on poetry, ancient or medieval literature, the person should have at least worked, if not on literature, on fiction, novel or short story. In Bhai Vir Singh Chair, if they are making a Professor as incharge of that Chair, a person might not have worked on ancient or modern literature. That is an insult of the Chair. This has been done by so many eminent people like late Shri Gurdial Singh, Johl and then by Professor Shelley Walia who himself has such a critical attitude in life and approving that kind of thing in the Committee. That is absolutely non-sense.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Chaman Lal to use polite words.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he would use polite words and requested Professor Shelley Walia not to mind it.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he does not mind for his criticism made by Professor Chaman Lal.

Professor Chaman Lal apologized for these words. He said that this decision has been taken just as expediency. Expediency should not be the reason of taking academic decisions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is well taken.

Professor Chaman Lal said that if he has criticized something, he should have the other view also. The Chair should be respected by designating the senior most Professor. The better alternative could have two things. There might be a new Committee to think of it and the financial constraints also. Actually, most of the universities are not able to fill up the Chairs because there is no talent for these Chairs. That is the biggest problem. He got Bhagat Singh Chair established in Jawaharlal Nehru University way back in 2008 but till now the Chair has not been filled up. It is a loss. They could transform the Chairs into lectures every year. Most of the retired persons could come for the lectures. They could invite persons who have proper qualifications and talent for the duration ranging from one month to one year. They could involve the Teaching Associates also. There could also be one lecture at the University level and one at the Departmental level. They should honour these Chairs, form a small Committee and Professor Shelley Walia should be made the Chairperson of this Committee.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that the Universities all over the world have different sections of Chairs with an objective to honour someone for the contribution one has made to the knowledge and also to distinguish some people who have made contributions themselves. The charge of a Professorship does not mean the charge of the office. The names to the Chairs are given basically to bring to the notice of the people the greatness of the people who have made contribution to knowledge. They have different types of Chairs, one type like Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, Dayanand Chair which have their own department and the structure and the people are appointed on those Chairs. One type was that the eminent people should be associated with the University as they could not come full time or for long term, and at the same time they should not be known to one Department but to each other Department. These Chairs were like Dr. Man Mohan Singh Chair, Mahatma Gandhi Chair, Tagore Chair and so on. Then there was P.N. Mehra Chair, G.P. Sharma Chair, Hans Raj Gupta Chair to commemorate the people who made remarkable contribution but were not Einstein. Taking into consideration different types, they made the recommendations that one Department is doing study in certain areas like Guru Nanak Sikh Studies is doing. They could associate people who could work there. There are few Chairs where they could use the persons to interact with the University people and come for a short period depending on some conditions so that there is interaction and inspiration. Then there are Chairs which are named after people who made contribution to those areas. The idea is that if they make Chairs in their names and allocate funds. But the University does not have the funds and the second is that the people are not available. There, they made a compromise that as they have a P.N. Mehra Chair, who was a great man, to commemorate his memory, the senior most person could be assigned that Chair. There are other Chairs like G.P. Sharma, Sarojini Naidu Chair and Dayanand Chair. The idea is that without spending any money, they should be able to commemorate and bring their contribution to the knowledge of the students. There was another Chair, Gurdial Singh

Dhillon Chair, and they used it as a sort of visiting position, inviting people for short period to interact with the faculty. Taking into consideration all these things, they made the recommendation that they should not have the same attitude for all the Chairs. They should have different attitude for different types of Chairs. They have University Chairs which they used to bring inspiration to the students about the people who were really great. Then they have commemoration Chairs for those people who have made contribution to the Department and named the Chairs after such people like Hans Raj Gupta, P.N. Mehra and G.P. Sharma. Then there is the question of some Chairs where they must spend some money but not as regular positions. For example, in the Defence Studies, they could invite some who could really help.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a wonderful recommendation.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that they have made the programmes more realistic.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it is appearing on page 221 what he had said in the Syndicate. He agreed with Professor R.P. Bambah because if they look at Mulk Raj Anand Chair Professorship in English, Sarojini Naidu Chair in English and Shiv Kumar Batalvi Professor in School of Punjabi Studies and if they offer these to a person, he is sure that the person is not going to start working on Shiv Kumar Batalvi or he/she would work on something of his/her own interest. What this particular Committee was doing to look at the recommendations of Professor R.P. Bambah and his Committee. According to him, they did deliberate on it and concentrated on what they were doing. It was not done in this kind of uncritical manner at all. When they give two Chairs to people in the Department of English, for instance, they do not need any kind of a person who specializes on Mulk Raj Anand or Sarojini Naidu, he/she could be working on Soho Don or Stephen Spender. He did not agree with the use of such adjectives and they should go ahead with this recommendation. It is a good recommendation especially keeping in mind that for so many years, the Chairs were not occupied. It is a good suggestion that they offer these to the senior people in the Department and request them to visit the University once a year and to contribute more and within the period of this Professorship, they should write a book and show some kind of contribution that they have made and some output that has come out. Let them look at this particular idea and ignore the words used by Professor Chaman Lal. He did not mind those words, it is good, it is robust. Professor R.P. Bambah's viewpoint is absolutely well taken. If they look at these 19 particular Chairs, according to him, they do not need particular specialization in the nomenclature. So the nomenclature is not relevant.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they accept the recommendations. The deliberation is very important.

Professor Chaman Lal said that his dissent be recorded on it.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that it is a very good thing that they have these Chairs occupied. The Committee, the way they have enjoined them to give an inaugural lecture plus a lecture, everyone who goes through this stage in his/her life for that period, he/she has to produce a little bit better quality work. It is like that the President of the Academy has to deliver an inaugural lecture at the meeting of the Academy. So, when a person becomes the President, every year he/she has to come up with a new piece of work which has to be exemplary. It is not like that one is a President of the Academy having so many administrative responsibilities, should leave the academics. The Presidentship of the Academy, in some sense, is enhancing the work for with no remuneration. One has to be more active academically during the Presidentship of the Academy. So it is like that. When one is a Professor, he/she pursues his/her own field. But for these 3 continuous years, one has to tell as to what he/she has done. It is a very nice thing and nothing is paid. They

should enable these people to do a quality work. So, it is his recommendation, they could take it to the Syndicate later if they feel so, that a person during his/her Chair Professorship at least, is given lesser/half the teaching duties in one of the semesters so that one could devote time to research. Let him recommend that whosoever occupies the Chair, in one of the two semesters that person is given half the teaching load and the other half is a privilege that one does some work because one has to give the lecture at the end of the term. He did not know whether it is a useful suggestion but they have to do something if they want to bring it a best level.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they could ask the Chair Professor to publish a monograph.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not a recommendation and there is no need to put such restrictive thing. It is alright that somebody has to come and deliver a new lecture every year which is based on his/her work. Let they not make it a burden.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the suggestion given by the Vice-Chancellor is well taken.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal suggested that the teaching load should not be reduced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since a quality work is expected from Chair Professors, they need some extra time. He himself has been a researcher and knows how difficult it is.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this experiment should be done on trial basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is an academic responsibility and they are not violating anything.

Professor Shelley Walia said that when one is given the Chair, it would induce some kind of seriousness and a moral obligation that the person has to work. According to him, it is a good incentive that half semester is given off.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not saying for half the semester off but half the teaching load.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that due to this the teaching work would suffer.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that the Chairs should be extended to the re-employed teachers also to which some of the members said no.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would complicate the things.

Dr. Parveen Goyal enquired as to what would be the term.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that the term would be 3 years.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the sentiment of the Vice-Chancellor is good. Even otherwise also, the Professors do not require filling up the teaching load in any proforma as if one after becoming a Professor in the University feels that he/she is omniscient. The suggestion given by the Vice-Chancellor is good but there would be problems in it as teachers posts are already vacant and giving less teaching load to Chair Professor would further aggravate the problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such positions are not more than 10 in the University and they are having 500 Professors and it is just like a drop in the ocean and if that is reduced to half, it would amount to nothing.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there are some Chairs which have been occupied by persons for 5 years together without even opening the office once. He is sure that if they ask that person as to where the Chair is located, that person might not be able to tell it. What is the use of assigning the Chairs to such persons?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) is a faculty member in this University and as he would grow in his career, he would pass through this duration of being a Chair Professor. So, it is not good to accuse that someone had not performed well. It is like condemning the whole concept which should not be done.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is not condemning it but only asking for the removal of deficiencies.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since Dayanand Chair is functioning from a classroom, proper office space may be provided to it.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the suggestion given by Professor Keshav Malhotra is a very good one.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-22 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXIV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-23 on the agenda**, was read out and unanimously approved i.e. –

**C-23.** That minutes of the Committee dated 20.12.2016 to re-look into (i) PU-CET (UG) to be conducted (ii) Merit displayed while declaring the result of P.U. CET (UG), be approved.

**NOTE:** That normalization of marks of the subject of Mathematics vis-à-vis Biology be carried out and to frame the guidelines for such normalization, the same Committee be authorized.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 20)**

**XXV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-24 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-24.** That –

- (i) letter dated 29.11.2016 of Professor (Dr.) Jaspal S. Sandhu, Secretary, University Grant Commission, New Delhi, regarding constitution of the External Peer Review Committee in term of clause 5.6.1(d) of UGC Regulation on (Minimum Qualification for appointment of Teachers and other Academic staff in Universities and College and Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) 2010, be adopted.

- (ii) a letter be written to the UGC for inclusion of Principals of those Colleges which have been awarded 'A' grade in the NAAC accreditation.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 4)**

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu enquired whether any reply from the UGC has been received as a decision to write a letter to the UGC had been taken in the meeting of the Syndicate?

The Vice-Chancellor said that no reply has been received.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that till the reply is not received, they could withdraw the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to pursue it. Still they are not implementing it but they would have to implement it as per the directive of the UGC for the Colleges getting A+ grade. They could not say that they would not implement it. They would have to implement it and wanted some additional input from the UGC. They did not have a choice not to implement it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if they approve it today and the advertisement is given but there is no relaxation given by the UGC, they would not be able to find more than two Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they did not approve it, did they have the authority not to approve and implement it. Could they say that they would not implement the directive of the UGC?

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that supposing they did not get the relaxation from the UGC, then they would be left with only 2 Colleges with A+ grade. Would they make all the appointments of the Principals through these two Colleges? They are an autonomous body.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what does the autonomous mean.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he does not agree with it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if he (Principal I.S. Sandhu) does not agree, it is okay.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they could wait for some time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not recommending that they should wait. Tomorrow, it could become an issue for him that the governing body of the University is reluctant to adopt the UGC guidelines. He is heading all the Promotion Committees being the Vice-Chancellor. All that they need is that whoever are the two Principals, they should act with objectivity. That is all that is needed at the moment. Why are they doubting the integrity of these people who are eligible to act.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that another concern is that in accordance with the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment, they are not getting the Principals. The teachers ask them to show their concern. As a representative of the teachers, what Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu is saying is right. They could hardly get 4-5 persons eligible for the post of Principals for the Constituent Colleges. Whenever an advertisement is given for the post of Principals for the



Colleges, in some cases they find a few persons eligible while in other cases, nobody is found suitable. They did not have the list of the publishers as to which of the books would be valid. In the list of the journals also, except the science journals, there is no list of journals and they would not be able to find eligible persons for the post of Principals. Since, there are only two Colleges of A+ grade, only those Principals would be repeated as members of the Committee and no other would be eligible. Therefore, they should make efforts and wait for the reply from the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the UGC is in a mess. The Chairman of the UGC is going to retire in a week. No reply would be received from the UGC. They would have unnecessary accusation that they are not implementing the directive of the UGC, the governing bodies of the University disregard the directive of the UGC.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it would affect the promotions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could just plead with the UGC.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that could they not invite the Principals of the other universities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could invite, who has said that they could not invite the Principals from other universities.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that then how there is a restriction of two.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is their (UGC) opinion that only the Principal of the affiliating University be invited. Otherwise, there are so many A+ grade Colleges in the country.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they are having two A+ grade Colleges, while Haryana is having no such College. So from where they could invite the Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they get could the Principals from A+ grade Colleges from Delhi, U.P. Maharashtra, Gujarat, etc.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is in his knowledge that Haryana is having no A+ grade College but does not know whether in other States such Colleges are available or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is his responsibility to find out.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that there are four A+ grade Colleges in Jalandhar like DAV College, HMV College, SD College and another one.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that this information is wrong. These all Colleges are A+ in the old grading and these would not be counted for the new category. It could be verified from the Dean College Development Council.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that S.D. College, Chandigarh is A+ grade College.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that S.D. College, Jalandhar has recently got the A+ grade.

The Vice-Chancellor said that A.S. College, Khanna where Dr. R.S. Jhanji is the Principal, is also a A+ grade College. The Colleges which have a score above 3.5 are A+ grade Colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu enquired as to how many Colleges are there which have got the marks above 3.5.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not answer it and he (Principal I.S. Sandhu) could not demand this answer impromptu from him.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if the Vice-Chancellor thinks that he (Principal I.S. Sandhu) and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu are saying something wrong, the Vice-Chancellor could provide the information as to how many Colleges are A+ grade.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not answer this impromptu.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the list of journals is not complete yet, it is dynamic and more demanding.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have been asked to adopt this and they are just adopting this at the moment.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the list of publishers is not complete. How one could earn the points?

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is a separate issue.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that according to the agenda item, it is for the appointment of teachers and not for the Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not brought the items out of blue. It has come from the Syndicate meeting.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if the Syndicate had not talked deliberately, then they are discussing here.

The Vice-Chancellor said, yes, they could discuss. He is not saying that they could not discuss the item.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the agenda item is regarding minimum qualification for appointment of teachers and other academic staff in Universities and Colleges, where is the letter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be possible that the item has been worded wrongly here and there. He has not got these things out of the blue. These matters have come from the Syndicate. While forwarding the same, if something has gone wrong, they could correct it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is sorry to say that if the agenda item is approved, it would be applicable as such for all purposes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the letter of UGC is regarding constitution of the External Peer Review Committee. The Principal has to be appointed for a period of 5 years and when the re-appointment has to be done, to review that the nominee of the Vice-Chancellor of the affiliating University and nominee of the Chairman, UGC would be the members of that Committee. The nominees shall be nominated from the Principals of the Colleges with Excellence/College with Potential for Excellence/Autonomous Colleges/NAAC

A+ accredited Colleges. This is what they especially have been told. So, it could be possible that the agenda item is something else.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the item could be corrected.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the wording of the item could be corrected.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that such a situation would come only after 5 years but not now.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if the matter has to be review after 5 years, but it is on the agenda.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the wording of the item be corrected.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the office to properly word the agenda item. They have to adopt the portion which is related with the re-appointment of the Principals after 5 years. A letter to the UGC has also to be written for inclusion of Principals of those Colleges which have been awarded 'A' grade. He said that no reply would be given by the UGC as it is such a minor thing.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the College teachers have the only one avenue for promotion to the post of Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are just mixing the things and not understanding the item. The item is for appointment of Principals for a period of 5 years in the initial stage. If the re-appointment is permissible, to have a re-appointment being permissible or second term of that person being permissible, that is to be reviewed.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that what Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu is saying that with the item, the decision for the appointment of teachers is also being taken. He knows it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if he (Principal I.S. Sandhu) knows it then why he is mixing up the things and trying to mislead the House instead of helping him (Vice-Chancellor).

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-24 on the agenda**, along with amendment in clause 5.6.1(d) of UGC (Minimum Qualifications for appointment of Teachers and other Academic staff in Universities and Colleges and Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) Regulations (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment) 2016, be approved.

**XXVI**

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-25 on the agenda** was read out, and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-25.** That the matter related with the fee structure of Panjab University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres for the session 2017-18, be considered.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 12)**

The Vice Chancellor said that this matter concerns proposal for revision of the tuition fee, largely in the teaching departments of the University, for whatever happen in the teaching departments, by default it also again is extended more or less with some variations, little variations here and there, to all the Regional Centres of the University which are an integral part of Panjab University. So what is this proposal? The proposal is to enhance tuition fee and the tuition fee is for students which have great heterogeneity depending upon the history of this University. Initially the University was having traditional courses and few teaching departments. Who came to the University initially, it is the best of the students of the colleges which came and enrolled themselves for the postgraduate courses in the University or in the Honours Schools system. It was students who enrolled for largely B.Sc. courses in the colleges after a stay of one year in the B.Sc. either in B.Sc. Part-I or those who chose not to join or join Engineering College or Medical College, they were the people who took admission in the Physical Sciences or Biological Sciences. One exception was Department of Chemical Engineering and Technology. The Department of Chemical Engineering and Technology, which was initially technical chemistry/applied chemistry, which took a different shape because Chemical Engineering emerged as a very important discipline after the 2<sup>nd</sup> world war. University Campus was meant for best of the students in the affiliated Colleges of the University. They were to come here, stay in the hostels. The economy of the country was such that living standards were not all that high, incomes were very low and seeing this background, the University kept tuition fee for all courses at the campus at the minimal level. Why it was minimal level, you could understand that it was the best of the students. Most of these students were supposed to be so good; they would deserve to receive scholarship in some way or the other. The tuition fee of this University was kept very very low. The University went for the bright products of the colleges. Idea to have self-sustaining courses in the University actually came in for, 50 years after the University. After as they passed towards the end of the century and that happened in the background of 4<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission and the employees' salary rising and University desiring to have pension scheme etc. So, in that background the pattern of education in India was changing. Everybody wanted to professional degree, there was mushrooming of engineering and other professional courses. Engineering, Pharmacy and Management, these were the things that came. PEC became a deemed University, but before PEC became a deemed University, the University had already commenced the University Institute of Engineering and Technology and few other professional courses came in. Their fees was kept comparable to the kind of fees which was being charged by the colleges in the private sector. And initially all these self-sustaining institutions because initially to start with the large number of students, the teachers are few, as the students increase, more and more teachers have to be employed. So the initial surplus kept on decreasing as time went by. But they have started with a fee initially it was comparable to those with the private institutions and they were slowing building up the institution. The private people, what they do, they build up that infrastructure very very quickly. They have to attract the students with infrastructure. They could have not built up their infrastructure that rapidly as the private sector had built up. They did not build up infrastructure rapidly, so they have surpluses. Then about ten years ago they started a kind of semi-self-sustaining courses for many of the disciplines on the campus like Stem Cell, Nano-Science and Technology, Physics and Electronics. So they have courses for which fees is less than Rs. 5,000. There are courses for which fee is between Rs. 30,000 to Rs. 40,000, and then they have courses for which fee is upward of Rs. 70,000. Once they started with 30, 40 thousand that also for some years, they did not touch. That the fee which was less than 3, 4 thousand they are touching it in some way but that does not make any difference. Even if they, some fees base is Rs. 2000, increased by 5% or 10%, how will it increase the income significantly. So in real way they started to increase the fees when they shifted from the plan budget to the non-plan budget, when the centre insisted that income from the tuition fee should also be seen to be enhancing. So what did they do, they said okay, they will enhance it? They took the decision that minimum enhance ment would be five hundred rupees and upper limit will be 1200 or

1500. So, it was a very narrow band. The 500 appeared a very large figure on a fee which was Rs. 1500. As if, they have increased the fee by 33 per cent. 1200 on 70,000 appeared 2 per cent increase. So that was an uneven kind of an increase and now they have reached the situation that in the University there are fees which are between 2000 and 5000 that is one band, there is a fee is between 30 and 40 thousands that is another band and then there is fees which is 60 to 70 thousand and that is third kind of band. They are being asked to rationalize the fee structure and try to bring the income up so that our fees look comparable to the fees being charged by the other Universities in Punjab. This is a kind of directive that is given to them. Make your fee structure so that it looks comparable to the fees in the other Universities. So, it is in that background, the committee has done very very careful job and come up with this proposal. So, this proposal is not a thoughtless proposal, this proposal is also not of a kind that increase fee by 20 per cent or 15 percent all across. It's a kind of differential adjustment. A lot of thought has been given in bringing out this proposal. So, first this fees which was less than Rs. 5000 that is being enhanced to a number that is closest to four figures, i.e., about 10,000. So, something which is 2, 3 thousand, when you bring it up to 10,000 what will it look. It will look a 300 per cent increase. Now, so they cannot, that is why it looks very large 300 per cent increase. Those things which were highest, for example University Institute of Engineering & Technology's is hovering over 70 thousand. Government of India is saying that they are centrally funded institution; they must bring their engineering fees not upto the IITs but bring it closer to NIT, bring it closer to Punjab Engineering College, which is an engineering college in your own home city. So, it is in that background the committee has recommended that University Institute of Engineering & Technology's fees should be brought to 90,000. It's a sort of figure which brings the figure comparable to a comparable institution within the Chandigarh city, which is again in the state set-up. So, this is the kind of, part of that. Though lots of courses, like Stem Cell, courses with sciences, applied sciences courses and in applied social science, it is already between 30-40 thousands. Those things have been touched minimally, because those are not the courses, where passing out students are getting the high paying jobs immediately. It takes time when the graduate of those courses try to find an employment. So, some fees have hardly been touched, say marginally been touched as 33,000 has been done 35,000 and 32,000 has been done 35,000, so that they are being brought at par. The Honours Schools, etc., whose fees were very less that has been brought to the order of 10,000. This proposal will apply only to the new entrants in the next year. Its real impact will come after 3-4 years, when everybody in a given course is paying them. Otherwise in a course of 4-5 years duration that will amount to very a very slow increase in income from the tuition fee. So it appears large in some cases, but that is a proposal which has been made after a great deal of thought and that is how that has come in. So, he urged all of them to examine that proposal in that context. When the proposal was put in the Syndicate, there was a discussion that all new entrants, who will be subjected to this fees, their incomes would be ascertained and it will be done department-wise by teachers accepting that responsibility. The teachers, who have to teach those students, they only will look at their background and wherever there is a hardship case, whenever it is felt that this person, the students are going on to enrol on merit and they will lose that merit holder if he or she is not provided a support. So the University will go out of the way and ensure that those students are not denied admission because his or her economic condition, is not proper. So, in order to break it down that it is a doable job. If he asks somebody to look at hundred cases or two hundred cases which shall not be possible. So, it has to be done at a Departmental level. Professor Bambah is there, in the Physics Department he will recall, Professor Bhanot used to look at every student's economic background and he used to grant fee concessions straight away. So they need in every Department, Professors like, Professor. V.B. Bhanot who made sure that no student is denied admission in this University just because his/her economic condition is not adequate. The University has that tradition of being compassionate. They have 6, 7 hundred regular faculty members in this University and the numbers of new students going

to enrol every year is not more than 3000 in all courses, upper limit of 4000. They have to redesign the admission form so that they ascertain relevant information, they set aside some income, from wherever they will find, and they are already paying enough scholarships to students. That scholarship money would be enough. FDO has given him a lot of data and he is personally convinced that the enhancement in fees being proposed is not as draconian as it appears by looking at whole matter in a holistic manner. Now look at it.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that enhancement what are you saying for.

