

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Monday, 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017 at 4.00 p.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Principal B.C. Josan
3. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
4. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal
5. Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu
6. Shri Jarnail Singh
7. Professor Mukesh Arora
8. Principal N.R. Sharma
9. Professor Navdeep Goyal
10. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
11. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
12. Dr. Subhash Sharma
13. Shri Varinder Singh
14. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
15. Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha Registrar ... (Secretary)

Dr. Dalip Kumar, Professor Pam Rajput, Shri Jitender Yadav, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

### **Condolence Resolution**

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

Smt. Chanderkanta Trikha mother of Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha, former member of Senate and former President, PU Non-teaching Employees Federation, on March 15, 2017.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Smt. Chanderkanta Trikha and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

The Vice-Chancellor said that before he reads the statement, he would like to tell the members that he has sent the congratulations on behalf of the Panjab University fraternity to the new Chief Minister of Punjab before and after he took over the office and has also sought an appointment with the Chief Minister but it will take a little while. Probably, it will happen sometime after the next month. He would not be able to join for the Convocation because the Assembly Session is being held during this period. We have already put in papers to have him in the Senate and have declared him as a member of the Senate as ex-officio member as also the Education Minister. The office will send a request to nominate two MLAs. All these things are in the pipeline.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the congratulations be sent to the Chief Minister and they are having so much hope from him and let they hope that the crisis of the University is over.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the Chief Minister should be invited to some function in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has sought a meeting with him and put a request to the Chief Secretary.

## **Vice-Chancellor's Statement**

**1.** The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that –

- (i) Election Commission of India through the office of Chief Electoral Officer, Punjab, has sanctioned the proposal put up by Research Promotion Cell, Panjab University to conduct Endline Survey of Knowledge, Attitude, Practices (KAP) of citizens in the state of Punjab. Professor Ashutosh Kumar and Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal shall coordinate the survey. Office of the CEO, Punjab has accepted the proposal and will release for the above task an amount of Rs.5,45,000/-.
- (ii) Dr. Vishal Sharma, Assistant Professor, Institute of Forensic Science, has received a research project titled 'A Novel & Non-Destructive Method of Characterization, Differentiation, and Dating of Writing Ink Samples by using FTIR Spectroscopy and Chemometrics: Application to Forensic Questioned Document Examination' from Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB) (a statutory body of the DST, Govt. of India) under Extra Mural Research Funding (Individual Centric) in Physical Sciences at a total cost of Rs.25,11,520/- (Rs. Twenty Five Lakh Eleven Thousand Five Hundred and Twenty only). He is a young Assistant Professor and it is a major grant.
- (iii) School of Oriental Studies (SOAS), University of London and Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS), Mumbai, have partnered with three institutions in India, which include, Panjab University, Chandigarh, Presidency (College) University, Kolkata and South Asian University, Delhi to establish UK-India Research Methods Node: Fostering and consolidating Research training and collaboration in the Social Sciences and Humanities under the UKERI-UGC Collaboration Scheme. This is to run in Project mode for three years and is being funded by a UK-India Fund. This project would lay the foundations for more extensive research between India and UK in Social Sciences and Humanities. Prof. Ronki Ram, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor in Political Science and Fellow, PU, is the lead person from PU in this project. The broad areas identified by the project leaders are: (a) Historical and archival research (b) Development and livelihoods (c) Education, health and well-being and (d) Economic and social change.

- (iv) Professor K.N. Pathak, former Vice Chancellor of PU, has been appointed as the Chairperson of PGI Ethics Committee.
- (v) Professor V.K. Kapoor, former Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been honoured with IASTAM Gopal Das Parikh Award 2017 for his contributions in drug development by the Indian Association for the study of Traditional Asian Medicine at Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. It is kind of a lifetime achievement award.
- (vi) Shri H.K. Dua, former Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha), Former Editor-in-Chief of Hindustan Times, Indian Express, The Tribune and alumnus of Panjab University, shall deliver the Keynote Address on the theme of 7<sup>th</sup> Chandigarh Social Science Congress (CHASSCONG) titled 'Achieving Sustainable Development Goals : Opportunities, Challenges & Strategies' scheduled on March 21, 2017 at 10 a.m. in the University Auditorium.
- (vii) Shri Shekhar Gupta, Eminent Journalist, Chairman, Editor-in-Chief, Printline Media Pvt. Ltd. and alumnus Panjab University, will present the Valedictory Address on the theme of the 7<sup>th</sup> Chandigarh Social Science Congress (CHASSCONG), titled 'Achieving Sustainable Development Goals : Opportunities, Challenges & Strategies' scheduled on March 22, 2017 at 2.30 p.m. in the University Auditorium.
- (viii) The first General Body meeting of the Chandigarh Regional Innovation and Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) Society was held at PU on Sunday, February 26, 2017. On this occasion, the state-of-art video conference facility created under CRIKC in the Central Instrumentation Laboratory (CIL) was inaugurated by the CRIKC President and Vice Chancellor, PU, Prof. Arun K. Grover. This facility has been partially funded from former MPLAD grant made available by the former Member of Parliament, UT, Chandigarh and former Union Minister Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, an alumnus, PU and senior member, P.U. Senate. He has given Rs.1 crore, 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of which has been utilized for the purchase of buses and the remaining for the office equipment and other facilities.

Similarly Shri H.K. Dua had given a grant which had been utilized by the School of Communication Studies.

- (ix) Professor Jagat Ram, Head, Advanced Eye Centre, PGIMER, has taken over as Director, PGIMER. PGIMER is a member institution of Chandigarh Regional Innovation and Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), now a Registered Society.
- (x) I am concerned to bring to the attention of members of the Syndicate that a retired faculty member of PU has recently intimidated a senior most officer of the

University in discharge of his duty and carrying out orders approved by the Governing Bodies of the University. This kind of conduct causes lot of anguish and I believe the University Officers and staff need to be provided adequate support so that they can withstand intimidation and provocation(s).

The Vice-Chancellor said that this has happened in the past also by another faculty member and the entire staff of the administrative building had threatened to stage a Dharna and so on. When another person during his first year as the Vice-Chancellor, came and misbehaved with the staff and strict warning had to be given to him that this kind of action is unbecoming. Somebody who has retired can do even anything. He thought that let it be known to the governing body. Sometimes the decisions happen which somebody might not like or somebody is unhappy. But that does not mean that the officers, who are carrying out or executing the decisions taken by the governing bodies, should be threatened. This is too much. He has made available to the members the copies of the communication. One could not come and start threatening like this that he would record everything.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they could not tolerate it and the matter should be intimated to the police to take action as per law.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired as to what is the case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that his (Professor V.K. Chopra) term ended on 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017. The things are not happening according to his will and he said that he should be given the salary for the month of February. They said that since his term is over, he could go and fight in the Court. He (Professor Chopra) is under the impression that the Court has granted stay, but as such, there is no stay and it is not mentioned in that language. He did not receive any advice.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to if he (Professor Chopra) had visited the Registrar.

Shri Jarnail Singh requested the Registrar as to what had happened/transpired.

It was informed that he (Professor Chopra) came to the Registrar's office and first asked that he wanted to meet him (Registrar). Since he had to go somewhere he told that he would meet him in the afternoon. Later, he (Professor Chopra) came to his office and started saying that as to why his salary is not being paid. He (Registrar) tried to explain to him (Professor Chopra) that he is already aware of his case and is in communication with the Vice-Chancellor and all the communications have been provided to him. The case has been considered by the Syndicate and the Syndicate has already taken a decision on it. Once the minutes are approved, the same would be uploaded on the website and he (Professor Chopra) could have a look at the same and he would also be informed. He (Professor Chopra) said that how could he wait. He said that he has to save the University, the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar have done this and that and made all sorts of allegations. He (Registrar) said that he has already explained to him (Professor Chopra) where the matter stands

and he (Professor Chopra) has already approached the Court and the matter is sub-judice. Once it is finalized, the same would be responded to accordingly. By that time, Dr. Neeru Malik also came in his office and then he had to tell him (Professor Chopra) that he has conveyed him all about his case and he has nothing more to inform him. Not happy with the response, he (Professor Chopra) started threatening him that he would see him and take this to the Court that he (Registrar) has committed contempt of the court. He (Registrar) said that he has been directed by the Syndicate and Senate and that has been communicated to him (Professor Chopra).

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he (Professor Chopra) should not be allowed to enter any office now if such is his behavior.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Chopra) should not be allowed to enter the administrative office building at all. He (Professor Chopra) should not be permitted.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if he (Professor Chopra) could do it with the Registrar, he could do it with the staff also.