The Vice Chancellor said that all of you discuss the matter.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he will give an example. He was the Chairman of the Committee which set up University Institute of Engineering & Technology and it was decided, based upon the fact that the land will be free, University will contribute two crores and they will take a loan of twenty crores and that the fee structure should be that it should break even in four years and after seven years it should be in profit. So, this fee structure which have been made for University Institute of Engineering & Technology was at that time the first batch was based upon this calculation and then there was plea of some Syndicate members, that what will happen to the poor students. If they had to have the profound fee structure, they would have to keep it some seats free for the low income group students. If they want to, they can see that was the method they kept in and it was going on well. After that there has been no increase. So, even if you apply the same formula now, you will find out that this particular amount of 90,000 has to be there.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that the matter of fees is a very serious because they have been elected from the Graduate Constituency and they had to give reply for many things. As far as he thought the increase in fees is difference between the income and expenditure of the University. One, by increasing the fees they have tried to fill that gap. On the other side, it has been said that they will reduce their expenditure. But in the report of this Committee, nothing has been written about how to reduce the expenditure. When we increase the fees as it is students' related issue, much hue and cry is made. Previously students had a dharna in front of his house when the examination fee was increased. There should be a justification that wherever they had increased fees, there should be that how they can reduce the expenditure. It may be his personal view, some may agree on that, or some may not. When some good work is started, it should be started from own home. The expenses should be reduced like this; it is my suggestion that they should start it from the Senate. The unnecessary expenditure should be reduced. As there is one issue, they have their flying duties. Senators and others, every person performs their duties. They are given honorarium of Rs. 1000. If they themselves say that they will reduce the expenditure like that. It will become a justification and students will also feel that the University is thinking as a whole and the burden is not put on them only. And it may be said that someone feel my thinking emotional that they come there. I think everyone has their own car. The D.A. they get, its rate may be reduced so that a clear-cut message should go that Senate is very much sincere to fill the gap. That is right they are writing to UGC also, but till they don't put example of this, he does not feel that they will be able to give justification to the students. That type of justified paper should be issued that that was the margin. In that committee the students' representatives should also have been there. They should know everything that such problems are there. To remove this problem, they have increased fees. To what extent the fees have been increased, proper message should go to the students, so that the atmosphere of the University remains good. In that Committee, one thing he liked is, the Dean of University Instruction stated that "students should ask for better placement facilities instead of opposing the fee hike". It is very good thing when they go to the students and tell them they have increased the fees and their quality will also improve. If had they done like this, when increased the examination fee. Had they told the students, the work

will also be done upto date. In the last zero hour also Mr. Sandeep Singh Ji also raised an issue that the result of revaluation should come before the result of compartment, but till date they have not received any reply. What type of procedure they are making. If they made something, their justification must be given so that no compromise be done with the quality. They will give the better quality; this clear-cut message should go to the students. So that the justification of the fees hike, students feel that really there is so much problem and they had no option, that's why fees have been hiked. Some gap be reduced by increasing the fees and some gap be reduced by reducing the expenditure. They have to minimize the loss with respect to the constraint by increasing the fees, by minimizing the expenditure. Do the things by making these types of procedure.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that first of all the Committee you had formed, the Committee had very good persons, but you had not included any member of this Senate in the Committee who represent the graduate in real terms. If they had Professor Mukesh Arora from the Graduate Constituency, he is not taking his name that why they had included him, but he is also a Professor. The thinking of a Professor and a person coming as winner from real graduate constituency is different. He thought they had knowingly done this unfairness. In the last Committee of the Colleges, he was the member. After that the University had decided that Naresh Gaur be not included in any committee. He had not been included in any committee for the last 5 years. He is happy that he is not in any committee. But, for your this approach there should be any member in that committee who challenge the University authority, who says the wrong to the decision of the University authority. So, first of all, he is not saying against the committee, with the system they have formed the committee, he is against it. There are a lot of persons of real Graduate Constituency who are normal graduate and had come winner from public and come in the Senate with aspiration of people. They had not included even a single member among them, he is not talking about himself, a lot of persons are there. Second, they are talking about increasing the fee; when the issue was raised two, three, four years back, first it was to raise 10 percent, then 5 percent. Then the issue was raised that they have not any fee hiked in 10 years, they must hike the fee. He is also agreed that fees should be increased. This doesn't mean that if the fees had not been increased for 10 years, its burden be put on suddenly on the today's generation. If they have been doing mistake for the last 10 years, it should not be that today's generation should face the consequences. That is very very wrong. It was decided in the Senate, he was member of that Senate also that 2.5% fees will be hiked in every year to fill the gap. He feel, what he has seen that they all told in their own language, they are very good orator. They know how to put their words, how to win the minds of the people. You tell things in the way, a person thought that there is nothing in it, what the Vice Chancellor is saying, he is saying very good thing. But, he doesn't feel so. They had put things in some people's mind that's why they have not been stopped some people and let them speak first. In many cases, you (Vice Chancellor) accepted that 200% fees have been increased. They have talked about the about the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, he don't think that they have got received any letter from the authority to do the fees equal to NIT or any other. But, alongwith this the Dean of University Instruction has written that they should look towards the placement. Before increasing the fees, they should make strong their placement cell. A student who is studying in NIT, Thapar College and any other colleges, they get their salary on placement is better in comparison to a student who study in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology. Merit-wise their University (Panjab University) is much better, but they have (other Universities) organised their placement Cells in a way, that their graduates get better remuneration. Therefore, he does not feel if there is any letter, if it is there, that letter should have been placed in the House, where they have been told that the fee of University Institute of Engineering & Technology should be equal to the fee of NIT. Second, the matter about expenditure, he had told in the previous Senate also about the new courses they could start, what is the reason that they did not continue, he did not understand till date. All the students after getting

done their B.Com from Punjab, who wanted to do M.Com, they all are doing it in Correspondence Studies from Kurukshetra University and Himachal University for so many years. Why don't they start M.Com in Correspondence Courses in their University this year? So many students of Punjab are doing B.Com. Mostly students wanted to do the M.Com. Why don't they (Panjab University) start M.Com in the Correspondence? It will generate the income without investing any money. On the one side they are saying that University School of Open Learning is going on loss, without spending any money the income of the University can be increased. There is no need of laboratory in Mathematics subject. That can be included in correspondence courses. If they calculate with seats of those students, the fee they have hiked, they can generate more revenue by these things. That is the easy way. He says in the every meeting that this is the easy way. There is no need to do extra labour. That's okay, committees are formed. He is Senator for the last five years, committees are formed, meetings are held and only half the members attend the meetings. He is also remained the members of many committees, he has vast knowledge. But they have to adopt a very easy way; that is the best way. This time the way in which fee structure is made, he thinks that they have taken the advice of a very grand and good advisor. So that the structure of fee presented in such a way that the Senators and other persons may not be able to understand half the things as to how the fees has been hiked. He is looking and unable to understand that in front side it is written 5% and at next place it is 10%. He is unable to understand how much per cent. The University should have given a calculator so that they may calculate how much fees is hiked. This time they have taken the advice of a very good advisor or hired some professional so that it may be put up in such a way the Senator sitting there do not know anything, they come and go by marking their attendance. So his request is that it may be reconsidered. The actual revenue generated be mentioned there. As the Dean of University Instruction has said regarding Placement Cell that should be improved if you have to hike the fees. They think perhaps and Senators also says that there are so many SUVs roaming at the Campus. On the one side they are saying that 15000 students are studying in this University, he doesn't think 15000 SUVs are roaming there. 15000 students are not roaming in the vehicle in this University. Not 500, not 700, not 1000, may be 2000 vehicles, but the 13000 students studying in this University are from very remote sectors, very remote areas and children of very poor parents, who had come here with aspiration to get the education, those students will be deprived from this education. Naturally they will arrange the fees, how they will arrange only that family knows. He has fully, strongly dissent on this the way you are increasing the fees. He has strongly objection on the way the agenda is presented. Let it should be clear, it should be written in front of every item. Persons from Press are sitting there; they are also not able to have idea that what percentage of fees is increased. Why not it clearly be written that they have increased this percentage of fees in that. Therefore, his request that he gives dissent on this agenda and fees should be systematically, what actual should be there. By increasing the fees, the deficit of the University cannot be met, if the deficit cannot be met, there are a lot of other systems in the University. Lights in the University may be replaced with LED. If they install LED lights, then half the bill of electricity may be reduced. There are a lot of things that can be done in the University, but by doing that a lot of energy will waste. They say this is the easy way to bring the agenda. First bring it in the Syndicate. Members of the Syndicate thought that if they do it, the issue will come on them, take it in the Senate and it comes in the Senate. Why did not they decide it in the Syndicate meeting? They said to take it in the Senate meeting; it is a big House where it will be in the way, he doesn't want to say much. He objects it strongly. He also objects it publically in which way and in which system the University has tried to increase the fees.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that as Shri Sandeep Kumar had started his talk, he has also come winning from Graduate Constituency. First he does the namaskar to this University that he had studied from this University and he is a teacher only because of this University. In the starting, he had announced in the first meeting that when he will go in any meeting



on behalf of this University, he will not claim TA/DA or any other such payment from this University. He is not boasting, but he gently wants to say that this University has given him a lot in his life. He had come from a village. He is now a teacher only because of this University. He is head of the Department. But with this, he listened in two three meetings, people were saying that there Senators take too much money as TA/DA. He received a phone from Controller Office that he has been put on duty on flying. He refused to do that duty, not because he was not able to perform the duty but he refused, he felt that if he will go from Patiala to Ferozepur or will go to Ludhiana or he will go to Hoshiarpur, University will have to give him TA of too much amount. Moreover, being a Teacher, a lot of his time will be wasted. So, he wanted that University should send a local person there. Local means as there is Ludhiana, near Ludhiana they have Doraha College, Khanna College, Jagraon College. If a local person goes there, his expenditure may be less. May be other Senators might have told this thing. But he feels that increasing of fees by the Vice-Chancellor, where it looks genuine, because they have been listening the situation of the University for the last three months that the University is in financial crunch. Because the Vice-Chancellor is the head of the family, he does not feel that a head of the family of the University may take any wrong decision. He might have taken decision after a lot of thinking. He feels that if they are saying something, he might be saying right. So with this he suggest that where it looks genuine, do it. But, where the expenditure can be reduced, it is his request that expenditure must be reduced. They are ready to do what is required from them.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that first of all, he is agreed upto a large extent with Dr. Sandeep Kumar and also with Shri Naresh Gaur. As they talked in the morning, a think-tank committee was formed, which recommended that 20% resources be generated by the University. When they talk about the generation of resources by the University, they have so much think-tank but they only find the one way that is to enhance the fees. No other suggestion had been given by their think-tanks, except to increase the fees. So many academicians, so many intellectuals are sitting there, they try how to run the government, how to run the corporation, they say about giving consultancy to business-corporation. When there come issue of revenue generation, for the last so many years, only one issue remains to increase the fees. As Goyal Saheb said that looks them the easiest way because if they adopt any other way for that Committee, University authority, Staff members and non-teaching staff also will have to do a lot of hard work. He feels that all try to find out an easy way. He had also told earlier meeting that there are a lot of issues should be made related to it and how to generate the University resources except fees by the think-tanks. It has also been talked in the morning regarding consultancy, despite being so much famous intellectualism in science, arts, social sciences, but they have been getting only Rs. 50,000 from the consultancy. They have projection of Rs. 1,00,000. Why don't they increase their consultancy so that they may bring lakhs of rupee or even crores of rupees? There are a lot of Universities in foreign which are running only from the contribution of alumni. They call the alumni for giving award. He appreciates that they come and their new students take aspirations from them. They might have alumni who are CEOs of very very big corporations. Why don't they keep in touch with them to contribute their alma mater and they might like to contribute? Why don't they increase partnerships of Industry so that the University have collaboration with Industry and resources may be generated? They are talking about increasing fees, he is fully agreed with Gaur Saheb that if they start M.Com or some other Master Degrees in the Correspondence, they may generate fees from there. There are so many ways. The infrastructure of the University can be used to increase the resources. These are as a layman kind of suggestions. If by forming a committee, some policy be made as to how generate the University resources so that the burden on the students may be minimized. He had also talked in the last Senate meeting that the International students, some time it looks to me and he feels some grudge by saying this that a lot of talks are done in the Senate, it may be his acquisition that it remains talks only. Some times a lot of good

suggestions come, neither committee is formed by the authority nor thinking about their implementation. The suggestions end only by speaking and listening. He had talked about the international students as he had an experience of one private University where there are 2000 foreign students. In a nearby University there are 1000 foreign students. If despite by putting burden on their own students, why not the burden be put on those foreign students and resources be generated which can be crores of rupees. There are so many suggestions. One thing that he would like to say as Gaur Saheb and Dhuria Saheb said about relationship between placement and fee structure. It means if there will not be much increase in the fee structure, the University will have no contribution in placement. It is their responsibility to get them job placement, make their career either their fee is more or less. This is not the relation that the placement will be done if fee is increased. Are they using the increased fee only for Placement Cell. He thinks not. He is totally disagreed. Either the fee is hiked or not, to get the placement done is their responsibility. Quality of education has no relation with fees, it is their duty, it is their moral duty. How they can say if they don't hike the fee, they will not produce the quality of education.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that one thing that he (Vice Chancellor) had put his case very well.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not his case.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that what he is saying is only for the justification given by him (Vice Chancellor), not as a taunt. If he says in taunting way, he will tell before taunting. He is saying this genuinely on the argument given by him (Vice Chancellor) and he was thinking on them. First thing is that what he talked in the morning although he (Vice Chancellor) tried to address, but some queries has left. He is hopeful, as FDO has comprehended Mrs. Gill Madam that he will also be comprehended, he is asking in this context. What he is talking about is Rs. 1,32,000 regarding his Department. It was 1,32,000 in 2014-15, now it is 15,00,000. What someone behind has talked about budget, he would also like to say that. Since morning he is doing ones, tens, hundreds, thousands, ten thousands and lakhs. They have put so much zeros. When they make this, please write in lakhs and crores, so that they may feel easy in calculating that whether those are 15 lakhs or 15 crores. He felt very difficulty in that. This 1,32,00 increased to become 15,00,000. Secondly they will see, he is not speaking on fee hike right now, English Department had 3,59,000, he has no enmity with English Department, their fee has also increased to 15,00,000. It means they earlier had 3,59,000, he is talking about traditional courses, he would like to tell him when he will finish, if they had more number of students then there is increase, if today they have 3,09,000, they have also 15 lakhs, as they told that they have different slabs, are they doing some variation in traditional courses also. If they are doing so, then they should also look that paragraphs will go Department wise. As talking about Dean of University Instruction, every person has own perspective. As he knows, Dean of University Instruction may confirm it, if he is wrong, he can stop him. There till now for placement, the students contribute fee to organize some event, other departments can do like that. Number two, as they have increased fee, are they doing this for some reason or increasing it in pressure. They all know that they are increasing fee in pressure, because there is a pressure on them to increase income. Had there been not any pressure, their grant inflow had been good; they might not have done this exercise. When they do something in pressure, they should understand, then many times right perspectives could not be seen. Third, what they say again, he also heard about GNDU and Panjab University. It would have been very good, had they been able to give comparison of fee structure of GNDU and Panjab University. Thirdly, they have enhanced the fee. When the Prime Minister delivered his lecture on 15<sup>th</sup> August, he talked about the toilets, are they providing the basic facility of clean toilets to the students, what to talk of placements. If they have enhanced the fee, whether they have been able to renovate the toilets which is one

of the demands of the students. Let it be left aside. He had raised an issue in the December meeting of Senate. Earlier, in the meeting of Board of Finance held on 15<sup>th</sup> November, an amount of Rs.1 lac was sanctioned so that the entry of the monkeys in the Department of Hindi could be stopped. He had pointed out that the monkeys could harm the students as there are some blind students also. In the budget also, it had been depicted that some of the projects have been completed and others are going on, but he could not find this issue in the budget. The Vice-Chancellor had made a good beginning in establishing the CRIKC and he feels elated on seeing the buses of CRIKC. Whether they have initiated any process for providing the facilities and the exposure to the students in those institutions? Those institutions are very good, focused and must be having good quality of equipments. As he had earlier in the morning said that when they enhance the fee, it sends a message, though he is not against it. He also evaluates around 400 answer sheets in a semester for which he is also being paid and it also fulfils the condition of API score. When they give this kind of signal, there becomes a perspective. What perspective is now becoming is that the teachers have got their remuneration enhanced, but did not care for the fee of the students in the same meeting of the Board of Finance. He is saying that they could pay the remuneration @! Rs.50/- per copy, there is no issue. Fourthly, the time has gone by when the teachers used to recommend fee exemption for poor students and the fee was exempted. But there is a different system working today. He has a doubt. Sometime ago, the Dean of University Instruction had taken an initiative that they should be reasonable regarding the attendance of the students and so many fake cases came up. He did not mean to say that they should abandon such initiatives. Such initiatives should be continued and it has brought about the sense of discipline. He would like to thank the authorities for this. When they are saying that the documents of the students numbering about 6000 who apply in the departments, their forms should be verified, they could face complications in future in doing so. Either they should have some criteria of income like the ITR, etc. otherwise they would have to face problems. They would have to think over it that if they are doing something under pressure, such a signal should not go in the public. As has been said by someone that they should also think of reducing the expenditure. If they think that by enhancing the fee, there could be a solution to the problem, he does not think so. There are so many issues involved in it. Lastly, when they are talking about the tuition fee, it is just one angle. If a student is not paying the tuition fee and paying only the examination fee, that has already been enhanced substantially. The hostel (fee) has also been enhanced. It is a burden on the students from all sides. He said that according to him, in the Department of Hindi, the students are comparatively from the lower strata or background of the society and some of the students did not have money to pay the examination. The teachers of the Department help such students even though the students return the money lent by them. This is the situation of the students. If they could frame such a mechanism that the rich students could pay more as compared to the poor students and the poor students are given the concession, then he is for it. As far as scholarship is concerned, the percentage of it provided in the budget would looked about .00. He would like to know if it is clarified that in the same traditional courses like M.A. English, the income from tuition fee is enhanced from Rs. 3 lacs to Rs.15 lacs whereas in the Department of Hindi, it is enhanced from Rs. 1 lac to Rs.15 lacs.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he had earlier also talked and would again like to talk on the issue. He represents the students. He cited the example that if a person has the capacity to pick up a weight of 50 kg. and if a weight of 100 kg. is put on him, he would die. Whether such a weight is put on the head or on the arms, it has to be borne by the legs. In the first instance, the examination fee was enhanced. Then the hostel fee was enhanced. The only fee, tuition fee, was left. But now the same has also been enhanced. He requested that the fee should not be enhanced. If the fee is to be enhanced, the percentage of enhancement be fixed. It would be better if the fee is not enhanced. The Government, elected by the people, is spending crores of rupees. If the students are coming to the

University for education, why the students should be burdened. He again requested that the proposal of enhancement of fee should be cancelled and the fee should not be enhanced.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that during the elections to the Registered Graduates Constituency, he found that about 80% of the voters in this constituency are school teachers. They had pointed out a problem, particularly the science and commerce subjects teachers, that the University is not having any such system of running the courses that they could further improve their qualifications. There is no such system in the Colleges that those school teachers could appear in the examination as a private candidate. If they could find a way out either by holding the evening classes or holding the classes during the vacation period for such teachers in science and commerce subjects, it could generate a lot of revenue. Maximum of the teachers, whose qualification is B.Sc., B.Ed. or B.Com. would like to go for M.Sc. or M.Com. It would also send a good signal in the public as they have already allowed to appear as private candidates in the arts subjects. This is allowed only in the theory papers. If they could have any such provision in the case of practical subjects also that the teachers or the employees could attend the classes in the Colleges during the vacations, holidays or Sundays and a certificate for the same is issued to such persons and they could appear as private candidates in the examination. If it is done in other subjects also, maximum revenue could be generated through this. It would send a message in the public that the candidates could appear as private candidates not only in arts but all subjects. It is a suggestion for generating the revenue.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is neither in favor nor against the agenda item. He would just like to give some suggestions. Students are one of the various segments of the University and it is the responsibility of all the segments to bring the University out of the financial crunch and they could contribute in it. Sometime back, the examination fee was enhanced. Regarding that, some of the members in the Syndicate had raised the issue that the students of weaker sections who could not pay the examination fee, their fee be exempted or they be helped in some other way for which the income criteria which was upto Rs.2.5 lacs had been enhanced to Rs.5 lacs. Even if he was in favor of enhancement at that time, but later he realized that only 10-20% of the students could be benefited. Since the students had to get the income certificate prepared from the Revenue Department, the time given to them was very short. Therefore, 80% of the students could not obtain the income certificate. If they have enhanced the fee, it does not seem that they would be able to generate a huge amount from this hike and the reason for this is that the students whether belonging to the family of big farmers or businessmen would, in one way or the other, prepare the income certificate of below Rs.5 lacs required for the fee concession and would get the fee concession. In this way, all the students, except the wards of the employees, would enter the category for fee concession. When a student at the initial stage enters the University, what kind of schooling that student has undergone and he has an objection on it that if a student who has studied in model schools by paying a minimum fee of Rs.2000-2500 p.m. in one of the smallest schools. He is surprised that in the small towns like Jalalabad, Fazilka, there is no such model school which is not charging an amount of about Rs.2000/- p.m. If such a student is paying an amount of Rs.24000/- annually to such schools and when he/she comes to gain higher education, according to him, such students would not face any problem in paying the fee. They should adopt a formula that when a student at the initial stage enters the University, they could know the background of the schooling of the students. Such kind of record should be available with the University. If a student has studied in the Government School, belongs to the rural area, is having rural background and they think that such a student really belongs to weaker section who could not go to a model school, they should think for granting fee concession to such students. But the students who have paid annual fee ranging from Rs.24000 to Rs.60000 in the schools, it would be better if such students are charged the enhanced fee. It would not be a

burden on such students but the interests of the weaker section students should be kept in mind.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that, according to him, this fee hike is minimal and it is called for under the circumstances. It looks to be justified and it is not very high. The middle segment has been taken care of. It seems that it has been got comprehensively examined and it is a very good job.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this job has been done by the Dean of University Instruction.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is quite impressed with that. He would like to add that the message that they are trying to send is that they are generating additional revenue. There are certain things. For example, they should, as a Senate, make a comprehensive proposal that while they are enhancing the fee, at the same time, they are also encouraging the Departments to come out with better consultancy projects or generating revenue through advertisement. He does not know how to do it. But they are generating additional revenue through other sources. Secondly, they are also making efforts to curtail their expenditure. The message has to be comprehensive. As has been suggested, they could use the LED lights which could save some money, though it may be symbolic. But it is important to send out a message that they are also curtailing their expenditure on all fronts and also generating additional revenue. There might be other sources which they could explore to generate revenue.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a detailed discussion has taken place on the issue. He would not repeat the points which have already been discussed. He is a member of the Panjab University Think-Tank also. When in a meeting, Professor D.V.S. Jain, Professor B.S. Brar, Professor Pam Rajput, Professor Akshaya Kumar and many others were present, a decision was taken. He would like to tell it from that angle and also as a member of the Senate. There was no item for fee enhancement but the item for discussion was as to how to keep the University running and since the University was facing a financial crisis, how to come out of that crisis. That is why, a Think-Tank was formed which earlier did not exist. The MHRD, UGC and Central Government sent their representatives to attend the meeting of the Board of Finance. They had a problem as to what to do. There were three issues: levying development charges, reducing the expenditure and generating revenue. The issue of student factor came up but it was not in that sense that whenever the University needed to enhance its revenue, its burden is passed on to the students. He has also passed through the stage of studentship. As some of the members have said, they should not divert their attention from the problems being faced by the University and think of their constituency from which they are elected. The students who have voted in favor of the persons must also be wanting that the University should come out of the crisis. It is their thinking that the students vote the members on the plea that the fee would not be allowed to be enhanced. The students also know that the University is in crisis. There is a need to guide the students about the crisis being faced by the University and they also know about it because it is their own University. He also used to be a student and now an employee of the University. The concern of the students for the University is more than their concern as the students also have a desire to study and become Professor in the University. So, the students want that the University should function and know that if the University is closed, then the fee would not be Rs.3000/- (as prevailing in the University) but it would be Rs.30000/- as there are many universities running like shops. If the University is closed, such a quality of education would not be provided as is being provided here. The Governments also want that the University be closed down and after selling the land, malls be constructed. They all are facing a crisis and all of them have to think to overcome it. They do not have an interest that the fee be enhanced. But their interest is that the

University should continue functioning and how to reduce the deficit as is being asked by the Central Government and the Punjab Government. The Governments continuously ask to reduce the expenditure. When they talk of reducing the expenditure, then they tell the Government that so much money has been earned from the consultancy projects, so much expenditure has been reduced and so much fee has been enhanced. The fee is to be enhanced minimal. They all know that by enhancing the fee, they could not pay the salary, it would be just a small income. They also feel hurt while enhancing the fee as the members elected from the Registered Graduate Constituency feel. The question at the moment is not of the fee, but how to improve the financial position. For improving the financial position, they would have to swallow the bitter pill at many fronts. While doing so, they would have to care for the students while enhancing the fee and provide the maximum benefits to the students. If they want to provide benefit to the students while enhancing the fee, they should provide that benefit to such poor students who have studied in such schools which in Punjab are called the Government schools. After looking at the certificates, they could charge less tuition fee, examination fee, hostel fee from such students. If the students who are paying lacs of rupees fee in private schools and they are against the enhancement of fee even by 2%. Then it is the duty of a Graduate, Post Graduate student and the Professors of the University that they should start doing it that the fee should be reduced in those schools also. There are students studying in the schools also not only in Panjab University. If there are about 15000 students in the University, there are about 2.5 lacs students in the Colleges also. Whether any voice has been raised that the fee in the private colleges should be reduced? The members just think about their vote bank that they are answerable to their constituency. This vote bank politics should not be there.

Some of the members objected to it.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that he respected Professor Ronki Ram. He had been a student of this University, he respects this University. Today, he is a teacher because of this University. He is a Senator from the Registered Graduate Constituency, but it is a minor thing. He said that he has the same sincerity which Professor Ronki Ram is having. It is not that in election, he has to face the public who has voted them for the Senate due to which he is here. He had already said that whatever best he could do, he is with the University. He is ready to do whatever the University expects from him. If the Vice-Chancellor thinks that the fee is to be enhanced, the fee could be enhanced wherever he feels justified as he is the head of the family. But he does not agree with what Professor Ronki Ram is saying.

When Shri Naresh Gaur wanted to say something on a point of order, the Vice-Chancellor said that there is no point of order involved.

Shri Naresh Gaur repeatedly said that the Vice-Chancellor allows a person to speak who suits and favours him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no favour in it and repeatedly requested Shri Naresh Gaur to take his seat. When Shri Naresh Gaur said that why he should take the seat and he has come to attend the meeting, the Vice-Chancellor adjourned the meeting for 10 minutes as some members continued to enhance the din.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that his issue was very much there where it was. He further said that either this should be decided that from the time onwards, nobody would be allowed to speak on the point of order. When he has made point of order on any matter, he feels that he is being discriminated and others who want to speak on point of order, they are allowed to speak.

The Vice Chancellor said that he should not be personal.

Shri Naresh Gaur continued saying that when something is happening personal to him, he will say it personally. If something is happening to him, he will make talk of himself and not of others. He said that when he had asked the Vice Chancellor that he wanted to speak on point of order, he must have been allowed at that very time. He said that he has nothing personal with Professor Ronki Ram, but every member who is sitting in the House, has the right to put forth before the house. He said that every member who comes after winning from the respective constituency, represents his constituency in the right manner. When there comes the issues of teachers, he represents the teachers. He said that he is strange to see that the remuneration of teachers relating to paper checking which has been increased, he said that in his view, checking should not be there. It is part and parcel of their duty. It is the duty of the lecturer, who teaches in the college, to check the papers. He cited an example that suppose he is working in the bank and if he says to the bank Manger that he should pay separately for every draft issued be me, I shall not be paid of every draft. Every one tries to nourish his constituency to whom he represents, either at the cost of the University or at the cost of the students. He said that the issue has been discussed with Professor Ronki Ram and he said that the manner in which it was stated, was wrong. But otherwise, it is his wish that he will again say it repeatedly that whatever is being relating to fees, is wrong for the University. He said that as has been envisaged and as also said by Professor Ronki Ram that in the time to come the University will make a dramatic advancement as has been stated by Professor Ronki Ram by increasing the fee. He said that they are making comparison with the Private colleges. He said that there is a great exploitation of teachers in private colleges, they are paid Rs. 15000 to Rs. 20000 and the salary of the University teachers is very much on the higher side as compared to the college teachers. He said that they should not make comparison with the Private Universities. In most of the colleges where you people go on inspections, and you people make recruitments, the Ph.D holder candidate are given Rs. 9500 are teaching the commerce classes. He said that the representatives of the colleges are sitting in the house and they know it all. But he is not making any criticism. He just want to tell them that do not compare private universities with the government university. He said that it is the duty of the government to provide health and education to every citizen of the country. Every citizen is charged of the tax for this purpose. He said that once again he is requesting that the fee structure should not be increased in the manner it is being done and he has strong objection over it.

Professor Rajsh Gill said that they were discussing the fee hike. When they look at the different course structures, she said that there is a huge variation. She said that if they look at the self-finance courses, the fee increase is minimal because their fee is already on the high side. But on the contrary, for the particularly traditional courses, the hike is very much high. She said that for instance, if she talks of her own department, in our class, there are quite a number of students who come from the slums, and from such a background that they cannot pay even the existing fee at all. She said that at present, she has one student, who came to her and told her that he shall have to discontinue her studies if the fee is increased, because he had nothing to pay. She said that she asked him to submit an application to the DUI office and DUI assured him of some help but he has received no such relief till the time. Talking about another strata of students, she said that particularly in the students of Evening Studies Department, a large number of students are from the lower income groups in Undergraduate courses. In postgraduate courses, it might be that the students happen to be from better economic ground. For graduation courses, the students join the college who do some petty jobs in the morning and come for study in the evening, and their fee has been increased from Rs. 2200 to Rs. 10000. She said that she is not saying that as to why the fee of all has been increased. She said that they should be considerate. It should be seen as to in which course, what type of students come and no

injustice should be done to the students. In the same way, even in the evening studies, the fee for B.P.Ed. and M.P.Ed. has also been increased Rs.2400 to Rs. 15000. She said that enhancement in fee of professional courses makes a logic because there are other professional institutions where the fees are very high. She said the in B.P.Ed. the fee hike has been made from Rs. 2440 to Rs. 15000, in humanities, in M.A. the hike has been made from Rs. 2440 to Rs. 10000 which she think is quite a high. It should be seen a little. She said that she is appreciative of the concerns shown by the number of members that they shall have to reduce the deficit. To her view, there are two factors in it. On the one hand, the income shall have to be increased and the expenditure shall have to reduced. She questioned as to whether they have ever thought of reducing the expenditure. She said that she is doubtful about this. To her view, the University have not done sufficient in this direction. She said that the people think that I know nothing about these matters. But she had made a study of all the balance sheets for about 4-6 hours and have gone through the financial statements and balance sheets and the expenditures which she was pointing out, was being pointed out with the purpose that have they ever thought that some of the expenditure could have been postponed. They could have postponed the renovations. They have spent Rs. 46 lacs on the renovation of Vice Chancellor office and Vice Chancellor Committee Room. They have put pavers on the sites, whether there was any such need. She further asked as to whether there was any need of it where iron grilling in some areas has been made. She said that even if we prepare our family budget, the rationality is applied even in it. It is done such that the luxury items are postponed if the financial health of the house was not well. She said that she think that they should think about that also. She said that they should think about how to inflate the income from the estate. She said that the University should think about how to get better income from the investments, from the guest house, from the holiday homes, from the department of distance education. She questioned as to what the Think Tank has been doing.

She continued saying that she would finally want to make it a point that if they are going to increase the fee, the quality assurance should also be there. She questioned as to if they were giving quality education to their students. He stated that she would appreciate the recent efforts taken by the Dean of University Instruction office in fixing accountability atleast, that of my colleagues, of teaching community only. So therefore, they have been able to, but we must ensure, they shall have to take some very concrete steps which shows that they are not only hiking the fee but are going to give the child some good quality of education also. She said that they were talking of the brand. The brand goes up suddenly and falls down rapidly as well. She said that they are saying it from the Senate Hall at their own that the brand of the University is so good. Let them see after stepping out of the Senate Hall. Therefore, they must ensure that the quality is also maintained.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they were missing larger picture. To his mind, the days have gone by when they give low cost tuition fee to the students. Education is no longer that cheap or low cost. Therefore, he is in record of enhancing. What the Dean of University Instruction has done, I think he is an expert. I am a socialist also. I do realize there are poor people in the University. It can be rationalized. He said that as he has pointed out lastly also that they could use the taxation model also. If they use that model that a student come from the poor school and see his last school certificate. But it is very important that they realize that enhancement in fee is made central and the exercise that you have taken is worthy of complement and credit. But the message that should go to the students, he thinks, is very vital. They need to convey to the students that not only the pressure that is being put on them but is a pressure being put on all of us also. Now how do we put pressure on ourselves. First of all, I recall and say how the pressure is going to be put on all of us. Actually the things were repeating as they were meeting time and again for a number of months. But he pointed out daily and now also that for instance, all over the world, if he sees the paper setting and remuneration is made part of teachers job. You



are not paid for it. Being the Universities since time immemorial, they have actually been paying. He said that this meant that many of them do not take this job because they do not need money and many of them take this because they need the money and do a very slipshod work out. Therefore, he would suggest that is too an immediate action, as Professor Rajesh Gill is saying that the things are not implemented. He said that as an immediate step and the Senate is sitting here, they can take decision right away. He said that they take the decision that paper setting is part of his/her job. He/she do not have to be paid for it. The paper checking is part of my job. Why should I take remuneration for it. The House supported this idea of Professor Shelley Walia by clapping and table thumping. He said that he is talking of the pressure and thinking of the message that would go to the society and the message is that if I am put on the Committee to inspect a college, somewhere, say, at Samrala or Ludhiana, he was getting duty leave here and during one day's leave, he is not teaching here because he is taking on duty elsewhere, he do not see why he be paid honorarium or any kind of payment. Therefore, he suggested that all the committees which are set up, where you go anywhere, we should save the money because it is a part of my job and on that particular day, he is getting holiday from his department. Why should he go at Ludhiana or any other places and take up the job from that point of view. He said that so no payment for being on a committee because let us say that allegations begins coming on the Senators that they get on to a Committee and they go on for making a lot of money for being on selection committee etc. He said that if he is on the Selection Committee, he does not get any money except the TA/DA he gets or the conveyance allowance but no other money should be given. Therefore, they give an example to the students and that was his urgency at the moment so that the students do not say tomorrow that there is no pressure on any of the teachers. He said that that was why he has given up all the remunerations beyond my pension and salary which he gets for doing any kind of work and why he should take it. He said that let they not just leave it at talk, the Senate is sitting here and as he is sitting here since the morning, they need a road map that this would be number one step, followed by number two step and number three step and so on and this is the only way because they have back to the ball and immediately to take drastic measures because situation is drastic. He said that they should not just talk and in the end we spare one. I do not think we have moved ahead.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him read page number 54. The following fee concession shall be applicable for all courses other than partially self-financed courses in each scheme which is already there after the implementation of the proposed fee structure. The students who have studied and qualified his 10+2 examination from the government schools and his annual family income is up to Rs. 5 lacs will be eligible for fee concession to 50% of the tuition fee. The students who have studied and qualified 10+2 examination from a government school and his annual family income is upto Rs. 2.5 lacs shall be eligible for fee concession upto 75% of the tuition fee. This means that the existing fee will remain. So nowhere the enhancement is in the traditional courses. It is between 2 and 2.5 thousand if it goes to Rs. 10000.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that the word used by the Vice Chancellor shall create confusion. There are government schools and other are government aided schools. The fee structure of both the schools is the same. He stated that it should be added otherwise there would be a problem.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that how this would be done. Every person shall get prepared the certificate of income of less than Rs. 5 lacs.

The Vice Chancellor said that it does not matter, let this do so. He further stated that let the mater proceed, by the experience and at the end of one year they would be able to know whether the income has enhanced or not enhanced. He said that it was there

apprehensions that they would not allow the matter to proceed. He said that government or government aid does not matter.

Professor Shelley Walia said that has not it been calculated as to how much is to be raised by this enhancement. It is very essential to know.

Ambassador I.S.Chadha said that very briefly, they can apprehend it. Very briefly he wished to add his voice to those who were supporting the case for enhancement of fee. He said that he always believed that we have to choose between the good University and the cheap University. There are cheap Universities around, the people who are only concerned with the level of fees, they could go to those Universities. At the same time, he always shared the concerns for those who cannot afford it and for that we have visions. There is a fear that those provisions could be misused and he thinks that those fears are unfounded and we should never avoid from taking a step which is good in itself. On apprehensions that they would be misused, the people will produce false certificates and it should not be beyond our capability to plug that and we should not refrain from taking good step simply because of the fear that it would be misused. Therefore, he said that he strongly supports the case for increase in fees and at the same time share the concerns of those who feel that if this causes hardship to the weaker sections of the society, they should be helped in the ways that has been proposed. He said that he wanted to make an appeal today to those who are opposing it. Some of them have said that they owe to this University and this University today in need of help in the way they could help is not to come in the way of increase in fee because in case they do, then one of the avenues of resolving this crises would be jeopardized because they know it will not have an impact on them, then our efforts to persuade those who hold the par strings will be greatly hampered if we go back to them in sense of calling that we cannot increase. Because there is one source of increasing the income. He said that he agreed that when they wanted to reduce the deficit, both increase income and decrease expenditure would be there. Both exercises shall have to be done. They cannot oppose one simply because enough is not being done on the other front. He suggested that they should go forward on both the fronts. He said that he does not think the reconvening of the Think Tank. This has to be gone into is not that something could be discussed by throwing a little suggestion here and throwing a little there and to be very carefully gone into and the efforts to reduce expenditure, he said that he had said it earlier also, should bear in mind that their concern for improving the performance of the University, improving the rating of the University, that should be the chief consideration but within that parameters show there are ways of reducing the expenditure. That should not be reason to oppose this effort to increase the income otherwise their case with the MHRD and UGC and others will be greatly weakened.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that she wanted to add something that as has been said that they would consider the last school pass certificate whether it is of government of government aided. To her view these too would not be able to bring transparency and all people would agree with the example which she is going to give. He said that nowadays, the students who have been joining private tuitions and in private institution have been preparing to click the entrance, they are taking admissions in government schools. In private schools, exemption from attendance is not granted while it becomes available in government schools, and they after attending private tuitions simultaneously. She said that in her neighbourhood, such happening are on a large scale and from 10<sup>th</sup> onwards, they have switched over to the government schools.

The members however did not agree to her observation and maintained that the situation was contrary as claimed by her. In reality, the private schools give full exemptions from attendance and the government schools require the prescribed attendance.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that by this time there is a school of thought and the general in it that there is survival of the fittest. Those who could survive, let them survive and those who cannot, should be left at the mercy of the circumstances. He said that their exercise is fully diverted to the direction that by whatever means and by increasing the income by enhancing the fee and others, the government is made satisfied. He said that if the government is satisfied by putting all the burden on the students, and they are making demand that what is their ratio 60 and 40, they should perform and fulfill it. He said that if we manage at our own without getting their obligation fulfilled, then there would be no pressure on them. He said that the question is that if they put every pressure honestly on all the governments that they should perform their duties because this is a public University and it is not a Chitkara and not A or B. That is why they should perform their role. He said that he is in favour of a moderate increase in the fee, which is a natural. He said that two or three topics which are always heard of on the fee increase issue are that and one of them is that as because in the Punjabi University and the Guru Nanak Dev University the fee structure is thus, and why our University cannot do that. That answer to that is very simple. He said that in our University there is an elected Senate, elected Syndicate, elected PUSA, elected PUTA and elected Students Council. Here everything is democratic. But unfortunately in Guru Nanak Dev University or Punjabi University, there is no such system. In those Universities, whatever formula the DPI or Education Secretary of Punjab government furnishes, that is approved and implemented without any arguments. He said that that is why that their fee hike is understandable that there happened deliberations never and the opinion of their stakeholders is never given any hear. He said that another issue that is often said that there is crowd of cars in the University. He said that if the strength of the student is of 18000, the 1000, 900 cars are inevitable to be here. He said that to treat the students of the strength of 15000 or 16000 on the basis of the number of cars is not justified. He further said that as has been stated by Professor Ronki Ram that they have to watch the interest of the students and the students want that the University should be saved. He said the President of the Student Council has said in the Committee that he represented the students community of the number of 18000, he is saying that do not make the fee hike and rather pressurize the MHRD for not to put pressure on the 18000 students who cannot afford to carry this burden. He said that he has talked to some hostel wardens and they have disclosed that in their hostels, there are such type of students who skip their lunch because they cannot afford for it. The diet of two is divided between the four. He said that a different kind of elements needy people are there. He said that he is confident that all the people sitting here belong the middle class. He said that to watch the interest of lower class or upper lower class is necessary. He said that it seems that all is being done under the pressure of the government and by removing the focus from them, we want to put the pressure on ourselves. It is a wrong thing in itself. He said that he wants that the fee be increased after revising whatever has been brought in proposal, it should not be passed as it is. By doing this, the message would be conveyed to the official machinery that what they wanted to be done by the University has been done and now it is their turn to reciprocate.

Professor Manoj Kumar said that he was listening to the debate and as they teach the business courses, there are two schools of thought as Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has mentioned. He said that most of the debate revolves around two paradigms, public versus private. Should they go for a globalization or localization. He said that he started his career as a student in 1960. So for last four years, he knew the history of the fee structures etc. etc. as a teacher and as a student. He conducted four surveys in last couple of years and the DUI knew it. He said that when he was in Amritsar, at that time in early 1980s, some private schools started. So much hue and cry was there and these schools would die of their death. But unfortunately, what happened, upto many years the government schools died and the private schools flourished and those private schools, most of them are working as IBMs and big companies. He said that he is touching the point of subsidy which many of

his friend mentioned. He said that in his own department, he teaches for the last 31 years now. There are times as early as when he joined the department, they had the people leaving the IIMs coming to his department, people leaving IMT Ghaziabad coming to his department. At that time the fee structure was subject to 2000 or 3000 and when he himself passed, the fee again was 3000 only. But what is the fee structure today. It is 22 lacs over there and in his own department and the fellows know it very well, it is hardly peanuts. It is the second dimension. Now the picture is that the people are talking about fee hike and other things, we the people in business school see it in the package. In his Department (University Business School), he is not blaming the University authorities, for the last five years the research scholars are teaching because they do not have the money to pay for the guest faculty. The students complained and there was a strike also that the research scholar who is doing research in accounting is teaching economics. During the period of 1985-87, they used to have around 150 guest faculty from various departments. There were many people who used to come. But today the research scholars are teaching because the income is less, why the income is less, it is because the fee is less. If the fee is lesser, they are going down. Today, the Vice-Chancellor might know very well that only 100 students had applied in the Department. He did not want to elaborate or say anything about it. But the fact remains that the people talk about the universities in Panipat and Sonapat where he had also visited 3-4 times, the fee in the courses like LL.B., B.Com., B.B.A. is around Rs.10 lacs and there is rush and there are lines of the people ongoing. Why is it so? These are not rich people but middle class. People from lower middle class are also there. They get the loans and also get the scholarship which the University is proposing. There are many things to do for quality improvement. In his opinion the quality of the students would definitely improve a lot. In the Department, they had a Placement Cell which did a remarkable job and the students got 100% placements for many years, but that needs money. Money is an important factor. If they are starved of money, they could not grow in a competitive environment in which they are living. He is proud to say that Panjab University is number 1 University. In order to sustain it, they have to do something very serious. In teaching departments, there are some areas, remote areas to which he belongs, but there the model has failed in the whole world, in the eastern European countries, the Soviet Union and the China, he is not saying, they are successful also, they are part and parcel of it. But they have to be little considerate to look the changing environment. The things have changed. They have to look for some restructuring and reprocessing in terms of the fee structure as well as expenditure part. So, they have a proposal. There is a CIIPP Cell but there are lots of difficulties. In his Department, they face lots of difficulties and the Vice-Chancellor might know very well that how they manage those things. So, there is a need for improvement for reducing the expenditure, increasing the expenditure in many areas. But there is definitely a need for increasing the fee structure of Panjab University.

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta said that first let him explain the perspective with which he handled. He has listened to the viewpoints of the hon'ble colleagues. The premise was very simple. They categorize the different courses on the basis of placements and placement potential and he admits it. In those courses where the placements are good and potential for placement is good, they hiked the fee substantially. They have hiked the fee from Rs.8,000/- to Rs.1 lac. Same was the case with Chemical Engineering Department. They have also reduced the fee in some courses. He would not be in a position to give the details but they have reduced the fee in a number of courses. They should not carry the impression that this exercise has been done in a manner that across the board in a blind manner, the fee has been increased substantially without looking on this part whether the students would be benefitted finally or not. The whole exercise was carried out in partnership with the members of the Student Council. From day one, they involved the students who played a very-very positive role. They (students) brought the information on the table which was not available with them (University). They listened to the students and that is why there was 100% consensus with representative of the Panjab University Student

Council in this matter. His humble submission to the colleagues, as he and Professor Manoj Kumar belong to the same University Business School, they have to reinforce the placement right from the day one. Two years down the line, they would be discussing the same issue until and unless they make the courses so attractive that the students are ready to pay high fee, take an education loan, and the child is very clear that he going to get a quality job. The Vice-Chancellor has already read out that the Committee was very serious to the students about whom they are talking having the total family income up to Rs.2.5 lacs and would get 75% concession. There might be some problems which they could not envisage with regard to the production of certificate of income and other issues. They have made it a part of the admission form itself. This is an integral part of the admission process. The student would have to attach all those certificates. From the next academic session, the admission process in the University would be 100% through online paper free system. Another issue which was raised by the members that they have broken the rules with regard to scholarship. Professor Sharma in the morning had told that they should keep certain seats reserved for economically weaker sections. They have given the scholarships beyond that also. There are certain conditions with regard to scholarship in that category. Even if a child has broken that condition, for example even if a student has failed in one subject, they are giving the scholarship to that student also. So, the members be sure that they would try their level best not to deny any child the opportunity of quality education just because the child is not in a position to pay the fee.