It was informed that he (Professor Chopra) had gone and spoken to the Deputy Registrar Establishment also, who is a lady and she has also complained to him (Registrar) that he (Professor Chopra) had come to her and demanded reasons for not releasing his (Professor Chopra) salary. She explained that she has no role in it as it is the Syndicate/Senate's decision.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he (Professor Chopra) should be banned from all the offices.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the security staff could be directed not to allow his (Professor Chopra) entry.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that banning the entry of a person is not a good thing but if such is the behavior, what they could do.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that till date, the University has not banned the entry of anyone.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this is the only solution.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that his (Professor Chopra) misbehavior should be condemned

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it should be condemned and it is unacceptable.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it should be condemned on behalf of the Syndicate.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the orders should be given to the Security Officer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is unacceptable, the Syndicate disapproves such a behavior and he (Professor Chopra) is advised that anything that he wishes to communicate to the office, he would do it

only in writing and would not personally visit any officer and no personal enquiries.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the resolved part should be given to the Chief Security Officer.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if he (Professor Chopra) wished to come, he should take the permission.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Chopra) would seek the permission of the Registrar to meet any officer or the staff in the University.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that a circular should also be sent that nobody should accommodate him (Professor Chopra).

The Vice-Chancellor said that the circular should be sent with a polite and firm language so that a message could be given because he (Professor Chopra) accuses anybody.

**This was agreed to.**

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it could also teach a lesson to other also.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is no such other person.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that someone like such a person could come up later.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Convocation is on schedule, i.e., 25<sup>th</sup> March. The Chancellor would be in the University from 11.45 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. Earlier, Professor Murli Manohar Joshi was to arrive on 25<sup>th</sup> but now he has sent a message that he is arriving on 24<sup>th</sup> and he would be a guest of the Hon'ble Governor, stay in the Raj Bhawan and would come to the University the next day morning. As the members know that he (Professor Joshi) is delivering a valedictory address at the CRRID which is also hosting a dinner in his honour on 24<sup>th</sup>. The Convocation is shaping up well. Dr. Nuruddin Farah has delivered a lecture and Dr. P.D. Gupta and Dr. Khush are also likely to deliver the lecture.

Principal I.S. Sandhu requested that all the students whose viva-voce is held till date be provided the degrees at the Convocation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the viva-voce of a student has been held up to 24<sup>th</sup> evening or by 10.00 a.m. on 25<sup>th</sup>, the degrees would be given.

Most of the members termed it as a very good decision.

It was informed that except about 40-45 students, all the other cases have been cleared.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could be difficult for the office to prepare the degree in the case of the students whose viva is to be held on 25<sup>th</sup>.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that any of the examiners must not have given the date for viva on 25<sup>th</sup> due to the Convocation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the cases whose viva is held up to 24<sup>th</sup> evening, the degree would be awarded. Dr. Dalip Kaur Tiwana would also be delivering the colloquium. Professor Murli Manohar Joshi would also be requested to deliver a lecture. It is not just awarding a degree. Let the benefit of the scholarship of national icons be felt by everybody.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as the University is holding the Convocation, some other Colleges are also holding the Convocations. Degrees of some of the students have not been sent. The DAV College is holding its Convocation on 23<sup>rd</sup> and he has come to know through a girl student that the University has stopped the work of the degrees of the College on the plea that first the work of the degrees of the University students has to be finished. He requested that the degrees of the Colleges should also be sent.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the College's work should also be done simultaneously.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a letter of sanction of Rs.21.72 crores has been received on Friday. He has sent an advance copy of the Resolution of the Senate to the Director, Higher Education. The Registrar would further communicate with the UGC Chairman and the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development. Till yesterday, the Supreme Court had not uploaded as to when the SLP would come up for hearing. At the moment, it is not clear as to which date the SLP would come up. They are keeping a watch on it. At the moment, Justice Saron has not uploaded his observations relating to the deliberations of 15<sup>th</sup> March as there was a very long deliberation and that is related to as to what would happen in the Supreme Court.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is very unfortunate that the Government and University is fighting in the High Court and the Supreme Court. They could use their good offices to get the matter resolved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that until there is openness, nothing could be done. The Punjab Government distributed money under RUSA. 50% of the money had been distributed. Except the Government College, Ludhiana, no money has given to the grant-in-aid Colleges affiliated with the Panjab University.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the meeting of RUSA is being held in Delhi and the DPI has gone to attend it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in spite of so many Colleges of Panjab University getting 'A' grade, no money has been given. This is for what he has sought a meeting and would prepare a presentation, a copy of the same would give to all the members so that whatever one could build pressure, should do it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired whether with the release of the grant, the deficit of year 2016-17 would be cleared.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be cleared.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that efforts could be made to prepare the provisional balance sheet of the University before 15<sup>th</sup> April so that before the next date of hearing in the Court, they could present their status.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could try it.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Dr. Vishal Sharma, Assistant Professor, Institute of Forensic Science, on having received a grant of Rs.25,11,520/- for the research project titled 'A Novel & Non-Destructive Method of Characterization, Differentiation, and Dating of Writing Ink Samples by using FTIR Spectroscopy and Chemometrics: Application to Forensic Questioned Document Examination' from Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB) (a statutory body of the DST, Govt. of India);
  - (ii) Professor K.N. Pathak, former Vice Chancellor of PU, on having been appointed as the Chairperson of PGI Ethics Committee;
  - (iii) Professor V.K. Kapoor, former Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on having been honoured with IASTAM Gopal Das Parikh Award 2017 for his contributions in drug development by the Indian Association for the study of Traditional Asian Medicine;
  - (iv) Professor Jagat Ram, Head, Advanced Eye Centre, PGIMER, on having taken over as Director, PGIMER.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (i), (iii), (vi), (vii), (viii) and (x) be noted and approved; and

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Syndicate disapproves the behavior of Professor Chopra and he be advised that anything that he wishes to communicate to the office, he would do it only in writing and would not visit personally any officer. He would seek the permission of the Registrar to meet any officer of the University. A circular to that effect be issued to officers of Administrative Block and Chief of University Security.



**Recommendations of Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016**

**2.** Considered and,

**RESOLVED:** That, the following recommendations of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016 **as per appendix-I**, be approved:

1. to 2 xxx xxx xxx
3. Postgraduate Diploma in Women's Studies (Semester System) regular course be reintroduced in the Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies and Development from the academic session 2017-18.
4. the Regulations/Rules for the above said Postgraduate Diploma be the same as at page 178 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.
5. number of seats be 15
6. xxx xxx xxx

**NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council has approved the recommendation (No.19) of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016.

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

**Post-facto approval of appointment of Mr. Aman Moudgil as Guest Faculty in UILS,**

**3.** Considered that the appointment of Mr. Aman Moudgil as Guest Faculty in UILS, be approved post-facto as a special case and the honorarium @ Rs.1000/- per lecture subject to the maximum ceiling of Rs.25000/- p.m., be released w.e.f. 21.07.2016, to meet with the audit objection and to avoid the hardship to him, under Regulation 8 appearing at page 113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The appointment of Mr. Aman Moudgil was approved as Guest Faculty, as a special case for teaching the subject of French w.e.f. 21.07.2016 by the Vice-Chancellor as proposed/recommended by the Director, UILS, as there was no qualified teacher to teach French.

2. The audit has observed that Guest Faculty be appointed strictly as per UGC norms and if qualified candidate is not available then the case be put up to the governing body for consideration and payment of honorarium.

3. Regulation 8 appearing at page 113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, is reproduced as under:-

“Nothing in these Regulations prevents Senate from appointing in special cases, short term or temporary teachers with special terms and conditions of service.”

4. An office note containing the brief history of the case is enclosed (**Appendix-II**).

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that the rules made for the University; are also being implementing in the constituent Colleges also. He feels that these are harmful for them in the constituent Colleges. For example, at the University if there is a lecture, they put a person on duty for one lecture. But, in their (Constituent College) case it is not so. They had given 3-4 periods to each person on guest faculty. They Full workload is being given to the guest faculty. They are giving sufficient amount of Salary to them. No other college gives so much money as they are giving. One problem is being faced that, the person whom they appoint as guest faculty, they have allocated 3 or 4 periods, not less than 3 periods, or they had full periods. A person they had on guest faculty at many places had 4 periods. Suppose a person had 3 periods in a day and he comes on duty for 9 days, then he had 27 lectures. They cannot deduct his salary. Where as full time, part-time and temporary teachers. Full time teacher can take one leave only and if he takes one to two leaves, his salary is deducted. They cannot stop this. Suppose he had a teacher and his mother is having problem of cancer at the initial stage. He cannot refuse leave on humanitarian ground to such person. Suppose that type of teacher remains on leave for 15-20 days, he gets salary of Rs. 25,000. Therefore, they will have to change this rule to be applicable at Constituent Colleges. As they have temporary posts in DAV College, S.D. College and other colleges, he is not saying that it may be done at the Registrar's level or Vice-Chancellor's level. He doesn't mind. The Principals of the constituent colleges be allowed to appoint persons on temporary basis for a session or semester as are appointed in other colleges. He is not saying that their salary be reduced, give them 25,800 or 21,600 basic what is being given to guest faculty, so that they may take full work from them. He will also have one leave for a month like other temporary teachers. If he comes 2 or 4 days, students also thought not take leave because otherwise students would suffer.