Professor Chaman Lal said that first of all they should not go to the root but to the symptom. The root of the problem is that the Government, whether it is the State Government or the Central Government, is running away from its duty required to be performed for a public University. At the time of the national movement it was said that whenever the Government would be formed, the health and education would be given the first priority. 6% of the budget would be provided for education and health. None of the Governments since 1947 has provided 6% of the budget to either education or health and that is continuing. Instead of increasing that percentage, the Governments are bringing it down and the present Government has reduced it further. This is the root cause and they have no solution of it. He would like to add for the knowledge of the colleagues that there is a group of countries in which Germany has just now entered, where the education up to the level of Ph.D. and health is absolutely free. It is free even for the foreign students also. It means that if the Governments wanted to do it, it could be done. It is not a social strategy. It is a gimmick on the part of the Governments because in the corporate and private institutions, their vested interests are involved. All the MLAs and MPs, belonging to any party, are party to it. Therefore, the Government itself is responsible for destroying the public health and public education. This is the root cause. Now coming to symptom, within the system the differential universities, he has an objection to it as to why they are talking about Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University but not about Kurukshetra University. If they see at the data of Kurukshetra University related with the fee, they would find that it is less than Panjab University. The fee in Kurukshetra University is very much less. He cited the example of Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), University of Delhi, Aligarh Muslim University, Banaras Hindu University. In JNU, when he studied there, even then the fee was less than Panjab University. Even now, neither the hostel fee nor the tuition fee for all category is more than Rs.1,200/- p.a. For the students in the income group of up to Rs.5 lacs, every student from B.A. to Ph.D. level gets scholarship. The students of B.A. and M.A. get an amount of Rs.2,500/- and an amount of Rs.5-8000 for others. If they talk about JNU, it is not a foreign University. The teachers in JNU are not given any remuneration for evaluation of the answer sheets but it is a part of their duty. However, it is completely an internal examination system in which the teachers themselves have to evaluate the answer sheets of the classes they have taught and the answer sheets are not sent to the external examiners for evaluation. However, if the evaluation work is done during the vacation period, the teachers are paid the DA and earned leave on

proportionate basis. According to him, if there is an internal examination system, no remuneration for evaluation should be paid, but that should be a part of the duty of the teachers. If the other universities send the answer sheets for evaluation, the remuneration is paid and that is optional and the teachers could also refuse that. Regarding reducing the expenditure, he said that instead of serving the tea/juice 5-6 times during the meeting, tea with biscuits only could be served twice and nothing else. Similarly, they could also reduce expenditure on the lunch by serving simple lunch. They could start reducing the expenditure from here itself. He supported the differential fee structure. As has been said by some of the members that 10 years ago, they had thought of enhancing the fee @ 2.5% every year. If this could not be implemented for the last 10 years, now they could not enhance the fee by 25%. Whenever the fee is to be enhanced, they should start enhancing it by 2.5%. As the salary of the teachers is revised and the DA is enhanced, similarly the enhancement in fee structure should be rationalized that the fee is to be enhanced at a rate of 2% or 2.5% every year. Thirdly, the Central Government and the State Government must not be allowed to escape their responsibility to the public. The main focus of the University should be on the Governments. The secondary focus, since they have to sustain the University, should be that a minor increase in fee could be effected and to reduce the expenditure. Since he has become a member of the Senate for the first time, if the members go for the inspection of the Centres and other duties for which the TA/DA is paid. The DA for these duties might not be paid to the members but the TA should be paid as someone, including himself, might not be able to afford it. He would like to offer that he would not take any remuneration for performing any duty of the University except the travelling allowance and all others should also offer it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Vice-Chancellor has said one thing that the concession or the rebate would be given only to those students who have studied in the Government schools.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be applicable to the Government aided schools also.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as per the RTE Act, every school, whatever and wherever they are, even the highly paid private schools have to provide 25% seats reserved for below poverty line and economically weaker sections. A child who is from a very poor family, even below poverty line and has studied in a private school, that category should also be included.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this category could also be included and there is no issue at all.

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta said that they would take care of it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that any child below poverty line studying anywhere in any school, this benefit should be given to such students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if such students had got fee concession in the schools, they could be granted the fee concession in the University also otherwise no concession.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that it is the responsibility of the Government to support higher education and in an ideal society education should be free to everybody. Even Professor Murli Manohar Joshi had yesterday said that the education should be completely free. That is ideal. He agreed with what Professor Chaman Lal's has said. They have two situations. One is the idea for which the society could build up enough opinion or pressure that the Government should take up its responsibility of whatever is the ratio. The other

thing is the practical problem that they have faced. Ideally, the Government should be supporting. But at the moment, the Government is not doing it and the University is in a situation where unless they do not generate more income, the Government is denying its sustenance. Then they have no choice and would have to do something to get out of the present problem. In the long run, they could always build up an opinion in the society that higher education should be free for everybody and it is the responsibility of the State. But in the short term, they have to face the realities as they are and the reality is that they have to do something. In this process, there are a couple of things that happened. They have done a good exercise that the minimum increase that they could add in the income is being done. On the other hand, he would talk about it later. There is also this impression that unless they reduce the expenditure that they could not face the students. Then he agreed with the suggestion that the internal examination and the internal marking should be completely the duty of the teacher and there is no question of remuneration. Even in the Senate, it should be their duty that when they go for inspection, they should not take the honorarium. Of course, the TA is essential because if they did not get money, they would find it difficult to go for inspection. In the matter of this, looking at the people who could not afford, even in private schools sometimes the families make lot of sacrifice to support their children to schools so that they could get better education. Therefore, it is not relevant where the child has got the school education. Also, getting the certificate is not an easy thing for people who are from a deprived section. He would trust his students. While the student applies for admission, in the form the student states and affirms that such is the family income in a particular slab like up to Rs.2.5 lacs, Rs.2.5 lacs to Rs.5 lacs, Rs.5 lacs to Rs.7.5 lacs and more than Rs.7.5 lacs, or so. In the admission form, it could be added that if a student makes a wrong statement, he/she is liable to be suspended. But getting the certificate from any officer should not be insisted. He would also not insist on Government school, Government aided school or anything like that, but he would say that he trusts the student. If a student says that his/her family has such an income. Instead of giving the subsidy to the students, they should have a slab fee that up to this point of income the fee is half, above such point of income the fee is 75% and above such point of income the fee is full. It is that the University is not giving subsidy but is charging less fee. It is the same thing but this is self-respect. He would personally say, if he were in a position to do something, that they trust the students, let them make the statement and at the same time the University might take the precaution, for example, when they found the medical certificates to be fake, action was taken. Similarly, they could take action. The University could trust the students but the students should not misuse that trust and the students would not be spared. Then a signal could go through that the statement given by the students is correct. The statement should not have the exact amount of income but a slab of income that the family is having and that should be repeated every year. Regarding the philosophy of higher education, they should build up a public opinion that it is responsibility of the State Government to provide for education at all levels. After all, the educated people are going to be a resource for the country.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that as in the earlier times, whenever a person feel ill, the physicians used to give bitter concoction to them. Therefore, the cure of the diseases is to be done accordingly as in the case of cancer, chemotherapy is being done. The problem of the University is not less than like a cancer. Therefore, they would have to take harsh decisions like chemotherapy. The Vice-Chancellor has also given a good model for concession to those students whose parents income is less than Rs.5 lacs. If some students who could not submit the applications for refund and this year could submit the applications, the refund should be granted. They should also enhance their income by increasing the number of seats in the courses.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that they had a very animated discussion in the morning on the budget. They recognized that they were in deficit and are in a desperate situation. This is recognized and it was approved. They are focusing on this item. Why this item is before

them? Why the Panjab University for the last many years has not raised the fee because they were comfortable? But today the negotiations are taking with the Government of India. He has heard from the discussion here that the Government is expecting the universities to raise their own resources and reduce the expenditure. For any negotiation that has to be done, it has to be done in mutual good faith. They could not have a negative attitude. Nobody is against anybody and nobody is against Panjab University. Government of India has its own constraints as Panjab University has its own constraints. So, according to him, they should pass this item. The proposals made are extremely reasonable as the Vice-Chancellor explained it in the beginning and Professor Dinesh K. Gupta supplemented it. He had no doubt on it. He would like to raise a general point. When a controversial item goes before the Syndicate, the Syndicate just refers the same to the Senate but the Calendar wants the Syndicate to consider the matter, to discuss the matter threadbare in a smaller body and to assist the bigger body in its appreciation of an issue. He is sure that this must have been discussed as in the morning, the Vice-Chancellor had said that there was some discussion but it is not in the minutes. It should have been mentioned in the minutes so that they could know as to what happened in the Syndicate. He fully sported what is being proposed and said that it should be approved.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that they could suggest the departments to reduce the expenditure by 10% and that is something which they should also exercise.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if they hike the fee on being asked by the representative of the Punjab Government in the Board of Finance, it is a bad thing. Otherwise also, they should have hiked the fee on their own. All the members have shown their concern that the fee should be hiked but not as proposed. The concern of the members is that the students belonging to economically weaker sections should not be deprived of the subsidized education of the universities. For that, Professor R.P. Bambah has given a good proposal that it is not impossible to identify such students, this responsibility could be assigned to the Departments. As Professor Dinesh K. Gupta had informed that one of the students had taken the benefit under the economically weaker section category, but come to study in the University in a Fortuner car and he had said that an enquiry committee has been formed to enquire into it. He suggested that if such cases come to light even after a period of four years, the admission of such students should be cancelled and the degrees, if awarded, should also be cancelled. The benefit should be given only to the genuine students and it is not a difficult task for the department to identify such students. There is no use of fixing the income criteria of Rs.5 or 7 lacs. The benefit should be passed on to the genuine students. If wherever there is a marginal increase, he would request Professor Dinesh K. Gupta to review it and where the fee has been hiked proportionately very high, that should be rationalized and whatever is being proposed be accepted. The students of the economically weaker section should not be affected.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the income certificate, one more condition could be added that the record of the property should also be taken since there is no income tax on the agriculture income, if a person is having 20/50 acres of land and is claiming the fee concession that is wrong. So, they should ensure that the genuine cases are provided the required help.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is a very emotional issue. As some of the members have said that they represent the Registered Graduate Constituency and in this constituency has all kinds of voters. He is a Government employee and nowadays working in a school. Many of the members have said that a student should pay the same fee as he/she had been paying in the school. In the University, there is a regulatory body which could regulate the fee but in the private schools, there is no such regulatory body. The managements are charging the fee. There had been thousands of complaints regarding the fee. In the recently held State elections, every political party had made it a part of its



agenda that the fee of the private schools should be regulated through a Regulatory Commission. It was in the agenda also that the girls would be provided free education. Whether these parties wanted to implement it or not but the people had voted on this count. He is not against the fee hike but it should be rationalized. Professor Rajesh Gill had cited the example as to what is the fee of master courses in humanities. They are taking the examples of Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University. They should compare the fee with their own affiliated Colleges. Even the Colleges situated in Chandigarh are charging double the fee as compared to Panjab University for humanities courses. In addition to this item, there should have been an item that the University should also regulate the fee of the Colleges. They are just doing it for the teaching departments. When they ask the Colleges to pay the full pay scales, then they should also check the fee structure of the Colleges. One College is charging more than Rs.18,000/- per semester. But in the University, they are not ready to enhance it to Rs.10,000/-. When they are enhancing the fee from Rs. 2,400/- to Rs.10,000/-, then it seems that the increase is 4 times. But it is unfortunate that they have not increased the fee in such a way that where the self financing courses are running, there their motive is not of profit. It is right that it is the compulsion of the University to enhance the fee due to financial crunch whether the increase is 2% or 5% or 10%. But there is financial crunch in so many States including Punjab. But Punjab has not revised the fee. The fee in the Government Colleges is about Rs.7000 or Rs.8000 and the Colleges are charging that fee. The fee must be enhanced and it should be seen as to how much increase is to be effected. As is the concern of the members representing the Registered Graduate Constituency, there are more than 2.25 lacs students in the affiliated Colleges as compared to about 15000-18000 students in the University. The item regarding the fee to be charged by the Colleges should also be brought next time so that they could know as to which of the Colleges is charging how much fee and that fee should also be regulated.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there is no doubt that there is a need to enhance the fee which was due for some years. Since the Committee had made the recommendations regarding the fee hike only for this year, it would have been better if the Committee had kept in view the increase year by year for the next 3-5 years. Similarly, the members have also talked about the school background of the students. The Vice-Chancellor had also said in his statement that the University was made for the meritorious students. In addition to the economically weaker students, they should grant the fee concession to the meritorious students also. If they ignore the merit, the quality of education would also fall as also the overall ranking of the University would fall. If they are going to charge the same as is being charged by the private universities, it might be that the students would prefer a University close to his home as compared to Panjab University. Therefore, they should not ignore the merit at all. They should take into consideration the merit also. As has been said by some members regarding the payment of remuneration for paper evaluation, whenever any person performs the duty overtime whether in banking or other organizations, he/she is given the remuneration for overtime. Any teacher working in the College is performing the duty in accordance with the UGC guidelines and the University Calendar. If the teachers are assigned the additional duty, it is their duty to pay them so that the system works properly. If they say that by saving a penny they would save a lot, it seems that there is some misunderstanding in it and they should consider it accordingly.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that there is a consensus that the fee should be enhanced. Three options have been given regarding the implementation. One is the fee paid in the school, the second one is income certificate, the last one that Professor R.P. Bambah has given. That is the implementation. The statement regarding implementation given by Professor Bambah is justified that let the candidate give a statement subject to the condition that his/her admission would be cancelled, the degree would be withdrawn if the given statement is found to be wrong. According to him, it is a implementable statement and to begin with the fee structure be in the lowest category and then they could increase it.

Therefore, he agreed with Professor Bambah rather than going to the income certificate and fee paid in the school. Let the candidate make a statement in writing that this is the income group to which he/she belongs and if anything wrong is found, the degree might be withdrawn, the admission might be cancelled. This option is better implementable rather than other options.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that there are 3-4 points due to which the fee is to be increased. The fee in Panjab University has not been enhanced for the last 10-12 years due to some reasons. If they see the comparative statement of the fee of other universities, the fee charged by Panjab University is less than other universities. Thirdly, the financial crisis in the University is because the State Government and the Central Government are running away from their responsibilities. It is not good for these Governments to ignore a public University. Fourthly, they had to constitute a Committee under the financial circumstances that the University is facing and had to increase the fee. He would like to appreciate the Chairman of the Committee who took a very good step in enhancing the fee keeping in view the interests of the economically weaker and poor students. This has also been kept in view that in some of the courses, the fee has been reduced. They could not say that the education opportunities have been reduced, but these have been increased. He requested that the suggestions given by Professor Shelley Walia, Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Professor R.P. Bambah should be kept in mind and he agreed that the fee should be enhanced.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that as there has been discussion on the fee hike. First of all, Jawaharlal Nehru had said that the pattern of the Indian society should be socialistic one. They had adopted the pattern of mixed economy and since the year 1991 they moved towards liberalization. Professor Chaman Lal has given an example that most of the capitalist countries are subsidizing the higher education. It is crystal clear to which the members would also agree that the University is being forced to hike the fee. They should pass a one-line resolution that the State Government and the Central Government both are forcing the University and the media persons who are sitting here should also highlight it. The concern of the members representing the Registered Graduate Constituency and the teachers is genuine as the respective voters would question them. The problem of the University started at the level of the Government as Professor Chaman Lal has said that this is the root cause. As regards the remuneration for evaluation, it has been said that evaluation is part and parcel of the duty of a teacher whereas Professor Chaman Lal has himself pointed out that some earned leaves are granted for doing the evaluation work. There are about 193 affiliated Colleges in Punjab and most of the teachers are not getting the full salary. It has rightly been said by one of the members that the fee structure is very different and the University has prepared a fee structure. But some good Colleges, whether of Chandigarh or Punjab, which have a large strength of students, are charging very high fee from the students. They could ask for an affidavit from the Colleges as to how much fee they are charging and the same should be displayed on the website of the University so that the public could know as to what is the fee prescribed by the University and what the Colleges are charging. As Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma has said that a column asking for the property details should be added in the form, but it would complicate the matter. If someone is having agricultural land or some other person like labour class, Carpenter is having any other property and if a student would ask for the document of the property from grandparents, there would be clashes in the family and there would arise some kind of complications. Therefore, this suggestion should not be considered. If there is a joint family having 10 studying children and are required to submit the property document, their parents/grandparents do not easily sign the property documents fearing that the children might get loan by mortgaging the property. This is a very serious issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he appreciates it.

Continuing, Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that about half of the population lives in villages. The vendetta which is being done with the University is wrong and all the Senate members should pass a resolution that the Government is doing like this and this should be highlighted in the media. The hike in fee should be reasonable because they did not want to run away from their responsibility whatever is the deficit. They should not make good the deficit from the students. They should follow the welfare path.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then how they would be able to pay the salaries and the pensions.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that the pension is available only to the teachers of Panjab University and none of the teachers of aided or un-aided Colleges in Punjab is getting the pension. He has already said that the teachers are not even getting the full salary. Why the students are being burdened to pay the salary of the teachers of the University?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University was established by way of the collection of fee otherwise it would not have come into existence. What Lord Rippon had said is that this University is different from all universities of India. When the people of the area said that a University be established, then they were asked to contribute the money. When the money was collected, only then the permission to establish the University was given. After that, the British Government did not give even a single penny. Who contributed for the Senate Hall of the University, it was the Nawab of Bahawalpur. Is there any such person today who would get constructed any building for the University?

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that as said by Dr. Jagdish Chander, the alumni contribute for the Colleges, they could contribute for the University also.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the fee should be enhanced but nominally. As has been said by some of the members, some new courses should also be started so that all the focus should not remain on enhancing the fee. The courses like M.Com. and M.Sc. in Mathematics through distance education should also be started so that the University could get some help from these courses. As some of the members have said that the private colleges are running like shops. Professor Ronki Ram has also said that the University would become a depot. The University should also take action in this matter. The fee should be enhanced nominally. Instructions should be given to members of Inspection Teams going from Chandigarh that they should travel in one vehicle so that the University could save on travelling as the travelling allowance of a member comes to about Rs.8-10,000/-.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he would like to bring it to the notice of the House through the Vice-Chancellor that as all the members are talking about the hike in remuneration for evaluation, this remuneration is paid out of the examination fee which has already been enhanced. If the University could withdraw the hike in examination fee, they could also withdraw the hike in examination remuneration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this issue is no longer there and that is already taken care of.

Principal S.S. Sangha said with the fee structure, there is another serious issue. The fee structure is genuine and be enhanced. As Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said about the Colleges running like shops, there are some Colleges in which about 70% of the students are non-attending and they are paying very high fee to the Colleges. A student who is not in a position to pay even Rs.20,000/-, he/she is paying Rs.30,000/-. A Committee should be

formed to enquire into this issue so that the Colleges are stopped from having non-attending students and the standard of the University is maintained.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there are some members senior to him and must be having more knowledge than him. A proposal could be placed before the House. Some of the members are raising an issue and it is for the House to accept or reject it. Since the issue of fee is related with financial crunch, there are two segments involved in it, one is the teachers and the other one is students. They could take the members of the House as the segment of the teachers. Whenever any member visits any place on his/her own car and travelling allowance is paid, in addition to the expenses incurred on the petrol/diesel, the wear and tear of the vehicle is also involved. The members travelling from far off places have to change the car after a very short period due to this. He proposed that except the travelling allowance, no member should accept the remuneration, DA or honorarium for the University work, does the House accepts it, which was accepted by some of the members. To travel without travelling allowance would not be acceptable.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could put it as a resolution in the Syndicate.

Continuing, Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the honorarium being paid to the members by the Colleges is not a burden on the University. He felt sorry if it pinches some colleague, there are Colleges which are getting new courses like B.Sc. Agriculture. He had been raising a voice that the Colleges, which did not have the B.Sc. courses, should not be granted the B.Sc. Agriculture because such Colleges are charging about Rs.40,000/- from the students thereby earning about Rs.70-72 lacs per annum. Why the honorarium for inspection from such Colleges should not be charged? The members who visit the Colleges, should charge the honorarium from the Colleges but no honorarium be taken from the University. If the members accept, then it is okay, otherwise he, on his behalf, declared that he would not take any honorarium from the University for any meeting whether it is at Chandigarh or outside. The members should agree with it that they should start reducing the expenditure from themselves and should not take any honorarium including DA except TA. Time and again, the issue of remuneration being paid to the teachers is being raised. Earlier, he had been a representative of the teachers and now representing the Principals and has worked on both the designation. The Controller of Examinations must agree with him that 90% of the evaluation work is done during the vacations. No teacher is granted any type of compensatory leave in lieu of that. If the teachers are paid remuneration for evaluation, they are devoting their time to the University. As per the Panjab University Calendar, the results of re-evaluation should be declared before the commencement of the next examination, but it has never happened. There is no fault at the end of the Controller of Examinations or the examination branch in it. It is because of the shortage of manpower and increase in the number of students. The strength of the manpower is the same which was earlier dealing with 35-40 Colleges and is now dealing with 193 Colleges. It should be enquired into as the answer sheets sent by the University for evaluation are returned by the teachers without evaluating even after the passage of a time of several months. Such members, who are raising this issue, should be asked as to how many answer sheets they have evaluated during one year. They have not checked even a single answer sheets and it should be made compulsory for them to evaluate the answer sheets. If a College teacher is evaluating about 200 answer sheets, the University Professors, who are getting more salary than a College teacher, should evaluate more answer sheets. If not more, at least 80-100 answer sheets should be checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not an issue under consideration. This is not a platform to put one person against the other.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he would like to bring to their notice a case study which was carried out. The Rotary Club, from the last many years, is giving full fee concession to 7 girl students in engineering. This year, they could not get the number of candidates who could apply for that. He went to Punjab Engineering College, Chandigarh College of Engineering and Technology and Chemical Engineering. He spoke to the DSW of Punjab Engineering College who said that they have no willing candidate. Similar is the case with the Chandigarh College of Engineering and Technology. With very difficulty, they could get 7 candidates to whom to give the full fee concession. So, they have to look at these things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are forgetting the higher education is slowly becoming a preserve of the haves and not of the have-nots. Panjab University admits the students on the basis of merit as determined either in the board examination or in the competitive examination. Neither the student could score good marks in the board examination nor perform well in the competitive examination without additional coaching unless one is Ramanujam or Sarvdaman Chawla or Professor Bambah while others could not go ahead. One has to be a child prodigy to reach such a level without coaching and without any additional support provided by the parents. So, the major difficulty is somewhere else. How to be inclusive? They could be inclusive for which they would have to make a provision that they reserve some seats in the University for the students getting the Hargobind Khorana scholarship, a scheme of Punjab Government. If they want to be really inclusive, some additional seats could be reserved for such students. Such kids have been identified to be groomed to reach the higher education. It might not be that the students who could not get additional tuition and support in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> class, they might be in the 80% marks category. That is why the scholarship has been given to those students. So, if they have to be really inclusive, they should devise some mechanism so that the students, who have been selected in an objective way, should come to Panjab University as they would provide competition to others. But that is a separate matter. As things stand, he is afraid that they would get only the haves students and the number of have-nots students reaching the University is very less. This is the worry which they all need to ponder. When all such statistics is collected in a year or two, they would come to know as to how many have-nots are able to reach the University. At the moment, they did not know as how many haves and how many have-nots are there in the University. When the diet charges were enhanced and there was a strike, then it was said that they would provide the concession to the students who ask for concession. Very small fraction of the students asked for the concession for the diet charges. If that is the number to go by, the point that Professor S.K. Sharma has raised, that is very realistic.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the University is giving so much fee concession that hardly any particular student was available.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as said by Professor S.K. Sharma, Panjab University and other institutions also grant the concession. But there is no single platform, if they have a look at the notice boards of the Departments they would find that in some departments the notice regarding fee concession has been put up on the notice board while in others it is not so. How the students could come to know about the fee concession? He requested that a link regarding the fee concession should be provided on the Panjab University website.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that they could set aside adequately a large sum of money from some reserves of the University, which would be replenished later on, which would be used exclusively for providing support to the economically weaker sections that includes the students who are supposed to get free education under some SC/ST scheme or some girl student scheme. Since the money under these schemes takes a lot of time to be released by the Government, they could advance about 80% of the money that such students are supposed to receive by well examining the documents so that the students did

not face any problems. As the year goes by, let them make this institution inclusive where meritorious students are cared for. Principal B.S. Behl used to run this scheme in DAV College, Jalandhar who had some money which was at the Principal's discretion. When a student was entitled for scholarship from anywhere and whenever it was to be released, if Principal Behl was convinced after he made a call to the concerned persons, the College Bursar would disburse the amount as a loan which was recovered by the end of the year. He had an active cell. Some money could be set aside for this purpose and keep replenishing it. He was a beneficiary under this scheme as his scholarship came in the month of March but Principal Behl had made it sure that from the very first month, he got his NSDF scholarship of Rs.100/- plus book allowance of Rs.125/-. So, they need to do those things which their predecessors have practiced. He requested to allow him to come up with a proposal in consultation with the Finance and Development Officer and they create this fund before the start of the next academic session. They should do this.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that when they talk about the scholarship, the office takes 5 months to disburse the scholarship.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since Professor S.K. Sharma now is in an NGO, he could also join him after his term ends and let them work on behalf of the alumni and do these things. These things are worth working for. Let the people who have completed the age of 65 years in the last three years from the campus volunteer to see that this University remains an inclusive place as the retired people usually visit the University. He would reach out to those people as those people know the University very well. Let them become the volunteers to see that the young generations are cared for by this institution.