The Vice Chancellor said that if MoU is done with Punjab Government, full money is given to them then there is no problem, otherwise there is no benefit of imposing rules after doing walk-in interview.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu saidn suppose they have two sanctioned posts vacant, it would not matter to those who had a big college but he had a small college and they required two-three teachers only. In future, if he had to start M.A. Strength of students may increase to 1000, 1500 or 2000. For teaching 1500 to 2000 students, they need minimum 6 teachers of Punjabi and 4-5 teachers of English. They will always have to have guest teachers. At that place as in other colleges, they be given amount of guest faculty but the nomenclature may be changed by changing the rules and regulations.

Professor Mukesh Arora asked if they been given full salary.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that they will take, how he can change it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal agreed with Dr) I.S. Sandhu. He added that in the University Institute of Legal Studies and in

Department of Laws, they had given the designation as part-time faculty for the guest faculty and they are also teaching two or two plus classes on part-time basis.

It was informed that the part-time concept is actually for the practicing lawyers. That is prescribed by the Bar Council of India (BCI) that where the procedural aspect has to be taught to the students. It has to be by the practicing lawyers. In the case of guest faculty, actually they have to have a kind of contract, contractual appointment, so that there should be a contract between the employee and the college defining all terms and conditions. And in this case, he is right in the sense that now Rs. 1000 per lecture is paid but the workload is for 100 lectures, so after delivering 25 lectures even then that teacher has to be paid Rs. 25,000 or even if he is going to deliver 60 lectures he is going to be paid Rs. 25,000.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the contract should be done.

It was informed that it is always better a contract should be devised.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Sub-Committee be formed, before the next semester and the Sub-Committee should come up with the concrete proposal well before the next session.

It was informed that rather it should be extended to. There are so many problems occur only at level of audit. They don't have any distinction between what is requirement for temporary employment and others.

The Vice Chancellor proposed that they must do it in the meeting of the Board of Finance. Next month there is a meeting of Board of Finance, so it is better that the matter is resolved in the Board of Finance. They make a committee and bring the proposal.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in the Government Colleges, the people are contacted with the Supreme Court, they are working against such posts. See what their provisions are, how they are doing there.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that their post is purely part-time.

Professor Navdeep Goyal agreed that a sub-committee be formed which would explore all that what they are saying and make a proposal.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had a concept, within India they can give up to Rs. 40,000 to them. Try to work out the plan. They will give them Rs. 40,000 and take the maximum work from them by defining the working conditions.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they fix it at Rs. 25,000 there will be problem again, he was in agreement with the proposal of the Vice Chancellor.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that his issue is that they get Rs. 25,000 even coming for 8 days only.

The Vice Chancellor said that a committee has to be formed. Dean, College Development Council and Finance & Development Officer should be there. He will also include 2-3 Principals.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in some of the constituent colleges there are some teachers of such category who were not paid salary for 7 months. They may also be included in that and their problem be looked.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that there are some subjects in which they have taken the approval of the Panjab University and two nominees of the University, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Yog Raj also attended it. As no eligible person came in subject of Commerce, then they had to take the services of an ineligible person. Similarly, in Computer no College had an eligible person, same is the case in English subject. This is what was approved. Their problem is what Shri Jarnail Singh has told, that they have passed the orders that they could not get the salary because the persons were ineligible. If even a single eligible person had come they would have kept that eligible person. If no eligible person had come only then they had kept ineligible person. That had not been approved by the Registrar because of being ineligible persons. He thinks that they were approved by 31<sup>st</sup> December. That should have been approved for the full session. Otherwise, the process will have to be done all over again. If they have been approved, than the approval should be applicable up to the end of the session.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it may be put in the further resolved part that how many such cases are there and their appointment may be got approved today.

The Vice Chancellor said that from whom they had taken work, they must be paid.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said they used to do it up to the last working day. When there is 1<sup>st</sup> holiday, they relieve them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it may be put in further resolved of Item No.3.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the persons who were appointed in Ludhiana through selection, after one month their approval were received from the Vice Chancellor Office. He thinks only then they were allowed to join.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said they also allow joining after 3 months.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that those persons suffer.

The Vice Chancellor said that if any person had taken classes, give them money. The persons who had taught by taking attendance, University would take care to pay them. Otherwise that would be unfair. It's Rs. 25, 000 only they cannot give more than this. So, it is the responsibility of Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu for getting the committee formed and give the output well before the Board of Finance meeting.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said okay.

**RESOLVED:** That the appointment of Mr. Aman Moudgil as Guest Faculty in ULS, be approved post-facto as a special case and the honorarium @ Rs.1000/- per lecture subject to the maximum ceiling of Rs.25000/- p.m., be released w.e.f. 21.07.2016, to meet with the audit objection and to avoid the hardship to him, under Regulation 8 appearing at page 113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee comprising of Dean, College Development Council, 2-3 Principals, Finance and Development Officer be constituted to work out the modalities for the appointment of guest faculty/part-time faculty in the Constituent Colleges.

### Deferred Item

**4.** Considered if Dr. Manjit Singh, Professor (Re-employed), Department of Sociology, be treated as on Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 16.12.2016 to 05.02.2017, as he did not resume his duty on 16.12.2016 after availing the of EOL w.e.f. 18.07.2016 to 15.12.2016.

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 6.02.2017 is enclosed.
  2. Dr. Manjit Singh was granted re-employment on contract basis w.e.f. 04.03.2013 upto attaining the age of 65 years i.e. 16.02.2018 by the Senate in its meeting dated 29.09.2013 (Para LXX(R-3)).
  3. He was granted leave without pay w.e.f. 10.02.2014 to 15.05.2014 (95 days) and again w.e.f. 18.07.2016 to 15.12.2016 (151 days) i.e. total leave without pay availed=246 days.
  4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.10.2013 (Para 5) has resolved that the teacher re-employed after superannuation, be entitled to 20 days Casual Leave (any time), Special Casual Leave for 10 days and Special Academic Leave for 30 days and Duty Leave as per University Rules and Regulation except Half Pay Leave and Commuted Leave. In addition, Extra Ordinary Leave without pay not exceeding one year be also allowed to the incumbent.
  5. Dr. Manjit Singh vide application dated 15.12.2016 requested for extension in leave without pay w.e.f. 16.12.2016 to 15.02.2017. The Academic and Administrative Committee in its joint meeting dated 28.12.2016 considered his request and resolved that the re-employed teacher be entitled of half pay leave and commuted leave in addition Extra Ordinary Leave without pay not exceeding one year be also allowed to the incumbent. But his request was not acceded to by the Vice-Chancellor. A copy of application dated

15.12.2016 along with minutes of the Committee dated 28.12.2016 and order dated 02.02.2017 are enclosed.

6. He joined back his duty on 06.02.2017 with request to regularize his leave without pay period between 16.12.2016 to 05.02.2017 (52 days), and the Vice-Chancellor has referred the case to the Syndicate.
7. An office note enclosed.

The Vice Chancellor said that again it is a tricky matter of a re-employed Professor. They (the re-employed Professors) are supposed to adhere to the certain discipline of teaching. So, it would be expected that when an academic session is on and they are part of the time-table and they have to take leave. Leave should be for a reason, which should be valid reason as somebody is extremely sick, he can understand, if there is academic exigency, he can understand. But taking a leave because he had to participate in something which had nothing to do with academic purpose and then he will come back in the middle of the session and say he should be allowed to join. So, he (Vice Chancellor) felt that, it is not an academic activity for which he had kept himself away. Given participation is to some other thing, other than the academics and then he is seeking benefit, that is not fair. He personally felt uncomfortable allowing such a person to join and resume duty, at least during this semester. So that is the reason he marked it to the Syndicate, the Governing Body also could be questioned as to what they are to prove. That was the reason matter is before them. So, they wish to take the call now, fine. Otherwise, they want to go through the agenda, come back to it by the end of the meeting. Even that is okay. So, they want to discuss a little bit and then come back to it at the end of the meeting. Even that is fine.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said has he joined back.

The Vice Chancellor said that he wanted to join back but he (Vice Chancellor) did not allow his joining back.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there is a letter from the head of the Department which is a joining report marked to the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that similar case was earlier done. That was Nahar Singh's case.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that they have done earlier but they have their reservations on that.

The Vice Chancellor said that one thing they see which is appropriate. Inappropriate becomes the norms. Inappropriate cannot be there.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that he had objected Nahar Singh's case also.

Shri Jarnail Singh said actually Dr. Manjit Singh remained PUTA President also. Both are different cases. They will discuss it later on.

The Vice Chancellor said that they may consult each other and inform him. He has explained them his reasons why he had marked to the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the item be deferred till the next meeting and Dr. Manjit Singh be not allowed to join till then.

**Evaluation of research work of Dr. Inderjit Singh for award of D.Sc. degree**

5. Considered examiner reports (**Appendix-III**) of (i) Professor J.N. Agrewala, (ii) Professor Jairoop Singh and (iii) Dr. R.K. Tuli, in respect of evaluation of research work of Dr. Inderjit Singh for award of D.Sc. degree by Panjab University, Chandigarh, under Regulation 4 at page 198 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 4 at page 198 of P.U. Cal. Volume-II, 2007 reads as under:

“The work submitted shall be referred to three examiners nominated by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor.”

2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-III**).

The Vice Chancellor said that Panjab University has something unique that they can ask to be awarded a D.Sc degree on the basis of their life time. It is again a British tradition, British used to have a Ph.D degree and D.Sc degree. After a Ph.D degree they can seek D.Sc. degree on the basis of their lifetime work. That is there in the calendar, for that there is a procedure which has to be gone through. So, Professor Inderjit Singh, very senior professor, he attended to his lecture. So, he desires to have a D.Sc. degree. Dr. Kohli had also a D.Sc degree.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the recommendations of the examiners, **as per Appendix**, be approved; and
- (ii) D.Sc. degree to Dr. Inderjit Singh, under Regulation 4 at page 198 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, be awarded.

**Reconstitution of PUCASH**

6. To re-constitute the Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) for the term of two years i.e. w.e.f. 01.08.2017 to 31.07.2019, as the tenure of present PUCASH will expire on 31.07.2017.

**NOTE:** The decision of the Syndicate dated 20.09.2015 (Para 33)(viii)) and the Senate dated 05.12.2015 vide Para XLI (R-6)) with regard to approval of PUCASH for the term w.e.f 01.08.2015 to 31.07.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

The Vice Chancellor said that they have that Committee of PUCASH right now. Its term would end on July, 2017. But since it has gone through Senate and Syndicate and Senate meeting does not happen frequently. So, he thought to start with that process, now. So, his advice is that they should form a sub-committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he thinks they should form a sub-committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that his advice is to form a sub-committee of Syndicate. They will bring it in the next Syndicate meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in that Professor Pam Rajput be made Chairperson.

The Vice Chancellor said she had not come today.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Professor Navdeep Goyal may be made members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even then she be made Chairperson and PUTA and PUSA Presidents be also included.

The Vice Chancellor said that any other who volunteer as member.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma volunteered to be a member.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that include any member.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the Vice Chancellor may include anyone as member.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay, they give him making this in the next Syndicate meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that actually madam (Professor Pam Rajput) has not come today. She will come tomorrow, she will be told tomorrow.

The Vice Chancellor said that bring it in the next Syndicate meeting. The way the things are moving, he will have to have minimum one Senate meeting after a month.

**RESOLVED:** That the following Committee be constituted to suggest the names for PUCASH to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting:

1. Professor Pam Rajput (Chairperson)
2. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
3. Professor Navdeep Goyal
4. Principal Gurdip Sharma
5. President, Panjab University Teachers Association
6. President, Panjab University (Non-Teaching) Staff Association
- Deputy Registrar (Estt.) (Convener)



**Issue regarding degrees of 7.  
EIILM & CMJ Universities**

Considered if,

- (i) the admissions of the candidates, sought for the session 2016-17 on the basis of their having passed their qualifying examinations from the E.I.I.L.M. University, Sikkim prior to the session 2014-15 be confirmed as the said University is not functioning since December 2014; and
- (ii) the degree/s of the E.I.I.L.M. University, Sikkim be derecognized w.e.f. the session 2014-15; and
- (iii) request of Shri Vinod Kumar (**Appendix-V**), Assistant Professor, Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City with regard to look into the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.07.2013 and allow the passed out students from CMJ University to continue their study in the Panjab University.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.07.2013 (Para 46) (**Appendix-V**) has decided that the degree/s awarded by C.M.J. University, Shillong (Meghalaya), irrespective of year of award of degree, which are placed or are to be placed before the Registrar or Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate after 12.06.2013, be not granted equivalence.

2. The item as at (i) & (ii) above was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 21.01.2017 (Para 33) (**Appendix-V**) for consideration and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred and this item along with the matter related to CMJ University be also placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

3. The Vice-Chancellor passed orders that Dean (Law), Chairperson, Department of Laws, Syndicate members from Law Faculty may study/examine the request of Shri Vinod Kumar and put up a note.

Accordingly, a Committee constituted by the Dean, Faculty of Law, in its meeting held on 13.02.2017 authorized the Dean, Faculty of Law and Chairperson, Department of Laws to prepare a detailed note to be sent to the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Committee. A copy of the minutes dated 13.02.2017 along with the said detailed note enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

The Vice Chancellor said that there is again an item which requires little careful deliberation because that had serious subject matter with several poor deliberations. So in view of that he doesn't know how many of them tried to read it carefully and tried to understand it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had understood it, he will tell. First of all one is to talk about the E.I.I.L.M. University, Sikkim. There UGC sent a committee, which found out that the University is closed from 2014-15. So, obviously whatever they had got that is it was de-recognized w.e.f. 2014-15 only and any University which was recognized earlier by UGC and the degrees which had been given by the University, those cannot be de-recognized. So, obviously their degrees before 2014-15, one had to recognize and after 2014-15 they can not recognize.

The Vice Chancellor said that but they had denied admission to some students prior to it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in that they had formed a committee and Dean, Faculty of Law was also there. If you see on page 43, what they (Dean Law) said, "Nobody/Authority is competent to take decision to de-recognize a degree/course retrospectively." Therefore, a University which had been recognized by the UGC once and a degree has been given by that University that cannot be derecognized until and unless the University is de-recognized and from whatever date the University is recognized, after that the degree can be derecognized.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had denied the students on those grounds.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the second part of that is clear and, as far as that was taken for CMJ University, that decision should also be taken. Because that decision was very clearly taken by the Syndicate on 27<sup>th</sup> July, 2017 that was on the basis of show-cause notice and order of 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017, which has already been quashed. The decision taken on the basis of that order is wrong as it has been quashed in the High Court and Supreme Court also. The second thing is that if they say retrospective degrees that is also wrong. They would have to revoke that decision, they cannot do that. Because, in case of CMJ University, even now after all the Courts proceeding, Meghalaya Government has allowed admission for the session 2015-16. It is clear, that is all attached. When the admission is going on, University is continuing and is in the UGC list of recognized Universities. Not in the de-recognized list but in the recognized list. When that is the position, the degree of that University cannot be derecognized. The issue of that University (E.I.I.L.M. University, Sikkim), which was recognized after a particular year, that year's onward degrees can be de-recognized not that of previous.

Shri Varinder Singh said the previous degrees were cancelled.

The Vice Chancellor said that what will be done to the degree of Vinod Kumar Ji.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that degree will be accepted. That will be strictly accepted.

Shri Varinder Singh said that had they seen all terms. Anu Chatrath and others were members of that committee.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that otherwise is it the decision of the court that the old degrees be not recognized.

Professor Navdeep Goyal no, it is not.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that earlier at many places they had not allowed.

The Vice Chancellor said that even the decision of the Syndicate banning of admission in that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the decision was wrong.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is illegal, therefore, needs to be reviewed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are reviewing it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the problem is that these students will block all the seats of the Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they (Universities) are in different areas. Not one, so many Universities are there. A number of them are in Rajasthan as well as other places. If they have to protect the interest, they may propose for an Entrance Test, if such problem is there.

The Vice Chancellor said that arising out of it is Entrance Test may be started.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that must be done. From where there is no complaint particularly or in all courses, either they may recommend that the faculties Arts, Science or whatever may be, they should recommend entrance test for admission to Panjab University. That problem is of different Universities. Now the situation is there are lots of private universities, lots of deemed Universities, even to the extent, he is talking about Thapar University. The marks of the Thapar University are much more than what average marks they give at Panjab University. So, if they talk about the different courses, if they go for an entrance test that is a better solution.

The Vice Chancellor said that or the percentage should be more.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that if the entrance test be done only in the private universities.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that regarding percentage, there are many Universities, how they can equate their own (Panjab University) topper to other Universities topper. Problem will come in percentage.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they can do the entrance test. They had introduced entrance test many times in the last 10 years, but they could not stick to it. The reason was that they do it for P.G. Courses and colleges are also with them, the no. of students does not qualify the test as compared to number of seats they (colleges) had. Ultimately, they do that they come to the same. They can see the previous years' record.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said but, what they are saying for the campus that is right.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that do it for the campus and not for the colleges.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu asked that how?