Professor B.S. Ghuman offered his services for it. He said that the seats should be reserved for the yellow card holders below poverty line. He further suggested that this should be announced from here.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Hargobind Khorana scholarship would be better. He said that they should come with the proper proposal. He did not want to do the things this or that way.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay, in principle, we accept the proposal.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he did want to say something. He said that an efficient discussion has been held but he has one request to make. He said that as has been stated and pointed out by Professor Rajesh Gill, in the evening courses, they have made an increase from Rs. 2200/ to Rs. 10,000/- straightway, what more is required to be done. He further said that he has a request that 10% increase in fee may be made. Then it will be right. Beyond this, if they think any increase while talking about scholarships, the things are such that so many students do not apply for scholarships knowingly because they consider it as a question of status symbol. They do not want to show themselves as destitute. He said that keeping this scenario in view, the fee enhancement may be up to 10%.

The Vice Chancellor said that 10% increase was not a proposed item.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that what was the advantage of doing all these discussions, if the things have already been decided.

The Vice Chancellor said that the debates are like this only. The debates are supposed to be expression of opinions. This was not the way to say the things in this manner.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he wants to record his dissent, he may do so.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said let they get it voted otherwise there dissent is already there. Those who wish that it be approved as it is, they would come to fore.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they may increase the fee but the whole burden should not be put on the students. In the first instance, the marking rates which have been increased, they should be reduced and the rule of non claim of payments other than TA should also be implemented. He further said that it was not only the matter of the University, whatever is happening in the colleges, that should also be seen.

Professor S.K.Sharma said that by its directions, the centre is becoming both the prosecutor and the judge. He said that this was a big scandal. Why the Senator members should go on discussing these issues.

The Vice Chancellor said that do not open these things.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the agenda of fee increase should be re-considered and today the fee should not be increased.

Professor Chaman Lal said that let they have some consensus. What they say that everybody has expressed his concerns and a large number of people are not in favour of this increase. He said that what the Vice Chancellor wanted was that it should be approve as it is and he is one of those who have shown dissent.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not going to have further discussion on that and he urged the members not to open the discussion. He asked Professor Chaman Lal what his proposal was. The Vice Chancellor said that the fee structure was this and the rest is how to implement it. That would have to be taken in question.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that whether the grants is received or not, the University has reflected the fee in the budget. He said that they are authorizing the Vice Chancellor that under the prevalent situation, whatever he thinks right, he may decide.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Professor Keshav Malhotra was talking very responsibly. But what he does is different from his sayings. He would say something different outside the house. So whatever they were saying should be listened carefully. He further said that he (Prof. Malhotra) was asking to oppose the item but here he is in favour of the increase.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point was that those who wish to record their dissent, he is willing to record it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in case the grant comes, then there may be no need of fee enhancement.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the grant comes or not, the University is not run on the fees.

Professor Chaman Lal said that whenever the increase is to be done, there should be a cap of 10%.

The Vice Chancellor said that the cap of 10% is not a proposal.

The Vice Chancellor said that the resolved part is that the fee structure as proposed is accepted in principle and since we have to be inclusive and there are some suggestions made, how to implement it, the way the proposal is, upto 2 and half lacs and 2.5 to 5 lacs, for that what should be the procedures, how that would be done as per the suggestions of this House.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that can they add one line more that the Senate is not very happy about the increase in students fee. But we have accepted it with a sense of regret we have to have.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that whether he could give a suggestion. He suggested that if a re-thinking is made on it in one more meeting of which they would not claim any TA/DA or anything else.

**RESOLVED:** That, with a sense of regret, the proposed fee structure of Panjab University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres for the session 2017-18, be approved.

The following members recorded their dissent:

1. Shri Sandeep Singh
2. Shri Sandeep Kumar
3. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
4. Professor Chaman Lal
5. Dr. Jagdish Chander
6. Shri Naresh Gaur

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the guidelines for providing fee concession to the students in the income group of up to Rs.2.5 lacs p.a. and Rs.2.5 lacs to Rs.5 lacs p.a., be framed on the basis of the suggestions given by the members.

**XXVII.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-26 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

**C-26.** That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in minutes of its meeting dated 19.01.2017, to discuss the issue of two new Constituent Colleges at Dharamkot & Ferozepur in the State of Punjab, be considered.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 46)**

Dr. Dalip Kumar enquired whether the MoU had been signed.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that the Shri Chander Gaiind, the representative of the Punjab Government had told everything in this regard.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-26 on the agenda** be approved.



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

**C-27.** That Gazette notification dated 20.07.2016, regarding UGC (Credit Framework for Online Learning Courses through SWAYAM) Regulation, 2016 forwarded by Dr. Roshan Sunkaria, IAS, Principal Secretary to Government of Punjab, Department of Higher Education & Languages vide D.O. No. 37/30-2017/RUSA/1182 dated 06.02.2017, be adopted.

**NOTE:** That a Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for implementation of the same.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 19)**

**XXIX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-28 on the agenda** was read out, viz. -

**C-28.** That –

- (I) The eligibility criteria for admission to M.A. Women's Studies be amended as under w.e.f. the academic session 2017-18, and the same be incorporated in the Handbook of Information:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join:</p> <p>(a) Bachelor's degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(b) B.A. (Pass) with at least 45% marks in Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology, or Psychology or Gandhian Studies or Geography or Philosophy. The candidates with these subjects be given preference in admission.</p>	<p>A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join:</p> <p>(a) Bachelor's degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(b) B.A. (Pass) with at least 45% marks in Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology, or Psychology or Gandhian Studies or Geography or Philosophy or Human Rights &amp; Duties.</p> <p>b(i) Subject weightage will be given to those candidates who have studies any one of the Subjects as mentioned in para (b) above at Undergraduate level for Three years or Six</p>

<b><u>PRESENT REGULATION</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u></b>
	<p>Semesters consecutively (except as provided in Rule 7.3 (b) of Handbook of Information 2016 page no. 245 which reads as "Some Universities award B.A./B.Sc. degree on the basis of aggregate marks of B.A./ B.Sc. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years. In that case the aggregate marks and the marks of the relevant subject in which the applicant is seeking admission, will be considered on the basis of marks obtained in B.A./B.Sc. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years only for calculation of the basic merit marks and in the relevant subject.)"</p> <p>b(ii) Weightage for Honours would be given to those candidates who have got B.A. with Honours degree in any one of the following subjects only: Women's/ Gender Studies, Public Administration, Political Science, History, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Gandhian Studies, Geography, Philosophy and Human Rights &amp; Duties.</p>

- (II) Regulation 11.1 at page 91 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, for admission to M.A. in Public Administration (Semester System), be amended as under w.e.f. the academic session 2017-18, and the same be incorporated in the Handbook of Information:

<b><u>PRESENT REGULATION</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u></b>
<p>11.1. 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:-</p> <p>(i) A Bachelor's degree</p>	

<p>obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the 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>(1) (a) For the Public Administration course, a person who has passed one of the following examinations shall also be eligible:-</p> <p>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology or History.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(1) (a) For the Public Administration course, a person who has passed one of the following examinations shall also be eligible:-</p> <p><b>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology.</b></p>
---	---

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 20)**

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that this matter was considered in the meeting of the Faculty and it was decided that those students who had studied the subjects like Geography, Political Science, Public Administration, etc. in the B.A.(Hons.), they would get the weightage for admission in M.A. (Women Studies). At that time, he had also suggested the students who have studied the honours subject in the literature subjects like Hindi, English, Punjabi which are having a lot of portion of the syllabus, such students should also be given the weightage. At that time, it was said that it would be considered by the Board of Studies but it has not been reflected in it. He requested that since there is a lot of women discourse in the literature, there is no harm in giving the weightage to the students who have done honours in the subject of literature as they have given the weightage to the students who have honours in the subjects like Geography, Political Science, Public Administration, Police Administration.

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta said that this proposal has come from the department and the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department have floated this proposal. On the asking of the Vice-Chancellor, he said that he would convey the sentiments of the Senate to the Department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the opinion of the Senate does matter and Professor Dinesh K. Gupta would convey it to the Department.

Principal I.S. Sandhu also endorsed that in the existing regulations, the students of language are also eligible to get admission. When they talk about the women discourse, according to him, the languages have organized more seminars than the social science subjects. He suggested that the benefit which is to be given to the students having honours in social science subjects, the same benefit should also be given to the students of having honours in languages.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it is a very valid point.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Dinesh K. Gupta to convey the sentiments of the Senate to the Department.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-28 on the agenda**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the matter regarding weightage to the literature subjects for admission in M.A. (Women's Studies) be referred to the concerned Board of Studies.

**XXX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-29 on the agenda** was read out, viz. -

**C-29.** That the recommendations of the Empanelment Committee dated 09.02.2017, be approved and permission be granted to invite expression of interest and initiate other procedural formalities, so that MOU may be entered with reputed hospitals willing to provide treatment as per approved rates.

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor be authorized, on behalf of the Syndicate, for modification in the approved rates as per NPPA.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 21).**

Dr. Ajay Ranga enquired as to if a temporary/daily wager/contract employee could be given the benefit at the cost of a regular faculty or regular employee?

The Vice-Chancellor said this is not related with the item and requested to raise such issues during zero hour.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-29 on the agenda**, be approved.

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

**C-30.** That -

- (i) the minutes dated 03.01.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to decide the fee structure of all PU Hostels for the session 2017-18, be approved; and
- (ii) the minutes dated 23.08.2016 of the Committee, constituted by the Dean Student Welfare, to frame guidelines/rules regarding hostel charges at Working Women Hostel, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 25)**

Professor Rajesh Gill said that page 313 shows the fees, funds and fines for resident students. In this, for instance, the fine for smoking is Rs.500/-, fine for possession of any weapon is Rs.2000/-, fine for any vehicle found parked inside the hostel building is Rs.500/- per default, etc. She just wanted to know as to how much fine till date has ever been collected from the students. She would like to bifurcate the students into boys and girls.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this data would be collected and provided to Professor Rajesh Gill by the DSW later on.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that smoking at public place is an offence. Do they have a system to ask the students to pay the fine?

Professor Chaman Lal said that he is not able to understand the data. How much is the substantial increase in the total.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not an increase.

Professor Chaman Lal enquired as to what is being charged presently and what is proposed to be charged. What is the total increase?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the data could be provided later on.

Professor Chaman Lal said that if the increase is within 10%, then it is fine.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that it is not 10%. They have JUST converted the annual charges into semester system. There is no increase in the hostel fee, the increase is only in the development fund and the increase is just 2%.

Professor Chaman Lal said that if the present charges are Rs.5,000/- and are increased to Rs.5,500/-, then it is fine. If the charges are enhanced to Rs.10,000/- from the present Rs.5,000/-, then he strongly dissented against such an enhancement.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that they have only restructured the charges and have not increased any charges except the development charges where the increase is only 2%.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-30 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXXII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-31 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-31.** That the recommendations of the Academic Committee dated 06.02.2017 the following changes in eligibility and admission criteria for B.A. B.Ed. course from the session 2017-18 onwards be approved and the same be incorporated in Handbook of Information 2017:

1. 50% marks in 10+2 from any board/University (45% for SC/ST).
2. Qualifying marks for entrance test will be 40% pass marks.
3. Weightage for entrance test will be 50%.
4. Weightage for merit in 10+2 will be 50%.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(x))**

**Item C-32 was taken up after Item C-37**

**XXXIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-33 on the agenda** was read out viz.. –

**C-33.** That on the recommendation of the Joint Admission Committee dated 06.12.2016 the following eligibility criteria for admission in 2017 in various BE courses of UIET, UICET and SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur be approved:

**For B.E. Courses**

The admission to the First semester B.E. Courses will be open to a candidate, who:

- (i) has qualified in the JEE (Main) 2017 conducted by the C.B.S.E. for admission to these courses.
- (ii) has passed 10+2 examination with Physics and Mathematics as compulsory subjects along with one of the Chemistry/Biotechnology/ Biology/Technical Vocational subject and at least 60% marks in aggregate (55% marks in case of SC/ST/Physically Handicapped), conducted by a recognized Board/ University/Council in March/April 2017 and not earlier than March/April 2015.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xii))**

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they make admission in the B.E. Courses in the Regional Centres, but there are no sports facilities in some particular sports. When a student has taken the admission, ultimately either the career in the sports is finished or the student asks for migration on the basis of sports quota. Therefore, they should review the decision of granting the admission under sports quota in the Regional Centres. Secondly, if a certificate of EWS category is signed by the First Class Gazetted Officer, that is accepted by the Joint Admission Committee. There is no further checking of this document. When he contacted the General Branch about the checking of such documents from the General Branch, he was told that it is the duty of the Joint Admission Committee to check all these certificates. These kinds of certificate should be checked at the initial stage and an affidavit with the certificates from the students should also be obtained. Secondly, they make admission to B.E. courses 3<sup>rd</sup> semester onwards on the basis of LEET in Panjab University Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, CCET, Sector-26 Chandigarh but not in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology. Due to this, more than 50 seats remain vacant in University Institute of Engineering & Technology whereas the data shows that about 4-5 seats are vacant. If they could personally check as to how many seats are vacant in which classes, they could earn more than Rs.1 crore from the vacant seats. There should be rotation for the members of the Joint Admission Committee as an amount of more than Rs.1 lac is paid to the members for this purpose and for the last many years, the same members are repeated in this Committee. It has become a point of discussion amongst the faculty members as to whether others are not eligible for this Committee. The Assistant Professors appointed at the initial stage are assigned only the examination duty for which they get a very less remuneration. In other universities like Punjabi University, M.E. course is run through part-time mode on Saturdays and Sundays but such courses are not run in University Institute of Engineering & Technology. If they could also start M.E./M.Tech. courses they could earn huge money through these courses as they are having the infrastructure, faculty and resources available in the UIET.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, the item under consideration is C-33 and what Dr. Parveen Goyal is saying, is add-on thing.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that all the points raised by Dr. Parveen Goyal are very valid.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, item 33 be approved and whatever Dr. Parveen Goyal has added, they could come to it later on.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that on page 356 the eligibility for admission is 10+2 with Physics/Chemistry/Biotechnology/Biology/Technical Vocational subjects. In 10+2 class, there are two groups of Medical and Non-Medical. For admission to B.E. courses, the admission criterion is Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics but now it is Physics, Mathematics as compulsory subjects along with one of the Chemistry/Biotechnology/Biology/Technical Vocational. With this, the criterion for admission is completely changed. How is it possible? Is there any example of any University so that they could know whether the proposed criterion is right or not?

The Vice-Chancellor said that this proposal has come from the Director, University Institute of Engineering & Technology.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that this criterion is proposed because in some schools the subject of Biotechnology is taught.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that some students take the subject of Biology and Chemistry simultaneously and try their luck in both the medical and non-medical courses. He said that for admission in B.E. courses in the institutions like PEC, IITs, there is a set model of the combination of Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics but the subjects of Biotechnology/Biology/ Technical Vocational subjects are not included. Earlier, it was not the case like this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it does not matter.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the combination of subjects is right as in many of the Schools, the subject of Biotechnology is taught and they could get the admission in B.E. courses.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it does not matter whether one has studied Biotechnology or Biology if that student has studied the subjects of Physics and Mathematics.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-33 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXXIV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-34 on the agenda** was read out, viz. -

**C-34** That the following age criteria for admission to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. Hons. 5-year Integrated Course from the session 2017-2018, be approved as recommended by the Administrative Committee dated 18.10.2016 pursuant to letter dated 17.09.2016 of Joint Secretary, Bar Council of India:

“The candidate must not be above 20 years of age as on the last date fixed for submission of application form of Entrance Test of B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 years Integrated Course of the year in which admission is sought to the said course (22 years in case of SC/ST).

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xiii))**

Professor Chaman Lal said that with this age criteria, they are restricting the admissions. If a person (like a Peon) after retirement at the age of 60 years wanted to study, why they are restricting such persons since India is a huge country having disparities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are not doing it on their own, it is the directive of the Bar Council of India (BCI).

Professor Chaman Lal said that the directive of the Bar Council of India could not be applied to B.A./B.Com. and only applicable to law courses.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is an integrated course approved by the Bar Council of India and they could not run these courses without the approval of the BCI.

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta said that this concern is genuine. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has already issued a judgment relating to the age. That judgment has not reached to them. When that judgment reaches the University, this would be revised. He has asked the Department to provide the judgment.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the judgment has not been received and if they approve it today, then it would be implemented and they would have to wait for the judgment. Since the admission process is going to start, it should be withheld for the time being.

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta said that they could improve that.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if they approve it in the light of the judgment of the Supreme Court and the admission process is going to start, they would unnecessarily invite litigation.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that they could approve it subject to judgment.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he had made a request to the Dean of University Instruction and the Dean College Development Council regarding the reservation of 2-3% seats for riot victims. The Punjab Government had endorsed the letter and the grand children of the riot victims are also given the reservation which had been provided during the last year and last-to-last year. According to him, since the letter regarding this reservation is issued every year during the month of March, this year the letter has not been issued till date. He requested that the letter regarding this reservation be issued at an early date.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this information was circulated by the Dean College Development Council on 15 June, 2016. The letter could not be delivered to the Department of Laws. Even he approached the Dean of University Instruction office. Since this information was not there in the Handbook of Information, the Chairperson of the



Department said that he would not entertain it. So, it is better that instead of issuing a letter, that should be incorporated in the Handbook of Information.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this time, it would be included.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-34 on the agenda**, be approved.

**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 on the recommendation (Item No.32) of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016 the eligibility criteria for admission to M.Sc. 1<sup>st</sup> year (Nuclear Medicine), as under, w.e.f. the session 2017-18 be approved:

Course	Seats	Duration	Eligibility/Admission Criteria
M.Sc.	10+2 NRI	2 years (4 semester)	<p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. first year in Nuclear Medicine will be B.Sc. from a recognised University with Physics and Chemistry (non-medical stream) or Chemistry and Zoology/ Biotechnology (Medical Stream) as core subjects. Candidates having B.Sc. Nuclear Medicine/Biophysics shall also be eligible for admission to the course. Candidates with B.Sc. degree in X-Ray/Medical Technology. B.Sc. through correspondence and open University stream are not eligible.</p> <p>Admission to M.Sc. course in Nuclear Medicine will be through Entrance Test to be conducted by Panjab University. The candidates should have passed the graduation (B.Sc. from a recognized University/ Institute with at least 50% marks, while deciding the final merit of Entrance Test, a weightage shall also be given to the B.Sc. marks obtained by the candidate, as per University rules. The cut off percentage marks secured in the entrance test will also be as per University rules.</p>

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxvii))**

**XXXVI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-36 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-36.** That on the recommendation (Item No.31) of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016 the proposed eligibility criteria for admission to M.Sc. (Hons.) Chemistry, as under be approved:

<b>Existing (Page No.175, Handbook of Information, 2016)</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
(a) B.Sc. (H.S.) students of P.U. after passing B.Sc. (H.S.) in Chemistry from Department of Chemistry, P.U. OR (b) Admission based on P.U. CET-(P.G.) for B.Sc. (Pass of Hons.) examination with 50% marks from P.U. or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry (ii) Physics (iii) Mathematics or any Science subject during all three years of graduation.	(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. One of the subjects can be Mathematics along with another Science subject.  (c) The maximum of 5% weightage be given to B.Sc. (Hons.) students.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxviii))**

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that as per the Handbook of Information, 2016, for admission to M.Sc. (Hons.) Chemistry, the admission based on P.U. CET-Punjab Government for B.Sc. (Pass of Hons.) examination with 50% marks from P.U. or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry (ii) Physics (iii) Mathematics or any Science subject during all three years of graduation. The persons in the Department of Chemistry said that Mathematics is a compulsory subject at graduation even if a student had studied Chemistry for three years and the objection was that the student had studied Chemistry as an elective subject at the graduation level. They could not deny the admission to M.Sc. According to him, the proposed amendment is for the reason that Mathematics is not a compulsory subject but along with Chemistry, a student could have any two subjects. In the proposed eligibility criteria, it is written that one of the subjects can be Mathematics along with another Science subject. It could again create a confusion that Mathematics is a compulsory subject. They should eliminate the subject of Mathematics. If a student has done the graduation with an elective, he/she should have a right to admission.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would check it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that when they started the course of B.Sc. Computer. Such an issue also came up around 2-3 years ago. The students are studying two subjects of Science. The earlier eligibility conditions as mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar where B.Sc. is mentioned as equivalent to Physics, Chemistry, Botany and for B.Sc. Non-Medical, it is with Mathematics instead of Botany. Now they have started the course of B.Sc. Computer Applications in which a student who has studied two Science subjects is coming for admission. They needed to amend those eligibility conditions which have not been done. Due to which this problem is arising. In the course of M.Sc. in Physics, they had got it allowed from the then Dean of University Instruction, Professor A.K. Bhandari. If a student has studied Chemistry or Physics for three years and if is interested for admission in Chemistry or Physics instead of Mathematics, such a student should be allowed as has earlier been done. This should be checked.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the Colleges, the subjects of Biotechnology, Microbiology and Bioinformatics are elective subjects and the students do B.Sc. in combination with Chemistry. Those students are also deprived of the admission. There was a case of M.Sc. Microbial Biotechnology in which those students were also eligible, as per the decision of the Board, who had studied Microbiology in B.Sc. Then, they discussed this issue in the meeting of the Faculty of Science in which Professor Tiwari was also present who immediately accepted that every student who had passed B.Sc. with life science could be eligible for this programme. He requested that the students who have studied the elective subjects of Biotechnology, Microbiology and Bioinformatics, Biochemistry should also be given the benefit of admission to M.Sc. Chemistry.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they would have to go back to the Faculty.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that as proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar regarding the life science that is the best option.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not as to why it is so. One could have the subjects of Chemistry, Mathematics, Information Technology. But if a student has not studied Physics at all, how could he/she progress.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the student who is opting for Botany, Zoology and Chemistry, how he could study Physics. It is more relevant.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the matter be referred back to the Faculty of Science.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would get it checked. Let it go back to the Faculty.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the item be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no need to defer it. Nothing is being deprived and it is only that a clarification is needed.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-36 on the agenda**, in principle be approved and the matter be referred back to the Faculty of Science to include other life science subjects also.