Shri Jarnail Singh said entrance test for admission to P.G. Courses.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they may add in that.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that so, take the decision that is to be implemented. It may not happen that they would have to withdraw.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that is right.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they would take the decision unanimously. But, he wants to say that a lot of selection committees had rejected it. They do not agree for Ph.D. He had also told this and they (Panjab University) used to send Vice Chancellor's nominee. Most of the work had been done. Second thing is, once you (Vice Chancellor) were chairing the Syndicate, it is the matter of his (Vice Chancellor) tenure, when he was also there. He was fighting for a student to be registered for Ph.D. under Kirti Vardhan Ji for not giving permission by Tomar Ji of Mathematics Department. Almost after one year, the permission was given that the student can do Ph.D under Kirti Vardhan ji. When he told to that student, who was a teacher of a college of our Panjab University, he told him to do the Ph.D., after one year under (Kirti Vardhan) as he had been given the permission. He told him (Professor Mukesh Arora) that he had taken the degree from CMJ. Within one year, he was fighting till then, he had taken the degree. It is reality. Then he asked, he is saying on record, he wanted to do Ph.D. under Professor Dr. Kirti Vardhan but he had shown the degree from CMJ University. When put in court, he was asked whether he wanted to do Ph.D. from here again. This had happened at many places, degrees were taken. They (CMJ University) gave the degrees to more students than they had the professors. They may do if they want. He had just quoted an example. The Student repented later on.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he (Kirti Vardhan) wanted to do Ph.D. again because that University had derecognized.

The Vice Chancellor said that those candidates they (Panjab University) had rejected will come and say that why they were rejected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that is alright, Syndicate had taken decision and Courts took decisions also, they are also reviewed.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that in that it is, it was the decision of the Syndicate. They will have to do as far as it was the decision of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that many time that happens in the Court also. The decision may be reviewed only then they had benefit.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that either all cases be done. All rejected cases be allowed again.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the degree should be valid.

The Vice Chancellor said that previous cases (before de-recognition) would not be rejected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that back date cases will not be rejected only after the date of de-recognition cases will be rejected. It will be seen by the Departments, if they had to protect it. If they want to introduce entrance test, they may do it. It should be applicable to Campus only.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that entrance test should not be colleges as they had to take it back later on.

The Vice Chancellor said let the Syndicate recommend that this matter (regarding entrance) be put up to the Chairpersons and then Faculty-wise they should give a recommendation.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu asked what the resolved part was.

The Vice Chancellor said that the resolved part was that what had happened in the past, had happened. Now, since, upto a certain year everything is valid, degrees upto that date are valid, even though they had not permitted them to be valid in the past. If those people apply, those cannot be disqualified.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said because CMJ University was disqualified for 2015-16.

The Vice Chancellor said that they cannot be disqualified. As regards admission in the campus, in the last year they had not permitted those candidates because those candidates were coming with very high percentages. They were sort of filling all the sections in the University. So the Departments felt very uncomfortable that from only one University all the student coming. So, they go back, Syndicate recommend that let this issue be placed before the Chairpersons forum, let them discuss it and if they want to introduce an entrance exam, in order to be protective about good candidates joining the University. Otherwise, there will be students from one University only and even the old students who could not get admission in the previous year; they all will choke the Departments. That will cause a problem once again. So, faculty-wise advise them and get the recommendations from them and do it fast.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that that will be sent to there Chairpersons that what they have to do in the admission in the next course. As far as degrees are concerned, if they are recognized that is not their accountability.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the decision regarding degree is done by them (Syndicate). They (Chairpersons) would be told that because of the fact of legal reasons, those are being done valid. But because of fact they foresee any problem, solution is entrance test. They can think for that.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that how it will be done in Ph.D. cases.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is no issue of Ph.D. Ph.D. is only for jobs. If they are not good then don't appoint them. It is very simple.

Principal N.R. Sharma said even in some cases in had been seen the degree comes within 6 months. He thought it will not be justified.

Principal B.C. Josan said that if it has been approved by the Supreme Court, what they can do.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that as they are putting some condition for PG courses, like that they can put condition there (in cases of Ph.D.).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that ultimately it is looked by the University Grants Commission. The eligibility for lectureship and Assistant Professors, if they (UGC) do it through NET, then there remains no issue and if in addition to this they are allowed through Ph.D., that selection committee have to see that candidate is good or not. It is simple issue.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the admissions of the candidates, sought for the session 2016-17 on the basis of their having passed their qualifying examinations from the E.I.I.L.M. University, Sikkim prior to the session 2013-14 be confirmed; and
- (ii) the degree/s of the E.I.I.L.M. University, Sikkim be derecognized w.e.f. the session 2014-15; as the said University is not functioning since December 2014; and
- (iii) the degree/s awarded by C.M.J. University, Shillong (Meghalaya) be recognized till the session 2015-16 as per the recommendation of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the matter for granting admission in the Panjab University campus to the students possessing the degree of Universities like E.I.I.L.M. AND CMJ, be referred to the Chairpersons meeting/Faculties so that a decision can

be taken to conduct entrance test in different courses for making admission at Panjab University Campus.

**Formation of Committee for revision of rents of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues**

**8.** Considered if, a new Committee, be constituted to examine the issue, relating to revision of rents of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues in totality.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 22.02.2014 (Para 43) considered the minutes dated 03.09.2013 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding revision of rent of Auditorium, Seminar Halls and Lawns etc. and it was resolved that a Committee comprising Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Karamjit Singh and Dr. Dalip Kumar be constitute to examine the issue in totality and make recommendations.

2. An office note containing the brief history of the case is enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in this item, they are talking about the revision of rent of auditoria, Seminar Halls, and Lawns etc. But, they could see one clear problem i.e. there are no uniform rules when they had to give those auditoria and there is another problem that University faces, i.e., officer in-charge does not know which programmes are going on in the University simultaneously and the programmes are going on in those auditoria, etc. So, he thinks that they need to form a committee that not only looks into the rent part but should also frame rules. When they say auditoria are to be given, how those are to be given and he thinks all the auditoria should be given by one authority only. They may form rules as far as Department auditoria are concerned in that case they may give some authority to the Department to use that and if a booking is to be made by the central authority, before booking they will ask the Department, Department need not to book that, in those Departments who had their own auditorium. But if the Department had to book the auditorium, it can do. If outsiders have to book, they book through central authority. The only thing that needs to be looked into it is that if the Department needs for its internal use, they will not ask for permission, but who has to book it will ask from the Department whether auditorium is available or not. And the booking for the outsiders should be from one authority. Like this they will have to make provision or rules so that the Committee they form that should look into all these aspects.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that his request is that it is of 3.9.2013. First they should agree in the Syndicate that more than 3 years are gone when the committee was constituted. And what thereafter they formed the committee, as Navdeep Ji says, to review that, but now more increase should have been there. What the increase was done before 3 year, they should have accepted this first and after that committee should be formed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked that it is accepted.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) was saying to form the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no, already these rates (increased rates) are being levied.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that if these increased rates are being levied, then all right.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that those have come further, only the recommendations had come of the previous committee. That already revised had been charged.

Professor Mukesh Arora that he thought that had come there today.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said no, these rates have been told as old rates. For new rates, naturally it had come to form a committee and they authorized the Vice Chancellor to form a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that who is volunteered to Chair the committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that get it Chaired from the Registrar.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that no, then there will be same problem even it is approved. It will be headed by the member of a Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that either it should be Dean of University Instruction or some other Syndicate member.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that make the Dean of University Instruction Chairman and he would like to be part of that committee.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they can make the senior member of Syndicate present there.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that the rent of the guest house should also be increased.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that perhaps he and Harpreet were the members of that committee and they had increased some rates. Whether that has come here or not, he thinks that has not come here.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that for the guests rent must be increased.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that they had increased rates for the guests.

The Vice Chancellor said that the committee had been constituted again.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that form the committee again.



Professor Mukesh Arora said that he had requested that the persons from the outside, Sharma Ji was included, one or two more outside persons be also included in the committee. They know the problem better. As they stay in the guest room, who stay there know the problem more. They had included more local persons; include more persons in the committee with Sharma Ji.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said the earlier also this issue was raised. For the rates of guest house, do not include the persons from the University because they are not affected.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they (campus persons) need not to pay.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that neither they (campus persons) have to give money, they are entitled and continue book the rooms. This committee be formed of the outsider fellows, who stay outside.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that rooms should able be made available.

The Vice Chancellor said that the recommendations given by them were on behalf of outsiders.

Shri Varinder Singh said that rooms do not remain available.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that form the committee without including him. He is not saying to include him. If he (Vice Chancellor) doesn't find him (Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu) right, make committee without him. He told what is objection in the decision of earlier committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not have that file.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he wanted to ask him (Vice Chancellor), tell him what is objection in that.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu) may come to him. He will sit with him (Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu).

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that is okay. But, the issues are related to outside fellows.

The Vice Chancellor said that but this is the University Guest House, they have not increased it for so many years. After all there has to be some equitable way out.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he thinks that he (Vice Chancellor) don't feel right what he is saying. Someone is coming from Ferozepur or someone is coming from Hoshiarpur, but the professor of the University who had been provided accommodation, his (professor's) 3 guests stay in the Guest House, and Senate members do not get rooms there. If they feel it objectionable then it would be objectionable to all. The University teacher has the accommodation, how he is entitled to put his guest in the guest house.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu) is digressing the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they should make rules.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that it is not in the rule. This is happening.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had complete data on who had occupied these guest houses. Its all there in computer now. You (Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu) can check it, examine it that during last two years, during last three years how many rooms have been used by a member of the Governing Body, how many rooms have been used officials/visitors of the University, how many rooms have been used by faculty members or their guests which had nothing to do with the University or by the guest of the members of the Governing Body who had nothing to do with the University. Complete data is now there. Let us not talk in vacuum. Complete data is there, objectively examine those things and come out with some algorithm that in order of reference, first members of the Governing Body, second Principals and Teachers of the Affiliated Colleges who are on official work to the University of any kind it is not necessarily the meetings.

Shri Varinder Singh said that for the seminars the money for rent be taken in advance. The reason is that many rooms remain vacant.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that what Shri Varinder Singh is saying that is right. Seminars are conducted by many Departments and the accommodation is booked, but teachers do not come and rooms remain vacant. The persons like outside Senate members like them do not get accommodation.

The Vice Chancellor said that many institutions have very well worked out such things, for example, if one books a room and one does not cancel it over a certain time, then a minimum charge has to be paid. That minimum charge is equivalent to either 50% of the full booking or full charge of one day booking and one has to give an account number through which that money will be paid. Any person who does a booking and does not give an account number through which it will be paid that booking will be invalid.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is right.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can give their own personal account number. The person who is getting booking, he/she would have to accept responsibility that from which budget money had to be paid. It can be their personal account number; it can be their Departmental account number, so that in default way, some action gets taken.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he had a request, don't mind. That committee was formed by the Syndicate; please bring recommendations of that committee in the Syndicate, if it goes back from here then its right.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a valid point.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that so that all members may know that any committee formed by them had given what type of recommendations. If Syndicate rejects it, there is no problem.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that he would like to update. Actually the committee was formed, what the problems that Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu was telling, they were doing the work to look into all those problems.

The Vice Chancellor said that the recommendations of the committee should be brought in the Syndicate for information.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that it was Syndicate's committee and should be rejected in the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had a valid point and it will be done so.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the second thing is that what they are saying be done. Principal N.R. Sharma is an outsider member and one more outside member of Syndicate be added to the committee.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that first the recommendations will come in the Syndicate only after that a committee will be formed. First impose objection on that committee in the Syndicate.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the committee has been formed in the Syndicate. They accept the Committee.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that that (previous) committee was also formed by the Syndicate. Why the recommendations of that committee have not been rejected.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that recommendations have not been rejected.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that recommendations of the committee have not come in the Syndicate yet.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as the Vice Chancellor has said the recommendations will come in the Syndicate. Now, the committee has been formed, they have no objection.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that they have formed the new committee, who had rejected the recommendations of the earlier committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had not approved those recommendations. He did not find it reasonable. He will bring back it to the Syndicate.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that secondly that committee revised committee.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he will see when that will come.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will bring that committee's recommendations back, he (Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu) can examine it himself. He had reservations on that. He had also brought Manjit Singh's case, because he had reservations on that. He will put it to him (Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu), he may have a look on it.

**(Following discussion restarted on the item no.8, after item no.13)**

The Vice Chancellor said that now again come to that committee of Guest House. He has got that file. That committee was formed in the month of July, 2016. The point that has come now had also come in the Syndicate meeting of 2016 also that the old data be seen, who comes there and who don't come there, who was utilizing. But that statistics had not been looked into at all. Those things had not been seen. The Committee had its two meetings and the last meeting was on December 26, 2016 in which Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky, Principal S.S. Sangha were members. Principal S.S. Sangha did not attend the meeting. Only three members attended the meeting. In first item of that meeting Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that the infrastructure of the entire Guest House especially in the building is not up to the mark and needs up-gradation. There are general remarks that the committee which was constituted be dissolved and should be constituted again for up-gradation the buildings etc. etc. So, those were all irrelevant things. What was main job, there was no focus on that. Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu had a point that Guest House should not be used as a commercial building. It is a facility for the teachers, fellows of the University. Suites should be given only to the members of the Governing Body, Vice-Chancellor and Registrar for their official guests. There must be a proper recommendation of the competent authority to avoid mis-utilization. There should not be proxy booking. Those are again the general remarks. That was not the mandate given to them that they have to prove. After a thorough deliberation on the issue, it was unanimously resolved the increase in room rent etc. Then there was a table agenda. No. 2 was that suites should be allotted only to the members of the Governing Body, the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar for their official guests, this is the only thing. So, that means Teachers of the University cannot book, if their guest come or if any visiting professor come, cannot book a room.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that see that are they entitled.

The Vice Chancellor asked what he meant by entitlement, how could he decide the entitlement.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that see the calendar, he is no one, see the calendar first.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will see the calendar. When the suites were made, what was the purpose of making Suites? Had they forgotten the purpose of making Suites?

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that are the Suites not part of the guest house?

The Vice Chancellor said that the main purpose of the Main Guest House should not be commercial; it is a facility being provided

to the Governing Body fellows and the allotment of rooms to be made on the recommendations of the worthy Vice Chancellor, Dean of University Instruction and the Registrar. Basic infrastructure, i.e., water geyser, room heater etc. etc. should be provided to all the guests. The mess charges should be realized from the guests. The committee which was constituted earlier and dissolved later, should be revived for the up-gradation of the entire guest houses specially Shimla buildings, faculty houses, Golden Jubilee House. For the guests not covered under category A to E, Category University Guest House at page no. 1 of the appendix etc. etc., other items will be discussed in the next meeting of the committee. So, that was the recommendations which came, he said not approved. New committee will look into it, please put up it to the Dean of University Instruction to suggest a new committee. That was what he did. But, that should have come to the Syndicate, he should not have written those remarks. It was he Syndicate's Committee; it should have come to the Syndicate. So he feels that whatever had happened since he wrote that on 19<sup>th</sup> of January 2017 was null and void and the committee he formed, stands dissolved. It was not to proceed further. So the matter was before them, they decide it on that day or they want to discuss it, he would send a photo-copy to all members.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that give photo-copies to all the members before the next meeting. If they don't want to pass it, he has no problem, and then get it done from the new committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that the deliberations had not been completed. He will send him what had to be done as specified in July 2016. They had to have financial model and algorithm for all those things. That had not been done. Point is, how to generate money themselves.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that their College Bhavan is working very well. Their rates are adequate. At least rates for guests should increase.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that they had increased in those recommendations. That is why he was saying to bring their report in that meeting, meeting was not to be convened by Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu, meeting was not to be convened by Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky, meeting was not to be convened by Principal S.S. Sangha.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will send all those to them (members) because those have to be finally seen by them, looking at the data over last 1 year, last 3 years. How much is the usage by how many candidates? If whatever rate had been there, patterns of occupation have not been seen, then new rates what the kind of income they will generate and whether the income is adequate for running the guest house. Totality should be there. It has to be done in totality. So it had a lot of work and the work cannot be done without the lot of help from the office itself. Office will have to provide them all the data. It is not only the guest house. Right now, there is no person in the guest house. Guest House should be manned on 24 hours basis. Somebody should be there. Guest House should be manned properly, Guest House kitchen should be stocked properly. There is a lot of work, guest house needs up-gradation. It has to be run like a motel because it has 22 suites. It is like a small motel and it has VIPs. Guest House is the reflection of how people perceive the

University to be. So some amount as subsidy for the guest house has to be there, first it will be used by the guests of the University i.e. if come UGC Chairman, UGC Secretary, AICTE Chairman, there are many Career Advancement Scheme Committees, CAS committees review being done, they all come there. Then, they had to see that all those other people pay for it for which the guest houses are being used. So, there has to be some accounting procedure. Career Advancement Scheme Committee comes there with 3-4-5 members, they had to be accommodated there. So they had to be paid for. Either University has to set aside some money on some other arrangement.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said either it be done from Career Advancement Scheme, it would had to be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that first of all they had not specified all those things properly. So, the committee will have to have proper representation. Earlier committees had lopsided composition and the committee had also become lopsided. It had imbalance, in the earlier committees there had been more persons from the University and in that committee there has been no person from the University. So, it has to be properly constituted.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he was sorry to state that the Committee was constituted by the Syndicate not by one person.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he feels that whenever any member of UGC come there or any selection committee is held, they think first priority should be given to them and it was being given.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that is why he had recommended that the guests of Vice-Chancellor, Registrar and Dean of University Instruction be accommodated. He said that a faculty member from Punjabi Department or History Department got four rooms booked. If the Syndicate decides he will have no objection.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that in that committee neither the issue of budget or of quality had been taken up. That the committee they had framed, he is updating it from the three Universities. They had taken the data from the three universities. Data had been taken from the ICSSR, data had been taken from their 3 guest houses that who was in deficit and who was in profit and why. Major is budget, if there is no budget, quality would not be maintained. If there is budget, only then quality will be given. These had not been considered in that committee. All the things had been there that last there quarterly how many teachers stayed, how many came from the colleges, after calculating all that, a loss of about Rs. 9 lakhs per annum is shown. They had tried to remove the deficit but then we have to consider the quality, in funds deficit quality cannot be given.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he was surprised that which person had rejected those recommendations, who made that committee because it is the prerogative of the Syndicate. As far as he understands, it was the committee of the Syndicate and Syndicate had to form another committee by rejecting that committee. He is surprised what the members are telling.