Before taking up Item C-37, some discussion on Item C-33 also took place which has been made part of that item.

**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 the Proposed Eligibility/Admission Criteria for admission to Master of Social work as recommended by the Academic and Administrative Committee (through circulation) dated 29.11.2016 of Centre for Social Work, University Institute of Emerging Areas in Social Science, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxx))**

**XXXVIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-32 on the agenda** was read out, viz. -

- C-32.** To consider 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 (Para XXXV) (Appendix), the Vice-Chancellor said that the papers related to the item were sent to the members in a sealed cover on 21<sup>st</sup> 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.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there was a Committee's report which considered it and that was regarding the misdemeanour by a member/colleague from the Senate and that report had been presented to the Senate and the report had been accepted, etc. and they were supposed to get back to this matter. So, now the issue is what should they do, what kind of deterrent should be put in that such things should not occur. They could not be seen to be approving a serious misdemeanor of a kind that got detected via that report. So, this is the matter.

Professor Keshav Malhotra talked about Mr. Karanbir.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not the matter of Mr. Karanbir. He read from the agenda item "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 and so on". So, they need to take a call on it as to what is to be done. He asked Ambassador I.S. Chadha if he would like to add anything to it.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that the report of the Committee which was formed under his Chairmanship on the decision of the Senate is from page 331 onwards and it has made specific suggestions with respect to each of the persons who were indicted by Garg Committee. Specifically, there was one recommendation relating to a member of the Senate who is no longer a member but at that time he was a member. The recommendation of the Committee is to proceed against him under section 36 of the Panjab University Act which meant removal from the Senate and the procedure was laid down. But since he has ceased to become be a member and this particular punishment has now become infructuous. Therefore, the question before the Senate now is whether they are alright with a person against whom such a serious charge had been established by the Committee headed by Justice Garg should not go unpunished. Now, he has been told that there is a provision in the Act for another form of punishment, may be removal of his name from the list of voters for the Constituency from which he was elected. So, that would then mean that he would not be able to seek election because he understood that he (that member) did seek the election. If that kind of action had been taken, he probably would have been ineligible to

seek the election. But now that he is no longer a member of the Senate, the recommendations made by his Committee is infructuous and at the same time now it is up to the Senate to consider whether some other form of punishment should be given to him and there is a provision in the Act. He read out section 37 Removal of Registered Graduates of the Panjab University Act which says: "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". So, if the Senate so wishes, it could invoke this and recommend to the Chancellor for the removal of the name from the list of Registered Graduates.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have this proposal but his concern is that the attendance in the Senate, at the moment, is thin. Should they bring it to the next meeting of the Senate at the beginning of the agenda items to which most of the member said, "yes".

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the quorum is there and they could discuss.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could discuss, he is not saying not to discuss.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that they could form a small Committee on what action has to be taken and the Committee could bring a proposal to this. Otherwise they would be discussing the matter in a vacuum.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor R.P. Bambah's suggestion is that a small Committee should be formed by Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate, which evaluates the proposal made by Ambassador I.S. Chadha and it should be brought straight back to the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why should they authorize the Vice-Chancellor. If they expel in this way, in future, they could expel him also if he speaks. It could not done so. He asked all the Senators to listen that today a Senator is being expelled for the first time in the history of Panjab University. How could they do it? How could they authorize the Vice-Chancellor?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that, that person has committed a big blunder.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that no blunder has been committed. This the report of the charges levelled against Shri Karanbir in which the High Court has imposed a fine of Rs.50,000/- on the University to take him back.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to sit down as he is misleading the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the name of Mr. Karanbir appears in the report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the High Court has not considered any matter.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he should be made known and this should be placed before the Senate as to what is the procedure of expelling from the Registered Graduate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, this is the item before them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the item should be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Ambassador I.S. Chadha has proposed and Professor R.P. Bambah has responded and they are just discussing that matter.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he was a member of the Committee and they found that Mr. Munish Verma's conduct was disgraceful, nothing less than that. Then the second Committee was formed under the Chairmanship of Ambassador I.S. Chadha and the only possible thing which could be done after he (Mr. Munish Verma) has not got elected the second time is section 37 of the Act. So by having another Committee, they would be doing the same thing. This is the only thing possible for them. If 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the members are in favor, it could be done and if not, it could be rejected. But if they send a signal that some kind of behavior is not acceptable in the Senate. If such people serve on the Senate, they could not be allowed to go scot free.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha clarified that the issue before them is not whether Mr. Munish Verma is guilty or not. That issue was considered by Justice Garg Committee which found him guilty and the report has been accepted by the Senate. So, that issue is not there. The issue is what punishment could be given and that issue was referred to the Committee under his (Ambassador I.S. Chadha) Chairmanship. The recommendation made by that Committee is now infructuous. Now the question is up to the Senate to decide whether if that punishment is no longer possible, whether they would like to impose the punishment under section 37. That is the issue that they have to pronounce.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor R.P. Bambah is saying that let them do not do it in a hurry at the fag end of the meeting, let few people from the this Senate who are present in the Senate examine it and bring it back as an agenda item in the beginning of the Senate meeting next time. As on date, there is no urgency.

Professor Ronki Ram said that as Shri V.K. Sibal said that no Committee should be formed, when the full Senate would be there, they could discuss the issue. There is no need of a Committee.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that no Committee should be formed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no need of another Committee. They would bring this matter back in the next meeting of the Senate in the beginning of the agenda papers and not at the fag end. On a suggestion from Professor R.P. Bambah, he said that he would talk to a few senior members including Shri V.K. Sibal, Ambassador I.S. Chadha, Professor R.P. Babmbah and others.

Professor Chaman Lal said that many of the members are not aware of the whole background. The proper background of the matter be made available to the new members so that they should be aware of the matter before participating in the discussion. According to him, it is better to postpone the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything is there. But he understood that the Senate agenda reaches the members only 8 days ago. It is such a bulky agenda. He accepted that it is not possible for the members to read all of it in 8 days. Now, they have adequate time. All the material is before them and they would come back to it in the next meeting of the Senate.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that an office note be prepared.



The Vice-Chancellor said that an office note would be prepared and sent to the members by e-mail. With this, all the items conclude.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the **Item C-32 on the agenda** be deferred and the item be put up in the beginning of the agenda in the next meeting of the Senate.

**XXXIX.**

The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-18** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**R-1.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Gurmukh Singh, Assistant Professor (temporary), UIET w.e.f. 28.12.2016 with the condition that he will have to deposit salary in lieu of short of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2009.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(iv))**

**R-2.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Pooja Garg, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Applied Management Studies (UIAMS), w.e.f. 16.06.2016, with the condition that she will have to deposit amount in lieu of short period of notice of three months, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, as medical leave applied for by her for the period from 19.08.2014 to 16.06.2016 has not been sanctioned due to non receipt of Medical documents. However, in case she fails to deposit the amount in lieu of short period of notice of three months, the same amount shall be deducted from her dues lying with the University.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(v))**

**R-3.** That the Vice-Chancellor, has not recommended further extension in re-employment to Dr. Arun Rashmi Tickoo, Assistant Professor (Re-employed), Department of French as requested by her vide application dated 02.01.2017.

**NOTE:** Dr. Arun Rashmi Tickoo, Assistant Professor, Department of French was retired on 31.08.2014 and she was granted reemployment upto 31.08.2019 i.e. the date of her attaining the age of 65 years and the same was ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 14.12.2014 (Para XXIV).

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxiv))**

**R-4.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Sanjeev Verma, Associate Professor in Orthodontics (Temporary), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, w.e.f. 13.01.2017 with the conditions that he has to deposit one month salary in lieu of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 given at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxv))**

- R-5.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Parmatma Ram, Sr. Tech. (G-II), Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology. His pay be fixed as per University rules.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxvi))**

- R-6.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 09.11.2016 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following eligibility condition for admission to M.Sc. (H.S.) Biotechnology in Panjab University and Colleges affiliated to P.U. and the same be incorporated in Prospectus for Entrance Test PU-CET (PG) 2017:

**Biotechnology (H.S.), P.U.**

- I For 5+2 (SC) + 2 (NRI) Only those students who have cleared B.Sc. Biotechnology (50% marks)/B.Sc. with 50% marks with biotechnology as elective/vocational subject (Studied for 3 years) are eligible.

**Biotechnology (in Colleges):-**

Bachelor's degree (under the 10+2+3 pattern of education) in physical, Biological, Pharmaceutical, Agricultural, Veterinary or Fishery Sciences or Bachelor's degree in engineering/Technology, Home Science, Medicine (MBBS) from any University/Institute recognized by the Panjab University. The candidate must have obtained at least 55% marks at the Bachelor's level.

- II The candidates seeking admission in M.Sc. Biotechnology should fill separate admission forms in Colleges offering M.Sc. course in Biotechnology.

No Centralized counselling will be done by the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(vii))**

- R-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request of Ms. Sukhdev Kaur, Assistant Registrar, University Business School, P.U., for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 31.12.2016 (A.N.) from the University service and sanctioned the following benefits, under regulation 17.5, at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at pages 131 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007.

- (ii) Furlough, for six months as admissible under Regulation 12.2 (B) (iii) at pages 124-125 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of furlough; and Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at Page 96 of Panjab University, Calendar, Volume-III.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxiii))**

**R-8.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following recommendations (No. I, III & IV) of the meeting dated 23.12.2016, pursuant to issue raised in the meeting of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016:

**(I) Grading System for Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) for B.Sc (Hons.) Courses under the framework of Hons. School System at Panjab University.**

Table 1. Conversion table for the percentage marks scored by a student in a subject into Letter grade and a Numerical grade point.

<b>Marks %</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Grade Point</b>
85-100	<b>O</b> (Outstanding)	10
76-84	<b>A<sup>++</sup></b> (Excellent)	9
68-75	<b>A<sup>+</sup></b> (Very Good)	8
60-67	<b>A</b> (Good)	7
55-59	<b>B<sup>+</sup></b> (Fair)	6
50-54	<b>B</b> (Above Average)	5.6
45-49	<b>C</b> (Average)	5
40-44	<b>P</b> (Pass)	4.5
< 40 %	<b>F</b> (Fail)	0
-	Ab (Absent)	0

The percentage marks obtained in a subject should be rounded-off to an integer before assigning a grade. UGC instructs that the cut-off marks percentage for B<sup>+</sup> and B letter grades should not be less than **55%** and **50%**, respectively.

Once the Letter grades and Numerical grade points are assigned to all subjects, the SGPA (Semester Grade Point Average) and the CGPA (Cumulative Grade point Average) can be subsequently calculated according to the UGC guidelines mentioned on page numbers 5 & 6 of the UGC document, *9555132\_Guidelines.pdf*. It should be included in this form in the final declared result along with the grade conversion table 1. Minimum criterion in terms of Credits has to be defined for promotion to next year as well as obtaining a degree. In principle, the calculation for

SGPA should be performed for all the students at the end of every semester. In case some students fail in certain examination(s), the SGPA calculations have to be recalculated after their reappear examination. For a student failing in a subject, the numerical grade point earned in the subject will be counted as zero for the calculation of SGPA and CGPA in the numerator of the assigned formulae. However, the minimum credits required for all the subjects should be considered in the denominator of the formulae.

The following illustration presents the methodology to estimate the SGPA and CGPA for a student.

Suppose a student acquires the numerical grade points of u, v, w, x and y in various subjects with the pre-assigned credit points of U, V, W, X and Y, respectively, in a semester. The SGPA<sub>i</sub> of the i<sup>th</sup> semester will be estimated as,

$$\text{SGPA}_i = \frac{(u \times U) + (v \times V) + (w \times W) + (x \times X) + (y \times Y)}{(U + V + W + X + Y)}$$

The total credit points CP<sub>i</sub> of the i<sup>th</sup> semester will include the credit points of all the subjects in a semester irrespective of whether the student fails in any subject.

The CGPA for the entire six semester course will be estimated as, CGPA =

$$\frac{(\text{SGPA}_1 \times \text{CP}_1) + (\text{SGPA}_2 \times \text{CP}_2) + (\text{SGPA}_3 \times \text{CP}_3) + (\text{SGPA}_4 \times \text{CP}_4) + (\text{SGPA}_5 \times \text{CP}_5) + (\text{SGPA}_6 \times \text{CP}_6)}{\text{CP}_1 + \text{CP}_2 + \text{CP}_3 + \text{CP}_4 + \text{CP}_5 + \text{CP}_6}$$

$$\text{CP}_1 + \text{CP}_2 + \text{CP}_3 + \text{CP}_4 + \text{CP}_5 + \text{CP}_6$$

The transcript for each semester and a consolidated transcript indicating the performance in all semesters should be issued to the students along with the table 1. The SGPA<sub>i</sub> and CGPA should be rounded-off to second decimal place.

The CGPA for the final result can be eventually converted into percentage marks by the following formula,

$$\text{Aggregate (Percentage) marks} = (\text{CGPA} \times 9) + 3$$

**(III) Criteria For Preparation of Merit List For Admissions to B.Sc. (Hons.) Courses Under the Frame Work of Hons. School System at Panjab University**

For the B.Sc (Hons.) admissions, the final merit should be prepared on the basis of merit consisting of three components (i) CET merit with weightage 75 %, (ii) 10+2 examination merit with weightage 25 %, and (iii) over and above weightage of NCC, NSS, etc.

For preparing the combined merit of CET for the two streams of students with (i) Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics combination and (ii) Physics, Chemistry and Biology combination, the two streams should be

evaluated independently. The final merit list for the admission to B.Sc. (Hons.) under the framework of Honours School System should be prepared by adding (i) CET percentile score with 75% weightage, (ii) 10+2 examination marks with 25% weightage, and (iii) over and above weightage of NCC, NSS, etc. in terms of marks.

Any changes in the evaluation of NSS, NCC certificates etc. after physical verification, or reevaluation of 10+2 examination will simply change the final score of that student. This student's position should be replaced with a marker 'b' in the merit list without disturbing the other positions in the merit list. This part of the procedure is same (as being followed presently).

**(IV) Criteria for Preparation of Merit List For The Admission to M.Sc. (Hons.) Courses at Panjab University**

For the M.Sc. (Hons.) admissions, the final merit should be prepared on the basis of merit consisting of three components; (i) Entrance test (OCET) merit with weightage 60 %, (ii) B.Sc examination merit with weightage 40 %, and (iii) over and above weightage for Hons., NCC, NSS, etc.

Weightage of Hons. in B.Sc. shall be given, provided the candidate has earned Hons. Degree in the concerned subject or has qualified the additional credits in the concerned subject only.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(i))**

**R-9.** That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Board of Control in Library & Information Science dated 23.01.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has enhanced the number of seats in the Department of Library & Information Science for the following courses from the academic session 2017-18:

- (i) B.Lib.I.Sc. - 45+5 NRI
- (ii) M.Lib.I.Sc. - 35+5 NRI

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(ii))**

**R-10.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Shweta, Assistant Professor (temporary), UIET w.e.f. 24.02.2017, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2009.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(iii))**

**R-11.** That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Joint Academic and Administrative Committees of the Pharmaceutical Sciences dated 20.01.2017 (Item No.1) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has changed the nomenclature of the following existing courses run at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, P.U. from the session 2017-18 with the ones from the list of the courses as approved by the Pharmacy Council of India as two of the six M.Pharm courses run by the

Institute are not in the approved list and the eligibility, admission norms, course structure, fee and number of seats in the proposed courses shall be the same as in the existing courses:

<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Master of Pharmacy in Pharmaceutical Analysis & Quality Assurance	Master of Pharmacy in Pharmaceutical Analysis
Master of Pharmacy in Drug Discovery and Drug Development	Master of Pharmacy in Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(iv))**

**R-12.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has executed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh, India and Institute for Protein Research, Osaka University, Japan.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(v))**

**R-13.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has granted Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) to Dr. Ajay Guleria, System Administrator, Computer Centre, P.U., for a period of one-year i.e. w.e.f. 07.03.2017 to 06.03.2018 to enable him to join as Sr. System Programmer/Manager in Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(vi))**

**R-14.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request of Ms. Kanta Rani, Assistant Registrar, Examination Branch-I, for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 31.03.2017 (A.N.) from the University service and sanctioned the following benefits, under regulation 17.5, at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at pages 131 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Furlough, for six months as admissible under Regulation 12.2 (B) (iii) at pages 124-125 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of furlough; and
- (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at Page 96 of Panjab University, Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(vii))**

- R-15.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.01.2017 of Research Promotion Cell and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved DIPAS as a recognized Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. in the subjects of Biotechnology and System Biology & Bioinformatics.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(xi))**

- R-16.** That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 31.01.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has increased the seats from 29 to 40 and 4 seats for N.R.I. students (i.e. 40+4=44), for M.A. course in Gandhian and Peace Studies from the session 2017-18.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(xii))**

- R-17.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has reduced the intake of seats for LL.B course as 300 in the Department of Laws from the session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** 1. The Chairperson, Department of Laws vide letter No. 489/D/Law dated 15.02.2017 has requested that the intake of seats for LL.B. course be reduced pursuant to letter of Bar Council of India No. BCI:D:1416/2015 (LE) dated 27.07.2015.

2. As per Handbook of Information 2016 the intake of seats for LL.B course is as under:

<b>Course</b>	<b>Seats</b>	<b>Duration</b>
LL.B. (Morning)*	166+14 NRI +166+14 (Evening)*	3 years (6 semester)

\*Subject to the approval of the competent authority

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(xiii))**

- R-18.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following eligibility conditions in accordance with Bar Council of India, Rules 2009, for admission to LL.B. Professional 3 years course- Semester System, in Department of Laws, from the academic session 2017-18 onwards:-

The Entrance Test for Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.) shall be open to all such candidates who possess the qualifications as mentioned below:

- (a) Those candidates who have passed/appeared in the final year of Bachelor's degree in any faculty of the Panjab University with at least 45% of the aggregate marks (40% for SC/ST/BC)

OR

- (b) A Bachelor's degree in any faculty of any other University recognized as equivalent to the corresponding degree of the Panjab University with at least 45% of the aggregate marks (40% for SC/ST/BC).

Provided that in case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the Panjab 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 (40% for SC/ST/BC candidates) shall be calculated by taking into account the percentage of aggregate marks that he/she had secured at the language examination, excluding the marks for the additional optional paper English and the elective subject taken together.

OR

- (c) A Master's Degree from the Panjab University with at least 45% marks in the aggregate; (40% for SC/ST/BC candidates)

OR

- (d) A Master's Degree from any other University with at least 45% marks in the aggregate; (40% for SC/ST/BC candidates) recognized by the Panjab University and the Bar Council of India as equivalent to the corresponding Post-graduate degree of the Panjab University.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 28(xiv))**

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the information contained in **Sub-Items R-1 to R-17 on the agenda**, be ratified; and
- (ii) Sub-Item R-18 be treated as withdrawn.

**XL.**

The information contained in **Items I-1 to I-33** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**I-1.** That following resolution passed by Panjab University Teacher's Association (PUTA) in its General Body Meeting (GMB) dated 16.09.2016, be approved:

“That the subscription to Panjab University Teacher's Association Welfare Scheme, be enhanced from Rs. 300/- to Rs. 600/-”.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 24)**



- I-2.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended (post-facto) the term of appointment, of the following Assistant Professors, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, till the end of session 2015-16 i.e. 30.06.2016, purely on temporary basis, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2015-16, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:-

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Designation &amp; Subject</b>
1.	Ms. Inderjot Kaur	Assistant Professor in Law
2.	Shri Hardip Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(iii))**

- I-3.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has: -

- (i) re-appointed afresh the following faculty members purely on temporary/Contractual basis w.e.f. 12.1.2017 for 11 months i.e. up to 11.12.2017 with one day break on 11.1.2017 (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:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
Temporary basis		
1.	Dr. Maninder Pal Singh Gill	Associate Professor in General Surgery
2.	Dr. Satya Narain	Associate Professor in Oral/Maxillofacial Surgery
Contractual basis		
3.	*Dr. Prabhjot Cheema	Sr. Lecturer in Anatomy
4.	*Dr. Rajdeep Brar	Assistant Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology

\* Their nature of appointment will be decided after the final decision of Senate.

- (ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty members purely on temporary/Contractual basis mentioned against each w.e.f. 10.2.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 9.1.2018 with one day break on 9.2.2017 (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:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
Contractual basis		
1.	*Dr. Shally Gupta	Professor in Oral Pathology
Temporary basis		
2.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma	Associate Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology
3.	Dr. Ikreet Singh Bal	Associate Professor in Public Health Dentistry
4.	Dr. Simranjit Singh	Senior Assistant Professor in Oral Pathology

\* Her nature of appointment will be decided after the final decision of Senate.

(iii) re-appointed afresh Dr. Vandana Chhabra, Associate Professor in Oral Surgery, on temporary basis w.e.f. 19.2.2017 for 11 months i.e. up to 18.1.2018 with one day break on 18.2.2017 (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 she was working earlier.

(iv) re-appointed afresh Dr. Sanjeev Verma, Associate Professor in Orthodontics on temporary basis w.e.f. 18.1.2017 for 11 months i.e. up to 17.12.2017 with one day break on 17.1.2017 (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 he was working earlier.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxi))**

**I-4.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of Ms. Rajni Chauhan, Assistant Professor in Commerce (purely on temporary basis), University School of Open Learning for even semester in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- + allowances for the session 2016-17, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xx))**

**I-5.** In pursuance of orders dated 24.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 22165 of 2016 (Dr. Krishna Saini 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 14.02.2017.