The Vice Chancellor said that those are mere technicalities, he had explained to him (Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu).

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he was surprised that he was also in the earlier Syndicate and when the committee was formed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already explained it to him (Principal I.S. Sandhu), does he want to punish him for that.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is a system and it should be left to the authority that has a prerogative. If he is saying something which is right, it is not taken in good taste and if he talks according to the authority, then it is good. It could not be done so. He would not do it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct. His (Principal I.S. Sandhu) Committee has not done the job competently.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that how the Vice-Chancellor could say so. It is only the Syndicate which could say so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would put it up to the Syndicate.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor could not reject the Committee's recommendations and only the Syndicate could reject.

The Vice-Chancellor sincerely regretted that he should have brought it to the Syndicate and he has not brought it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that after rejecting the first Committee, only the Syndicate could appoint the second Committee. He is surprised that he did not have the knowledge as a Syndic, when this Committee has been formed. He was the Chairman of the Committee and the recommendations of the Committee should have been placed before the Syndicate. Who rejected those recommendations? He did not have any information about the formation of a new Committee as it is the prerogative of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already sincerely regretted it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that who rejected the recommendations? He did not know, being a member of the Syndicate, as to when the Committee was formed. Firstly, the recommendations of the earlier Committee should be rejected. He has no objection over it. The new Committee could be formed thereafter. If such a thing happens with some other member, only then he/she could understand it. He was the Chairman of the Committee and the recommendations of the Committee have been made null and void without placing before the Syndicate.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the complete item should be placed next time. The Vice-Chancellor has just now requisitioned the file from the office and the recommendations could be rejected now itself from the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the file could be Xeroxed and provided to the members.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be brought up as a proper agenda item in the next meeting.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he had stayed in the Guest House of National University of Law at Patiala which is an excellent one. They could see that model as that is the best maintained Guest House.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that if that is well maintained, that University charges Rs.1,000/- per day.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the rent presently being charged from the Syndicate/Senate members be not enhanced, but the rent to be charged from the guests should be enhanced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has been trying for the last four years that the charges of the Guest House should be enhanced. This is not the first Committee. Every Committee's recommendations are rejected here.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that most of the University teachers, Chairpersons and others usually say that there is no accommodation available for the experts who come to conduct the viva and they have to accommodate the experts at their residences. It is a reality. It is better that the rent is enhanced which would also facilitate them as there are some persons who ask them to book the rooms in the Guest House.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is otherwise also that when the guests of the teachers of University come, instead of staying the guests at their homes, they book rooms in the Guest House for the guests.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the charges should be revised for others except for official purposes.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that the rents should be enhanced marginally, i.e., Rs.100/- to Rs.200/-. If the present rate is Rs.300/- it could be enhanced to Rs.500/- but not to Rs.1,000/-.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the charges of the College Bhawan are Rs.500/- and everybody is paying for that.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they have already tried it, but the occupancy of the rooms should also be there so that some money is earned. It might not be that they enhance the charges and the occupancy reduces.

Shri Varinder Singh said that as the room rent of the College Bhawan is Rs.500/- and is mostly occupied. The charges of the Guest House could also be enhanced to Rs.500/-. If the charges are enhanced to Rs.1,000/-, there would be no occupancy and the rooms could remain vacant. Then there would be no benefit of enhancing the charges to Rs.1,000/-. The charges could be enhanced by Rs.100/- to Rs.200/- so that the rooms of the Guest House did not remain vacant.



Principal N.R. Sharma said that suppose a Chairman of the College comes to stay in the Guest House, who is a rich person and instead of presently paying the charges of Rs.200/-, pays Rs.1,000/- how it could affect that person. Secondly, the UGC pays the money for the stay of the experts attending the seminars/workshops, etc.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that not many Chairmen come in the University and stay in the Guest House whereas the experts keep visiting the University regularly.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the suites were constructed because sometimes the University had to make stay arrangements for its guests outside the University and the University had to bear more expenses on it. This was one of the purposes for the addition of more suites.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there were 15 rooms, 7 more were added and 4 were at the disposal of the Vice-Chancellor. Then he said that the rooms being used by the governing body earlier in the Guest House that should be retained and the remaining whatever had been added, let those be used by the University. Earlier there were 14 rooms and 7 more were added making it to a total of 21 rooms. He had proposed that if 10 rooms were exclusively reserved for Fellows. Let those 10 rooms remain there. Out of suites available with the Vice-Chancellor, one more was given, meaning thereby a total of 11 rooms. The remaining 6 were exclusively for the teachers, 11 for the Fellows and 4 for the Vice-Chancellor which also attends to the emergencies of the Fellows. So this is the formula which could address the issue. Then the College Bhawan was constructed having a huge capacity. The guests of the College teachers or non-Fellows College teachers, College Principals, all could stay in the College Bhawan. There is no issue at all. There are 14 rooms in the Alumni House. That is a little bit expensive as it is not subsidized. As far as the accommodation on the campus is concerned, they have those 14 rooms also. So, the accommodation at the campus has increased hugely over the last few years. There should be no quarrel that there is shortage of accommodation but all these have to be maintained well. They are also having a Faculty House with 15 rooms. These rooms were exclusively for the College teachers because these were made for the use of the faculty of the affiliated Colleges. 7 more were added. They have not got over the last four years a comprehensive plan, for the 60-80 rooms that they are having in the University for the guests of the University, that they must be maintained well, kept well, professionally run. There should be an e-booking for all of them. All these facilities should be there and for that some money has to be spent. If they want to outsource and give it to someone, either it should be outsourced or somebody within the University has to accept the responsibility for the outsourcing. They are having management school, hotel management and some revenue model should be prepared. Somebody, either a student or a faculty member or someone should produce software and run these things for which honorarium could be given and income should be generated for that. Until they generate some income, it could not be done. The University should put in some money because some guests of the University have to be accommodated. So, there must be some subsidy from the University, rest of it must be generated as an income and they should professionally run all these things. They have no shortage of anything. The Guest House which was exclusively used by the Fellows of the University, that should be allowed to be used by the

Fellows of the University. No doubt about it. Since they are having so many accommodation on the campus and the Guest House which was used by the Fellows, that privilege should not be taken away from them. Some prestige is attached to something, it is fine. There is no issue at all. 11 rooms (10 rooms plus 1 suite) be exclusively used for the Fellows, there is no issue at all. These are earmarked for Fellows. If some room is not booked by a Fellow, then it could be booked by anybody. Otherwise, these rooms should be left as exclusively marked for the Fellows and give highest priority to them.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if some other suites are vacant, those could also be given to the Fellows.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he has said that those could not be given to the Fellows.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the lawns of the Alumni House are in bad shape.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Alumni House is not in a bad shape, they could go and see it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that when he visited about three months ago, then it was not good and the occupancy is also very less.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the occupancy is less because the rent is Rs.1,000/- per day.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the occupancy should be increased.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the reason for this is that the accommodation in the Guest House is available for Rs.300/- per day. The guests go to the Alumni House only when all other accommodations are booked. Therefore, if some charges are increased, the guests could think of accommodation in Alumni House.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the charges of the Alumni House are very high.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the cleanliness is to be maintained for which they have to pay the staff.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Alumni House is not subsidized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the College Bhawan is also not well maintained. They could see that there are serious problems of maintenance because it is understaffed. The expectations of the teachers of the Colleges and University are very high and they want that they should be looked after. If they find the rooms dirty, their ego is hurt. Who would maintain these? They need trained and adequate number of staff who could attend to the problems being faced by the guests regarding water/electricity during night. They need competent staff for it and from where they would pay the salary to the staff since the Centre says that they could not employ more people. This money has to be recovered out of the income. What was the purpose of these Committees? All the Committees which had got formed during the last four years, none has looked into the totality. He has read out all

the reports, have they looked into the totality. Is it the kind of report that he should get from the experienced governing bodies of this University. What are they talking about?

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the guidelines should be given to the Committee on which it has to work.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not provide the guidelines. The members have to frame the guidelines. They should understand that the University was not of this kind when this Calendar was written. This Calendar was written when the University was not employing even 50 teachers. When the Calendar was last written? The Calendar is so old, it is of 1904 Act. So, it is a very serious job. They are afraid of doing this thing in a complete way.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Guest House Committee should be expanded with the inclusion of 2-3 members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not forming any Committee. It is the members who have to suggest the names and give him a Committee and the Committee which would do the task, that task has to be defined. As far as he is concerned, he proposed that the Committee that he formed stands dissolved because it did not have the approval of the Syndicate. If the members wanted to approve it, they could do it the next time. It has already delayed by so many years, let it be delayed by one more month.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that reports of so many Committees are not submitted for years together, but then nobody says anything about these.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the promotion policy of the Dental College is pending for the last four years. The files do not move here. If some file is handed over to someone, that file does not reach the office for years together. The Vice-Chancellor could not look after all these things as he is also stretched to a limit. Ever since the financial crisis in the University has been created, he is under lot of pressure.