- (i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Krishna Saini, Professor, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur be considered to continue in service on re-employment basis w.e.f. 01.11.2016 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 31.10.2016 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.
- (ii) all those 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 21.01.2017 Para 48(iii))**

- I-6.** That the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that in the court case (LPA No.1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and others and connected LPAs) following employees 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 be paid to anyone) as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the LPA filed by them. The payment to all such appellants shall be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the undertaking as per enclosed *pro-forma*:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of employees/ Designation</b>	<b>Department</b>
1.	Dr. Raj Kumar, Librarian	A.C. Joshi Library, P.U.
2.	Shri Pardeep Kumar, Deputy Librarian	U.S.O.L, P.U.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(iv))**

- I-7.** In pursuance of orders dated 09.11.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 23201 of 2016 (1. Dr. Sukhjinder Singh Gill, 2. Dr. (Mrs.) Dhian Kaur Vs Panjab University & Ors.) to be heard along with CWP No.22165 of 2016 on 06.12.2016, wherein she has got interim orders on the same terms as allowed in other similar cases (LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others and connected LPAs):

- (i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. (Mrs.) Dhian Kaur, Professor, Department of Geography be considered on re-employment basis as in all other such cases and salary paid which she was drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 09.11.2016 passed by Hon'ble Court in above said case, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim order measures

subject to the final outcome of the Court filled by them. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking.

- (ii) all those 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 21.01.2017 Para 48(v))**

**I-8.** That the Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) allowed that the lien of Late Dr. Rahul Sharma, . Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, P.U., as continued on his substantive post of Senior Lecturer, be retained for the period of having his actually worked as Reader on contract basis w.e.f. from 19.07.2010 to 05.12.2015.
- (ii) granted post-facto approval towards his due provident Fund contribution as per P.U. Rules along with University share for the above said period for which he actually worked as Reader on contract basis i.e. from 19.07.2010 to 05.12.2015.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(vi))**

**I-9.** That the Vice-Chancellor has extended the period of Agreement between the Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Punjab Postal Circle, Chandigarh w.e.f. 01.01.2017 to 31.12.2017 for collection of Examination/Re-Evaluation Fees of Panjab University through various Post Offices under e-payment service throughout the country.

**NOTE:** Earlier, an agreement was executed between the Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Punjab Postal Circle, Chandigarh w.e.f. 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016 which was noted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 vide Para 41-I (xiii).

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(vii))**

**I-10.** That the Vice-Chancellor has accepted the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhry, IAS (Retd.), Ms. Urvashi Gulati, IAS (Retd.), and Ms. Keshni Anand Arora, IAS, Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana, Revenue & Disaster Management and Consolidation Department, for institution of Medal, to be awarded to the topper in Women's Studies post-graduation course, in the memory of their mother-Late. Smt. Savitri Anand wife of Professor J.C. Anand, Department of Political Science, P.U.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(viii))**

- I-11.** That the Vice-Chancellor, has allowed that the Syndicate Para 48 I-(ii) and (iii) dated 27.11.2016, regarding re-employment of Dr. A.K. Vashisht, Professor, UBS, and Dr. Saroj Ghosh, Department of Music, be kept pending.

**NOTE:** Both the above faculty members are continuing in service beyond the age of 60 years as per interim orders of the Hon'ble Court, noted by the Syndicate vide Para 48 I-(xxx) dated 27.11.2016.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(x))**

- I-12.** To note the orders dated 06.12.2016 of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in LPA No.1505 of 2016 (O&M), along with connected cases filed by Amrik Singh Ahluwalia and another Vs. Panjab University and others.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(xiv))**

- I-13.** That the Vice-Chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Kalpana as full time Medical Officer (on contract) at Bhai Ghanayia Ji Institute of Health Sciences, P.U. for the period of one month from the date she joins the duty, on fixed emoluments of Rs.45,000/- p.m. against the vacant post of Additional C.M.O. (Dr. B.S. Lal), who has proceeded on leave without pay.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(xv))**

- I-14.** In pursuance of orders dated 17.12.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 26187 of 2016 (Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop Vs Panjab University and 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 14.02.2017.

(i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Science be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.01.2017 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 31.12.2016 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.

(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 25.02.2017 Para 29(i))**

**I-15.** In pursuance of orders dated 15.12.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 22992 of 2016 (Dr. Rakesh Datta Vs Panjab University and 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 14.02.2017.

- (i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Rakesh Datta, Professor, Defence and National Security Studies be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.01.2017 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 31.12.2016 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.
- (ii) all those 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 25.02.2017 Para 29(ii))**

**I-16.** As per authorization given by the Syndicate/Senate at its meeting held on 31.05.2015 (Para 6) & 29.09.2015 (Para XXXIX), the Vice-Chancellor has re-fixed the Basic Pay of Rs.19740/- + AGP of Rs.6000/- of Dr. Samarjit Sihotra, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics, as per revised LPC, issued by Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, submitted by him in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining i.e. 29.09.2010, with next date of increment as usual.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 29(iii))**

**I-17.** That the Vice-Chancellor has allowed to reverse the excess interest credited to the GPF/CPF subscribers for the year 2014-2015, in accordance with the decision of the Syndicate dated 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 (Para 17) and Senate dated 27.03.2016 (Para XV), as per the recommendations of the Interest Committee dated 04.01.2016.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(xvi))**

- I-18.** Pursuant to General discussion (4) of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.08.2016, the Vice-Chancellor has permitted the LL.B passed out candidates to join B.Ed. w.e.f. for the session 2017-18, whatever be their background B.A. or B.Sc. or B.Com., subject to fulfilment of other eligibility conditions as prescribed by the University/NCTE.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(xvii))**

- I-19.** That the Vice-Chancellor has executed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Fresenius Kabi Oncology Limited, B-310, Som Dutt Chambers-1, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 48(xviii))**

- I-20.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the total number of seats for B.Sc. 1<sup>st</sup> Year, be increased from 29 to 30 in the Department of Microbiology, in order to keep uniformity in the admission process (as in the several departments).

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xiv))**

- I-21.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Board of Control in Punjabi dated 16.11.2016 that 15 students be admitted in M.Phil. Punjabi and 10 students be admitted in M.Phil. Guru Granth Sahib Studies instead of 25, for each course for the academic year 2017-2018.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xv))**

- I-22.** That the Syndicate had considered on 21 January 2017 the letter from MHRD in accordance with the regulations and had recommended a Committee of independent members to the Senate and the Senate in turn resolved to forward those names to the Chancellor which they reiterate. The Chancellor has now to take a call on it, to accept it or modify it, however, the Committee should commence its task as per the provisions of the Act at the earliest. The Syndicate also expressed its anguish over the expression and text used by the complainant for the Syndicate and Senate, which is unbecoming of a member of the Senate.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate also expressed its anguish over what Professor Shelley Walia's action of writing to the Chancellor.

**(Syndicate dated 25.02.2017 Para 9,9A & 9B)**

- I-23.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Board of Control dated 09.11.2016 that an entrance test for admission to M.A. History Semester-I, be held from the session 2017-18.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xvi))**

- I-24.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the intake of the students admitted for the following courses, in the Department of German, P.U. from the academic year 2017 and beyond as recommended by the Academic and Technical Committee of the Department of German dated 15.11.2016:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Courses</b>	<b>Students Intake (Number of Seats)</b>
1.	Certificate Courses in German	130
2.	Diploma Courses in German	30
3.	Advanced Diploma Courses in German	20

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xvii))**

- I-25.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved Partnership Working Agreement between Skills Anytime, BKSB India Private Limited, based at Shop 2a, Taj Hotel, Block No. 17, Sector-17-A, Chandigarh, and Panjab University, Sector-14, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xix))**

- I-26.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the proposed modification in following existing criteria approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016 (Para 16), for admitting the students falling under categories of Rural Area students and Border Area, over and above the sanctioned seats for UG/PG courses offered by the Departments of Panjab University, Constituent Colleges, Regional Centres and Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, from the session 2016-17:

<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<p><b>(i) Two additional Seats for Rural Area Students</b></p> <p>Only those candidates will be considered in this category, which have passed their matriculation and +2 examinations from those rural schools that do not fall in the area of the Municipal Corporation/ Municipal Committee /Small Town/ Notified Area. Further the candidates should have been studying in such school for at least five years before passing the last examination. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the D.E.O./Principal of the concerned institute of the area certifying that the school from where the candidate has passed the Matriculation and +2 examination, falls within the aforesaid rural area.</p>	<p><b>(i) “Two additional Seats for Rural Area Students</b></p> <p>Only those candidates will be considered in this category, <b>who</b> have passed their matriculation and +2 examinations from those rural schools that do not fall in the area of the Municipal Corporation/ Municipal Committee /Small Town/ Notified Area/<b>Cantonment Area</b>. Further the candidates should have been studying in such school for at least five years before passing the last examination. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the D.E.O./Principal of the concerned institute of the area certifying that the school from</p>



<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<p><b>(ii) One Additional Seat for Border Area Students</b></p> <p>The Border Area students shall mean those candidates who have passed their matriculation and +2 examination from the Border Area Schools situated within 20 kilometres from the International border. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the Tehsildar or the Principal/ Headmaster/ Head of the School certifying that the School from where the candidate has passed the matriculation or +2 examination, falls within the aforesaid Border area.</p>	<p>where the candidate has passed the Matriculation and +2 examination, falls within the aforesaid rural area.”</p> <p><b>(ii) “One Additional Seat for Border Area Students</b></p> <p>The Border Area students shall mean those candidates who have passed their matriculation and +2 examination from the Border Area Schools situated within 20 kilometres from the International border. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the Tehsildar or the Principal/ Headmaster/Head of the School certifying that the School from where the candidate has passed the <b>matriculation and +2 examination</b>, falls within the aforesaid Border area.”</p>

**(Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 47(xxii))**

**I-27.** That the Syndicate has felicitated the following:

- (i) Hon’ble Mr. Justice J.S. Khehar, an illustrious alumnus of Panjab University, on having taken over as Chief Justice, Supreme Court of India, on January 4, 2017;
- (ii) Professor Ajay K. Sood, on having taken over as President of Indian National Science Academy (INSA), New Delhi w.e.f. January 1, 2017
- (iii) Professor I.B.S. Passi, former Dean University Instruction, PU, on being elected as Council Member of INSA, New Delhi w.e.f. January 1, 2017;
- (iv) Professor S.K. Mehta, Department of Chemistry and Director, SAIF/CIL/UCIM, on being awarded with prestigious Fellowship of the Royal Society of Chemistry (FRSC), London;
- (v) Prof. B. S. Bhoop, University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, on being selected for ‘Honorary Fellowship Award’ by the Punjab Academy of Sciences, Patiala;
- (vi) Dr. Jitendra Mohan, Professor Emeritus, Deptt. of Psychology, on being honoured with Life Time Achievement Award by the Indian Academy of Health Psychology;

- (vii) Prof. Indu Pal Kaur, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), on being awarded with the prestigious Fulbright-Nehru Academic and Professional Excellence (FNAPE) Fellowship for the session 2017-18, by the United States-India Educational Foundation (USIEF);
- (viii) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Sr. Lecturer in the Department of Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopedics at Dr H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences on having won the Famdent Excellency in Dentistry Awards (FEDA) for the third consecutive year on 17<sup>th</sup> December in Mumbai;
- (ix) Professor Rupinder Tewari, on release of his book entitled 'Industry-Academia R&D ecosystem in India in India' by Dr. R. Chidambaram (Principal Science Advisor to Prime Minister of India), Dr. V. Saraswat (Member, Science, NITI Ayog) and Dr. Ashutosh Sharma (Secretary, DST), during the Indian Science Congress 2017 on January 3, at Tirupati;
- (x) Babe Ke College of Education, Mudki, Distt. Ferozepur (Pb.) on being awarded CGPA 3.63 with A+ Grade by the NAAC ;
- (xi) Babe Ke College of Education, Daudhar, Distt. Moga (Pb.), on being awarded CGPA 3.57 with A+ Grade by the NAAC;
- (Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 Para 1)**
- (xii) Prof. G.S. Khush, Fellow of Royal Society (FRS), Prof. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia, Deptt. of Botany and Prof. B.S. Bhoop, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences on having been conferred Fellowship of the Punjab Academy of Sciences.
- (xiii) Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU, on having been bestowed 'Desh Bhagat Sardar Lal Singh Oration Award' by Desh Bhagat University.
- (xiv) Prof. Kanwaljit Chopra of University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU on having been sanctioned an amount of Rs. 94.25 lakhs for implementation of the project entitled 'Metagenomic and Functional Characterization of Soy-based Fermented Foods of Northeastern Region' by Department of Biotechnology, Government of India.
- (xv) Professor Sanjay Kaushik of University Business School on having been appointed as Honorary Director of ICSSR-North Western Regional Centre (NWRC), Chandigarh for a period of three years.

**(Syndicate dated 12.02.2017 Para 1)**

**I-28.** That the Syndicate has noted and approved the following:

1. Hon'ble Shri M. Hamid Ansari, Vice-President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University, has very kindly consented to deliver 66<sup>th</sup> PU Annual Convocation address on March 25, 2017. On this occasion Hon'ble Chancellor will confer five Honoris Causa degrees on eminent icons, viz., Dr. N. S. Kapany (D.Sc.), Prof. Murli Manohar Joshi (D.Litt.), Prof. G.S. Khush (D.Sc.), Mr. Justice J.S. Khehar (LL.D.), Dr. Nuruddin Farah (D.Litt.) as well as honour three awardees, viz., (i) Sahitya Rattan (Prof. Ms. Dalip Kaur Tiwana), (ii) Kala Rattan (Shri Anupam Kher) and (iii) Vigyan Rattan (Dr. P.D. Gupta).
2. Hon'ble Prime Minister of India, Shri Narendra Modi ji has sent best wishes to the Vice Chancellor, Panjab University for 2017 and has urged us to use as many digital means as possible for economic transactions and has asked us to urge others to do the same.
3. Philatelic Advisory Committee at Ministry of Communications, Government of India, Department of Posts, has recommended for release of Commemorative Postage Stamp on 'Prof. Balwant Gargi' an illustrious alumnus of Panjab University along with four other writers viz. Shri Krishan Chander, Pt. Shrilal Shukla, Dr. Bhisham Sahni and Shri K.V. Puttappa under the theme "Eminent Writers" in due course to commemorate their birth centenary. Three of the above five luminaries, viz., Shri Krishan Chander, Dr Bhisham Sahni and Professor Balwant Gargi are alumni of Panjab University while Shri Krishan Chander and Professor Balwant Gargi studied at F.C. College, Lahore, and Dr. Bhisham Sahni studied at Govt. College, Lahore and later obtained his Ph.D. from PU in 1958.
4. Ambassador of Korea to India, Mr. Cho Hyun visited Panjab University along with a delegation and delivered a special address on the topic 'Korea, India's Strategic Partner' on 23 December 2016 at ICSSR Complex. He has invited a Road Show on behalf of Panjab University and CRIKC Institutions in South Korea.

Koreans have a big presence in India when it comes to consumer goods. In north-western India, their sale is the maximum amongst all the other regions of the country and there is no Korean manufacturing. Actually, there is no activity on behalf of the corporate sector of Korea in the north-west of India which could aid the economy and part of the reason is that the Koreans, who manage these things, are unaware of what north-west India is. Mr. Cho Hyun shared that a very large number of Koreans go out of Korea to study in U.S., China and several other countries. However, only a small number to India, even though medium of instruction in most higher education institutions is English, and Koreans are comfortable with English language. Chandigarh is a natural place which should attract the foreign students. The

Ambassador wants awareness about the academic institutions in north-west to be spread in Korea so that the young people could come and study here and once they will study here, they will get familiar with the society, and the Korean companies will employ these young people here. He says that if the north-west region could have their presence, this could lead to manufacturing of Korean goods located here, as their senior managers will stay here. So, he desired that the University should take a road show to Korea, and rest of the arrangements will be done by them. The University should advertise every kind of education there at undergraduate, postgraduate, research, post doctoral level. The road show would be sponsored by the Korean Embassy. It is a challenge but it is worthwhile to try.

**(Syndicate dated 12.02.2017 Para 1( 1, 2, 14 & 15))**

5. Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, has sanctioned an amount of Rs. 2.4 crores to the Department of CIL/SAIF for purchase of ICP-Mass Spectrometer, half of the cost for Spectrometer and half for its maintenance and AMC for five years, recurring expenditure, Seminars/Workshops related to it, etc. and other academic activities which need to be organized so that the Spectrometer gets utilized by a larger community.
6. Professor N.S. Kapany has desired that the Honoris Causa Degree (D.Sc.) be presented to him during the next year's Convocation. He had earlier confirmed to come and he is now unable to come for the Convocation on March 25, 2017.
7. Shri Nuruddin Farah, recommended for the award of D.Litt. (Honoris Causa) in 2015-16, has confirmed to receive the degree at this year's Convocation on March 25, 2017. He would spend two weeks at PU Campus interacting with students, research scholars and faculty. During his stay he would deliver the PU Colloquium on March 16, 2017. As soon as he arrives, the very next day, he will deliver Panjab University Colloquium on March 16.

Justice J.S. Khehar cannot come on March 25, 2017. Dr. Kapanay cannot come. Dr. Nuruddin Farah's of last year is carried forward. So, now we have three confirmations from Professor Murlu Manohar Joshi, Dr. G.S. Khush and Dr. Nurrudin Farah. The confirmation for the three medals has also been received. All of them will give minimum one lecture. Some of them will give several more lectures. The Convocation benefit would indeed accrue not only to the University but also to many neighbouring universities. It is a good tradition to work for

**(Syndicate dated 12.02.2017 Para 1(iii, vi & vii))**

**I-29.** Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 56), the Committee in its various meetings, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses/subjects for the session 2016-17, as under:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Date of the meeting of the Committee</b>	<b>Name of the College</b>	<b>Name of the Courses/ subjects</b>
1.	08.11.2016	MBBGRGC Girls College of Education, Mansowal, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year and 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (1 unit for each year), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfil all the condition by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
2.	08.11.2016	Satyam College of Education, Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> Year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfil all the conditions latest by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
3.	08.11.2016	SGGS College of Education, Beghpur Kamlooh, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> Year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year (4 units for each year), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfil all the condition by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
4.	08.11.2016	DIPS College of Education, Tanda Urmar, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> Year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year (2 Units & 1 Units respectively), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfil all the condition by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
5.	08.11.2016	Guru Nanak College of Education, Dalewal Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> Year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year (4 Units for each year), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfil all the condition by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
6.	08.11.2016	J.S.S. Asha Kiran Special School & Teacher Training Institute, V.P.O. Jahan Khelan, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Special Education (M.R.)-1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (30 seats), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfil the condition by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection committee and NCTE including appointment of

			teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
7.	08.11.2016	Rayat Bahra College of Education, Bohan, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (2 units for each year), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfil the condition by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
8.	08.11.2016	Sant Baba Hari Singh Memorial College of Education, Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (2 unit & 3 units respectively), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfil the condition by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching and non-teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
9.	08.11.2016	Babe Ke College of Education VPO Mudki, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. Course (Three Units-150 seats) and (ii) M.Ed. Course (One unit-50 seats), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfill all the condition by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
10.	08.11.2016	Lala Hans Raj Memorial College of Education, Near Bhugipura Chowk, V.P.O., Talwandi Bhangarian Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (one unit i.e. 50 seats each), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions latest by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection shall fulfill all the conditions latest by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
11.	08.11.2016	Tagore College of Education, Jalandhar Road, Fatehgarh Korotana Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions latest by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
12.	08.11.2016	Shree Satya Sai B.Ed. College, Village-Karaiwala Tehsil-Gidderbaha Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions latest by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
13.	08.11.2016	Dasmesh Girls College of Education	M.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (50 seats each), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions

		V.P.O. Badal Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	latest by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
14.	08.11.2016	Arjan Dass College, Dharamkot, Moga	(i) B.C.A. I, II, III (40 seats each) (ii) PGDCA-40 seats (iii) B.A. III (Fashion Designing)-40 seats (iv) New Course-B.A.I (Computer Science)(Additional Optional) Module-I, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its reports, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
15.	08.11.2016	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College of Education, Sukhaanand Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions latest by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
16.	08.11.2016	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education, Gidderbaha Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> Year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (Four units i.e. 200 seats each) and M.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (one unit i.e. 50 seats each), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfill all the conditions latest by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
17.	08.11.2016	M.D. College of Education, Abohar- 152116 (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course (Two units-100 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
18.	08.11.2016	Rayat College of Education Railmajra Distt. SBS Nagar (Nawanshahar), Punjab	(i) B.Ed. Course (Two Units-100 seats), and (ii) M.Ed. Course (One unit-50 seats), subject to the conditions that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
19.	08.11.2016	Baba Kundan Rural College of Education, Kullainwal- Jamalpura Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (2 units i.e. 100 seats for each class), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.

20.	08.11.2016	Bhutta College of Education, Bhutta, Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> (2 unit i.e. 100 seats for each class), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
21.	08.11.2016	Sadbhavana College of Education for Women, Jalalwal, Raikot, Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	(i) B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year-200 seats (ii) M.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (50 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
22.	08.11.2016	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education for Women, Kamalpura Tehsil: Jagraon, Distt. Ludhiana Punjab	B.Ed. Course (1 <sup>st</sup> year) 50 seats & B.Ed. (2 <sup>nd</sup> year) 50 seats, subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
23.	08.11.2016	Nighingale College of Education, Pakhowal Road, Narangwal, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> year -100 seats (one unit), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
24.	08.11.2016	S.D. College for Women-3, Jawahar Nagar, Moga	B.A.I, II & III (Computer Science), 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.
25.	08.11.2016	Sant Darbara Singh College for Women, Lopon, Distt. Moga	M.Sc. (IT) 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> semester)-30 seats (ii) B.Com. III-60 seats, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report, failing which the temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
26.	08.11.2016	D.A.V. College, Moga	Diploma in Cosmetology and Beauty Care under Community College Scheme, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
27.	23.08.2016	D.A.V. College, Chandigarh	B.Voc. (Food Science and Technology) 2 <sup>nd</sup> year under UGC B. Voc. Program



28.	08.11.2016	D.A.V. College, Chandigarh	Diploma in Cosmetology and Beauty Care under Community College Scheme, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
29.	08.11.2016	A.S. College, Khanna Ludhiana	B.Voc. (Banking, Insurance & Retailing) and B.Voc. Multimedia (Graphics & Animation) 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> year, 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.
30.	08.11.2016	Govt. College for Girls Ludhiana	Diploma in Cosmetology and Beauty Care under UGC Community College Scheme, 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.
31.	08.11.2016	Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Civil Line, Ludhiana	Add-on course in Certificate Course in Bank Management under Career Oriented Courses Programme approved by the UGC, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report failing which the temporary of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.

**NOTE:** A Committee comprising Shri Ashok Goyal (Chairman), Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Principal B.C. Josan, Shri Raghbir Dyal, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Principal S.S. Sangha, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and D.R. Colleges (Convener) constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 56) to check the inspection report/s thoroughly and verify their compliance/s and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, has granted/not granted affiliation/extension of affiliation to the above colleges.

**I-30.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has allowed S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur, to continue the D.P.Ed. Course 1<sup>st</sup> year (50 seats) for session 2016-17, subject to the approval of the Regulatory Bodies. The matter has already been discussed with the Chairman of the affiliation committee also.

**NOTE:** The College shall not make admissions to D.P.Ed. Course-1<sup>st</sup> year from the next academic session i.e. 2017-18, without getting prior permission from the University.

**I-31.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Mata Gurdev Kaur Memorial Shahi Sports College of Physical Education, Jhakroudi, Samrala, Distt. Ludhiana, to continue the D.P.Ed. Course 1<sup>st</sup> year (50 seats) for session 2016-17, subject to the approval of the Regulatory Bodies. The matter has already been discussed with the Chairman of the affiliation committee also.

**NOTE:** The College shall not make admissions to D.P.Ed. Course-1<sup>st</sup> year from the next academic session, i.e., 2017-18, without getting prior permission from the University.

**I-32.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Govind National College, Govind Nagar, Narangwal, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab), to continue the D.P.Ed. Course 1<sup>st</sup> year (50 seats) for session 2016-17, subject to the approval of the Regulatory Bodies. The matter has already been discussed with the Chairman of the affiliation committee also.

**NOTE:** The College shall not make admissions to D.P.Ed. Course-1<sup>st</sup> year from the next academic session i.e. 2017-18, without getting prior permission from the University.

**I-33** To note the summary of the reports submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U., on various matters.

**(Syndicate dated 21.1.2017 Para 48(i))**

Professor Rajesh Gill said that her dissent be recorded on Item I-22.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that his dissent be also recorded on Item I-22.

Shri Naresh Gaur also gave his dissent on Item I-22 in writing because he wanted to leave the meeting due to some unavoidable work.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that her dissent be recorded on Item I-33 also.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said I-33.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Item I-33 has been provided as table agenda 'the summary of the report submitted by CVO' on certain matters.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they need the reports of the CVO.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested that the reports related with Item I-33 be provided to them. She said that in this item a number of complaints and CVO reports have been

mentioned and in majority of the cases, the complaints have been corroborated by the Committees. She requested to provide copies of each of these.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Rajesh Gill to convey what she wished.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the item it is mentioned that the reports have been submitted to the Vice-Chancellor, copies of the same be also provided to the members as without the copies, they could understand nothing.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether she wanted all the reports.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill said, 'yes'.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to whether she wanted all the 30 reports.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that whatever are the reports, all of those reports be provided as all have not been provided.

One of the members suggested that it could be given on demand.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whoever wanted whichever of the reports, should ask for the specific reports.

Professor Rajesh Gill said 'no'.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the CVO has conducted the enquiry and many things have been proved.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that majority of things have been proved.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that first they should expel Shri Ashok Goyal from the Senate next time since he had said that since he was raising objection, either action should be taken against him or action should be initiated against the person who has done wrong. The CVO has clearly stated that "Professor Navdeep Goyal in his written reply has stated that his brother is one of the Directors in the firm Sunrise Integrated Pvt. Ltd., Panchkula to which the contract has been given for outsourcing the manpower of Panjab University International Hostel Sector 25". But before that, Shri Ashok Goyal had said last time that Mr. Vinay Jindal is the son of real maternal uncle of Professor Navdeep Goyal. The CVO has given a twisting report about that. The Senate should ask the CVO as to why the CVO is silent on that. Whether that person is not the son of the maternal uncle of his (Professor Navdeep Goyal)? If it is not so, Shri Ashok Goyal should be expelled next time from the Senate with 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this case should be handed over to the CBI.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that this case be handed over to the CBI.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, why not.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Shri Ashok Goyal had said in the Senate that if that person is not the son of the maternal uncle of Professor Navdeep Goyal, he would himself be out of the Senate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it meant that they would expel the complainant but not the person against whom the complaint has been made.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that is this the way the enquiry has been done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) could look in to that.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have the post of CVO and this is what the CVO has done, it is to be noted. Secondly, what the other Senator has done or not and are they expelling him.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is a bias.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if one member is to be expelled, then the other member has also to be expelled. What kind of an enquiry is this? This enquiry be handed over to the CBI as Professor Navdeep Goyal has accepted that, that person is his brother.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is financial bungling.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why the CVO has not enquired whether that person is the maternal uncle's son of Professor Navdeep Goyal. Why Shri Ashok Goyal was not asked in this matter? If Shri Ashok Goyal is wrong, then he should also be expelled from the Senate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that now the charges have been proved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the charges have not been proved. He would give the CVO reports.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked, that is this the way that the Senate is being run. The item is just to note only, it should have been for consideration.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that because he is a special Senator.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that he is a special Senator.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the CVO reports would be given.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is going in all the Colleges as a nominee of the Vice-Chancellor because he has the protection of the Vice-Chancellor and many appointments have been done.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since morning they are talking about financial crunch and how to bring the University out of it. Would they turn a blind eye to it? Would nobody speak about the financial bungling?

Professor Ronki Ram said that whether it is financial bungling or one has gone with someone against the interest of the University and has caused loss to the University, whether one is a relative, that is not the question. The question is that if someone is wrong, the Senate would not pardon that person. There could be no excuse. Whatever decision had been taken and whatever Committee was formed, whatever enquiry has been conducted, it should be looked into totality.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it should be brought to the next Senate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it could not be said that till a decision in the case is not taken, the person should not be punished. This is not the question. Whatever decision the Court has taken, Shri Sibal is an experienced person and he could tell about it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, that item is over. He is talking about I-33.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that all these reports should be provided.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the item should have been C-33 for consideration and not for information.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the CVO has not recommended anything for consideration. All the CVO reports would be given to all the members, no issue at all.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he does not know whether the report has been submitted to the Syndicate or not as it is written that the report had been placed before the Syndicate. If the reports had been submitted in the Syndicate, why the same have not been provided to the members here?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the item had not been placed as a consideration item but as an information item in the Syndicate also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the CVO has not recommended any considerations on that.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the CVO has clearly mentioned.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that how does it matter whether the CVO is recommending or not.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the allegations levelled by Shri Ashok Goyal are correct.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that how does it matter that the CVO recommends or not. It is a fact.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if the allegations levelled are correct, would the punishment be given.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it could be done after looking into the report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the CVO reports are available in the office and one could go through the same.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why the CVO reports are not being made public. Why it is not being brought to the Senate?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it meant that the item was being passed without the reports and it would have been passed as it is. They are passing the items without seeing the reports.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nobody is passing anything. This is an information item.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she pointed out it otherwise it would have been passed. It is a fact.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is happy that the Vice-Chancellor also knows it.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what he knows.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why this item was not brought for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is nothing recommended in it for consideration.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Vice-Chancellor) is protecting him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nothing is being protected. Unnecessary accusations should not be put in.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that then Shri Ashok Goyal be expelled.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a matter under consideration.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this item should have been for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no matter for consideration.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Shri Ashok Goyal is serving the University for so many years and is the best person.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had said that if he is found wrong, then he should be expelled from the House.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that for future this item should be brought for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "okay, fine". All CVO reports would be put in.

**Referring to Sub-Item I-22**, Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he would like to read the full para appearing on page 42 for the House and according to him, its psychological content analysis should be done. This is case of accident occurred in the University and fortunately/unfortunately, the student is a student of Ph.D. under his supervision. The Vice-Chancellor advises people to speak after thinking, but he has levelled allegations against him (Dr. Jagdish Chander). Therefore, he would have to read the complete para: "The Vice-Chancellor said that no one believes". First of all there is an objection on it that it is not a matter of belief, it is a matter of some facts that the accident happened near the Vice-Chancellor's house. It is page 42 of the table agenda. It is written that no one believes. It is not a matter of belief, it is a matter of some facts, it is some reality. He wanted to say that its psychological content analysis should be done as to what the Vice-Chancellor wanted to say in this. After reading the content, he could not understand as to what the Vice-Chancellor wanted to say. The first line is that "the Vice-Chancellor said that no one believes". What is not the belief and about whom? An accident happened which is a reality, it is a fact. The second line is "there was an accident of Neena Capalash". It is not an accident of Dr. Neena Capalash. It was her son actually. The accident which happened of girl, that student is a very poor and she is the adopted child of the parents belonging to a

very poor socio-economic background. The accident did not occur with Dr. Neena Capalash but with her son. He wanted to correct it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is mis-spelt here.

Continuing, Dr. Jagdish Chander said that then it is written “he asked from”. He did not know whether “he” is the Vice-Chancellor or anyone else. Then he read: “he asked from Dr. Neena Caplash. She told that it was an accident and what to do”. He did not know who asked this “what to do”. Then “Dr. Neena Caplash Ji’s son was chasing; he said this and that and hit the car from the side and alleging sexual harassment. He came back and asked”. Who came and who asked and what asked is not clear. Then “the Dean of University Instruction said that he has marked the complaint to the Committee”. Which complaint? If the Vice-Chancellor allows him, he would like to tell about the language used by the Vice-Chancellor when he telephoned him (Dr. Jagdish Chander). He told that the Vice-Chancellor told him that he would be in trouble. The Vice-Chancellor telephoned and threatened him to see in the Senate on 26<sup>th</sup>. Now, he is in the Senate and what the Vice-Chancellor wanted to see, he did not know. The Vice-Chancellor had used that word that “I will see you in the Senate on 26<sup>th</sup> March”.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) is quoting out of context.

Continuing, Dr. Jagdish Chander said that they should listen. When the Vice-Chancellor had telephoned him, told all about this accident that it happened near his house. At that time, he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) did not have the complete knowledge about that accident as to what happened and what was complaint made. He (Dr. Jagdish Chander) just asked about the reason of the accident and how it happened and had no more knowledge. The first allegation levelled by the Vice-Chancellor was that he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) is a Senator, is a member of the governing body and it is he who is enticing the student. It was not he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) who was enticing the student.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) is misquoting him.

Continuing, Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the Vice-Chancellor on telephone had said this to him.

The Vice-Chancellor said, ‘no’.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that why the Vice-Chancellor had forgotten. He said that he (Vice-Chancellor) asked him on telephone. Then he said that the Vice-Chancellor should not forget and should also speak after thinking as he says the same to the people.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) is not telling the things correctly.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he be allowed to say three things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him first tell the things correctly. He said that an accident happened in front of his house. Dr. Neena Capalash’s son was driving a car. It was raining and dark. The car was coming in one direction and at a perpendicular direction one research scholar on a scooty was coming. That research scholar happens to be doing research with their Senator. The accident happened. He was at home as also his wife. It was dark and raining. They enquired after a while and came to know that the person concerned was taken to the hospital. Few days later, he asked Dr. Neena Capalash who said that the treatment is going on, etc. Three weeks later, when he was on a holiday, an e-

mail came where this girl who had an accident with that car, she alleged sexual harassment that Dr. Neena Capalash's son was chasing her, etc. and she was traveling in the same direction whereas she was travelling perpendicular to him. He asked the security person as to what happened on that day. The security person gave him a report that one person was coming from one direction and the other person was coming from the other direction (perpendicular). This is how the accident happened. So, it was purely an accident and three weeks later, a research scholar of the University makes out a sexual harassment case against the son of a Dean of the Student Welfare and it pained him (Vice-Chancellor). It is in that context that he called up him (Dr. Jagdish Chander) and said that he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) is a Senator and see as to what wrong is happening. Why there should be a sexual harassment case?

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that why the Vice-Chancellor accused him as he was not in the scene and accused him (Dr. Jagdish Chander) that he has enticed her. He wanted to clarify that there is nothing like enticement and had no knowledge as to what complaint the girl made. Secondly, what the Vice-Chancellor said to him, as a kind of order to the subordinate, that he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) must disown that student. The Vice-Chancellor had said this three times to him that he must disown that student.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a student who would indulge in this thing, why should a certain Supervisor attached to this University have students who are indulging in such things. Where is the moral responsibility of the members of the governing body of this University in a higher position and should see that their own students should not indulge in such things.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they did not know. It might be that the student must be telling correct things.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that how the Vice-Chancellor could say whether the girl is saying rightly or wrongly. He also could not say it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the student is saying wrong. He is saying so because he was at home at that time and at that time itself he enquired from the Security Guard and the entire security system has watched this and also reported to the police they were at right angle (to each other).

Dr. Jagdish Chander enquired whether the Vice-Chancellor had met the accused boy.

The Vice-Chancellor said who is the accused boy?

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the boy who had done the accident. The Vice-Chancellor is saying in detail that the boy is Dr. Neena Capalash's son and he might have met him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not met him (boy).

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that if he (Vice-Chancellor) had neither met the boy nor the girl, then how is victimization?

The Vice-Chancellor said that when prima facie they are travelling at right angle to each other and that right angle to each is seen by the University employees and they have given it in writing that it is a right angle and not coming in the same direction.



Dr. Jagdish Chander said that when one would enquire only then it could be known. He said that the Vice-Chancellor spoke that she is a criminal, she is a criminal minded person and he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) condemns that language and the para in which the Vice-Chancellor had explained this matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how could one put false sexual harassment accusations?

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that how could he (Vice-Chancellor) say it that it is a false case. Why is there a victimization?

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that let it be examined by a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not victimizing anything. In the background of technicalities, they could not have this kind of things going on in this University.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that why he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying whether anything is wrong or right.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was right angle and not parallel driving.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that it does not mean that he (Vice-Chancellor) would protect as the boy is the son of the Dean.

At this time, Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and Dr. Jagdish Chander started saying together out of which nothing could be made out.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that, that boy is the son of the Dean and could not do anything forcibly.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that on the one side is a powerful Dean of the University and on the other a poor girl and the Vice-Chancellor is defending the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is defending the Dean of the University.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that why he (Vice-Chancellor) is defending, the student is also a student of this University, she is a student of the Department of Sociology.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is defending because the false complaint has been filed.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the Vice-Chancellor is writing that "you are people of a College". Everyone has a dignity.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that what does it mean that "you are people of a College".

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he is a Ph.D. of this University and a Fellow of this University. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to respect the teachers of the Colleges and humans also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is also respecting but he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) should also respect.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he (Vice-Chancellor) is not respecting).

The Vice-Chancellor said that one should not indulge in putting false case against the Dean of the University.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that how could he (Vice-Chancellor) say that it is a false case. Any enquiry, let the enquiry report come.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the enquiry report come.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying false cases, try to listen to him.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that let the court conduct the enquiry. Since the matter is in the court and it would be known from the police as to what is right and wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the court take care of everything.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the leg of the girl is fractured at five places.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he (Vice-Chancellor) did not even enquire about the health of the girl. Is this his (Vice-Chancellor) human approach but instead protecting the accused?

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be known.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that it is not known. The Vice-Chancellor used the word criminal minded and criminal girl student.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Sexual Harassment Committee has 90 days to give the report and within that period it would be known. He (Dr. Jagdish Chander) and he (Vice-Chancellor) are here for the next 90 days and everything would be known clearly.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Vice-Chancellor is giving the judgment in advance.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the Vice-Chancellor should not give the judgment, but be human.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that a Committee could be formed and the case be given to that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Sexual Harassment Committee is already looking into the case.

Dr. Jagdish Chander requested the Vice-Chancellor to be objective.

The Vice-Chancellor said that here is a University where false cases are put against the Dean of the University, here is a University where the false cases are put by the teachers of this University against the Dean of the Management of the University/against the Dean of University Instruction, here is a University where false cases are put against Vice-Chancellor of the University.

Professor Rajesh Gill objected to it. She said, is he the judge that it is a false case.

The Vice-Chancellor said, yes.

Professor Rajesh Gill said how he (Vice-Chancellor) could be the judge. This is the Vice-Chancellor and it is a pity in this University. It is shameful. She recorded her dissent on I-22.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he did not accept such kind of statements from the Vice-Chancellor.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that this is a matter apparently he has heard for the first time. It has been mentioned that it is sub-judice, there is a complaint before a Sexual Harassment Committee. Pending the report of that Committee, how they discuss this matter in the Senate.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he (Vice-Chancellor) is giving the judgment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he talked to him (Dr. Jagdish Chander, the matter had not yet been referred to the Sexual Harassment Committee. The Dean of University Instruction is here with him.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he (Vice-Chancellor) had said to him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had said that it is not good that false cases are being put against the Dean of the University, something which is patently false should not be pursued.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that report has not yet come.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the report would come and everything would become clear and till that time, the matter had not gone to the Sexual Harassment Committee.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that when he went to the girl after getting the phone from the Vice-Chancellor, he asked the girl as to what kind of complaint she had made, rather she made available a copy of the complaint to him saying that the Sexual Harassment Committee has forbidden her not to give complaint to anybody and she did not give that complaint in spite of he being her guide. It is total biasness going under the administration of the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no biasness going on. He requested Dr. Jagdish Chander not to level accusations.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that there is biasness and the content itself shows it and that is why he had said that psychological analysis of the content should be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, he could get it done.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that there is a line "you are a senator, and you are people of a college, what the University can do".

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it should be withdrawn.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that the last line be withdrawn.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he is an elected member and has some dignity.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the last line be withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay, it is withdrawn.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that it not only be withdrawn but the Vice-Chancellor should apologize for it because he is favouring the authorities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not favouring anybody.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that this is only line where 'ji' has been used and it has not been used anywhere else.

The Vice Chancellor said that he regrets the last line. They should understand the spirit. Why are they not appreciating the spirit?

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the spirit is not objective at all.

The Vice Chancellor said that the spirit is objective. False cases are being put against the Dean of the University. How could they accept that?

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that everything would be clear in the report of the enquiry.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) could question on that as the accident happened in front of his (Vice Chancellor) house.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that as the position has been explained. Secondly, it is to be seen as to who took the victim to the hospital. If the person involved in the accident took her to the hospital, he did not deny his duty on humanitarian grounds. If it was an accident and she has been taken to the hospital well in time, why it took 29 days to lodge a complaint. She is an educated woman and woman is being empowered and in the University it is to be considered that they are empowering enough to use their rights. Right from the school, they have been taught their rights and students if they are very well spoken, it is to be considered that they are well competent, well confident and if they have used somehow wrong words, then the Act which has been provided by the society for the safety of the women, if they are making it a tool to spoil someone and if it is proved by the Committee that the complaint lodged by the girl is wrong, according to her, they should set an example that the admission of the student be cancelled. It should be a role model to the students not to lodge wrong complaints.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the girl is doing the Ph.D. on the topic of sexual harassment.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that then why it took 3 weeks. If she is pursuing her research on this very topic, she might have gone through so many review of the literature.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that in the PGI, Dr. Neena Capalash got the signature of the girl on a plain paper.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that let the Committee decide.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that this is what he is saying.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that if it is a false complaint, it has to be considered very seriously. If a person reaches a high position and allegations are levelled, it is wrong.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the signatures of the girl were taken on white/plain paper.

Professor Chaman Lal requested all the members of the Senate, most of them being the Chairpersons, to cool the tempers. Let them discuss this thing in a very cool manner. There are certain issues which are very sensitive. He also makes this mistake many times. On sensitive issues, they need not lose temper but need to calm down. Let them take it objectively. According to him, there could not be any judgment about what if the complaint has been lodged of sexual harassment, then there is a Committee which is empowered for this and they should not pass any comment on it. So whatever the Committee decides, they should trust that. According to him, the tempers have been raised because sometimes when the minutes are recorded, they become little careless. While recording the minutes, the generalised kind of statement should always be avoided. He suggested that in the general statement, this line should be avoided. He requested the Chairman of the Syndicate and the Senate as also all the Syndics that in the next meeting when the minutes are to be confirmed, these minutes should be revised and whoever feels the line offensive, that line should be changed.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the drafts minutes it is very difficult to read each and every line.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the language is very offensive.

The Vice Chancellor said that, it is just language, is that act not offensive.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he did know about it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the act is offensive. And the act is offensive because he was at home.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that, that girl is doing the Ph.D. on the subject of misuse of laws against husbands.

The Vice Chancellor said that he called him (Dr. Jagdish Chander) because he wanted the sexual harassment case to be withdrawn because if she withdraws the complaint, the matter is finished. If she did not withdraw the complaint and the complaint is false, its consequences are very serious for the complainant. It was in that context that he (Vice Chancellor) phoned him (Dr. Jagdish Chander). He also phoned Principal B.C. Josan that there is a research scholar in his College.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the girl is a student of the University and not of the College.

The Vice Chancellor said that he told Principal B.C. Josan also that the girl is registered with a staff member of his College and the case is false, when the case would go, it would harm the student more than anyone else. So, have this thing withdrawn.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he had discussed with the Vice Chancellor who had said that he wanted him (Dr. Jagdish Chander) to disown the student. He got this order. The Vice Chancellor had not talked of the solution.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested the Vice Chancellor to call Dr. Jagdish Chander in his office and find a solution to it.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he had talked to the Vice Chancellor that he could come to his (Vice Chancellor) office to which the Vice Chancellor had said 'no'.

The Vice Chancellor said that when a false case put against Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, before anybody in this University reacted, what did he do that he went straight to the DIG to see that no harm is done to the Dean of the University that a false case has been put. No one had asked him, but he went to the DIG to defend Professor Dinesh K. Gupta as also went to the IG.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the Vice Chancellor had also said to him that this was a false allegation, what to do.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the matter should be sorted out by sitting together.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Jagdish Chander) does not know about the wrong things that have been done but just pointing out a technicality. He would revise the minutes and regret that. But after that, he sincerely regrets that nobody could defend that the false cases should be put.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that he is not defending.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that even then he is telling that to save that student from very harmful consequences, the complaint should be unconditionally withdrawn otherwise her future is finished.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that their work is to build the future and not finish.

Professor Rajesh Gill sarcastically said it is very good.

The Vice Chancellor said that he wanted to protect the people.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he regret to say that the tempers are very high.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has to be high. One could not have a situation where the Vice Chancellor is accused of sexual harassment, the Dean of University Instruction is accused of sexual harassment, Dean Student Welfare is accused of sexual harassment. What is this going on in the University?

Shri V.K. Sibal said that they have an information item. They do not have an item for consideration and some facts have come out that there is a complaint with the Sexual Harassment Committee. After that, they have nothing to do and they should wait for what the Committee says and do not take any positions this way or that way so that they are not accused of being biased. The Vice Chancellor is quite right in saying that it is a false case.

The Vice Chancellor said that he wanted to see that a young person's career is not harmed. What does he do?

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he respects his (Vice Chancellor) point. If she (the girl) does not want to cooperate, she still wants to persist it, then she is to face the consequences. She is an adult human being and the Vice Chancellor has done his job, and also told whatever it is and given a message that if she persists with it and if the complaint is found false, then she would have to face the consequences, it is for her to weigh that to take a decision. So far as the Senate is concerned to weigh, they could not take any decision.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the last line should be withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that, it is already withdrawn.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the minutes should be revised.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay, it is over.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the information contained in **Sub-Items I-1 to I-21, I-23 to I-32, on the agenda**, be noted;
- (ii) the information contained in **Sub-Item I-22, on the agenda**, be noted with the modification that the last line of a paragraph that **“you are a senator, and you are people of a college, what the University can do”** be removed from the Syndicate proceedings (25<sup>th</sup> February 2017, Para 9, 9-A and 9-B); and

The following members recorded their dissent against this item:

- (1) Professor Keshav Malhotra
- (2) Shri Naresh Gaur
- (3) Professor Rajesh Gill

- (iii) **Sub-Item I-33** be placed as an item for consideration in future.

The following members recorded their dissent against this item:

- (1) Professor Keshav Malhotra
- (2) Professor Rajesh Gill

When the members requested for having zero hour, the Vice Chancellor said that it is not mandatory and if some members have any issues, they could discuss with him in the office.

G.S. Chadha  
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover  
VICE CHANCELLOR