Shri Varinder Singh said that last time also, it was requested that some duties could be assigned to the members of the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Dean of University Instruction for revision of rents of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues in totality. The Committee will also frame guidelines for bookings of different Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues.

Principal I.S. Sandhu pointed out that earlier the Syndicate had constituted a Committee for revision of rents of the Guest Houses and the Committee had given its recommendations but the same have not been placed before the Syndicate so far.

In response to this the Vice-Chancellor said that the same would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

**Deferred Item**

**9.** Considered the following recommendations dated 15.02.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider the request of contractual Lecturers working at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital for regularization of their services, that:

- (i) 09 posts of Demonstrators from Medical side be converted to Dental side, where the demand would increase with passage of time at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, P.U.
- (ii) The educational qualifications and experience for the post of Demonstrator would be as under:

**Educational Qualifications**

Minimum of BDS from a recognized Dental College/Institute

**Teaching Experience**

Minimum of five years experience in recognized Dental College/Institute (with certificate of experience)

- NOTE:**
1. As per the Budget Estimates 2017-18 of Panjab University, there are 14 posts of Demonstrators in the pay scale of 10300-34800 +GP of Rs.5000/- + NPA.
  2. Dr. Ashish Jain, Principal-cum-Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital has written that the qualifications for 09 posts of Demonstrator from Dental side will be as above and the qualifications for rest of the 05 posts from medical side remained same as earlier.
  3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/15/28/29.05.2016 (Para 77) considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 22.01.2016, to consider the request of contractual Lecturers working in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital for regularization of their services and resolved that the item be withdrawn and a small Committee, including the Principal of the Dental Institute, be constituted to submit a proposal to be placed before the Board of Finance.
  4. The matter will be got noted by the Board of Finance as and when the meeting is convened in near future

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this item is right, but the way the item has been framed problem may come in the resolved part. Actually, the final thing is only what has to be written, because the first para should not come in the resolved part. But, what they are doing is, 9 posts of Demonstrators from Medical side be converted to Dental side. So that is the resolved part. This is not that they are allowing them as regular appointments. If they read the previous note, it looks like that they are asking to allow the lecturers' appointment. The resolved part is that 09 posts of Demonstrators from Medical side be converted to Dental side, where the demand would increase with passage of time and the educational qualifications and experience for the post of Demonstrator would be that is attached. That will only remain in the resolved part.

Shri Varinder Singh said that what about the recommendation they had given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that is the recommendation, but the way the item has been made, it looks like that they are allowing regularization also. That may be circulated to all members. It is supplementary item. It is right they continue work as contractor employee if these positions are converted. This item must be taken into the Board of Finance because there will be no financial burden in this conversion. Already many people are working there. They will be given that position. They are not giving them regular appointments. If they will advertise posts only then they may be regular.

Professor Mukesh Arora asked that in the medical college (Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital) is age 65?

Shri Varinder Singh said the persons who had given this representation, they are demanding for regular appointment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that agreed, the qualifications they had made, if these suits them and if the positions will be advertised, only then they be regularized, otherwise it cannot be possible at all.

Shri Varinder Singh said that is right, that will be done like that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that so that is why they had to take the permission from the Board of Finance, because there will be no financial effect in this. Some persons are doing work there. That will be advertised. They will remove from there and come on those positions.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they cannot say that all the persons will come on new positions.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that so send it to the Board of Finance and requesting Board of Finance that there is no financial implication.

The Vice Chancellor said that make sure financial implications will not come.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that how the financial implications will not come?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that those 9 persons will be removed and put on 9 new positions, that's why. Qualifications are attached there. Minimum of five years experience in recognized Dental College/Institute certificate of experience. Total 14 posts are to be advertised.

Shri Varinder Singh said that otherwise are there 15 vacant posts in the medical (Dental College)?

Professor Navdeep Goyal that total 14 persons are working there, 9 posts will be dental and the remaining will be of medical.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked, which medical side?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two, one is of dental and another is that of normal MBBS and others, they are medical. They are not of the dental, but are of medical.

Shri Jarnail Singh said what is the issue, are they BDS all, not MDS.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that those are BDS and they are working there for many years. Now, for Assistant Professors, qualification is MDS, they cannot become the professors.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that on what post are they already working?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are working as contract lecturers.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu that they are working as Demonstrators.

Shri Varinder Singh said they cannot be appointed as lectures without MDS. The recommendations had come in 2007.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are contract lectures and now they willing to make them Demonstrators.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even their salary will reduce, but will become regular.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that either they are being made Demonstrator as such and after that made them regular or they will come through interview.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that they will come through interview. It will be only through interview.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they cannot do otherwise.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that had they given them commitment that they will take all the seven. So that they may not loose their job.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that when they will advertise the posts, too many people will come.

Shri Varinder Singh said that otherwise in section-5, the Principal of Dental College had already appointed excess persons i.e. 15-20 excess persons.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that on the posts of Assistant Professors, Demonstrator will work.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they will get the regular job, now any time problem may come.

The Vice Chancellor said that will they not have the fixed salary.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they will have the scales. They will have the scale of 2000.

The Vice Chancellor said that then there will be financial implications.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that salary will reduce. Now their scale will be less.

The Vice Chancellor asked, what was their scale earlier?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they had lecturers' scale.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that financial implications would come. Right now they are on fixed salary.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they will find out what will happen. Whatever goes to Board of Finance, they will give it after doing the study of the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that it had to go to the Board of Finance. Don't make the statement that there will not be financial implication.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they will appoint them against their posts. They detail will send to the Board of Finance with financial implications.

Shri Varinder Singh said that make a sub-committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they will do that. There is no need of the committee. They will do it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that okay; Professor Navdeep Goyal will do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that finally address the concerns of persons concerned, they are dealing with persons not dealing with objects.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that okay.

The Vice Chancellor said that ultimately, why they are doing. So that somebody should feel a little secure, should work with more dedication so that the institution and society gains. Otherwise, it is going on.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they will talk about it.

It was informed that if 5 persons will get, 4 persons may loose.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that definitely there will be.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they will after talking about this.

The Vice Chancellor said that how can he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) do by talking.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that someone will have to be talked.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now what those are. Those positions are lying unoccupied. If they are lying unoccupied, then you convert unoccupied positions with a new label and wait for people to compete for it. The person who will able to compete it, will gain and who is not able to compete, he will remain there as it is. So, he will loose.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that there is another problem.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the people, who are already working there, had something there.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that if you left the work of lecturer and appoint them as Demonstrators, they will have to do the appointments of lecturer there.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that Dental Council of India will ask to fulfill the requirements.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they see the committee, what the committee was. It looks like there was Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor. K. Gauba, Registrar, Professor Mohammed Khalid, Professor. Rajat Sandhir, Professor Parveen Rishi, Professor Ashish Jain, Col. P.S. Sandhu.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that they will again mind what he is saying that, in addition to University people, outside people are also knowledgeable. They do the favours in the appointments.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in that he wants their case should be done, they are working for a long time since 2006-07 in the University on the post of lecturer. But, later on there will be lot of politics there. Professor Ashish Jain, Principal of the College had already involved in a lot of politics there. When there will be interview, outside persons may come there.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that they cannot give the guarantee in the interview that only they will come, persons from outside may also come.



Shri Varinder Singh said that he wants to say that their internal persons, who are working there, should be safe. It may not happen that they go outside and may lose job.

The Vice Chancellor said that is why he is asking. There are persons who are working there, those positions are not vacated. First ask a basic question. These people are working on certain positions, they are not being declared vacant. Those new positions are being created so that they can compete for those, otherwise they cannot compete in medical side.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that is the reason.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are bringing in some positions so that they can compete for it. If they are successful, then there is a great relief for them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said otherwise they remain as such.

The Vice Chancellor said that otherwise they remain as such. So, but there is a financial implication because they are converting some positions which are lying unoccupied they would have all them occupied. There is no financial implication, if somebody competes, gets it and that position is not filled up, because this position has a lower salary structure. Otherwise, prima facie, it is a financial implication.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that those vacant posts will have to be filled up and financial implications will come there.

The Vice Chancellor said that so, he thinks, it should not be taken to the next Board of Finance because the next Board of Finance is a contentious Board of Finance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should defer it. They do not do it.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that defer it now, then they will look it carefully.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they took it to Board of Finance then straight it will be rejected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that today they defer it. Then what they were saying, form a sub-committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that is right, a Syndicate sub-committee to be formed and Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu will be heading that committee. Actually they have to resolve the matter.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the item be deferred.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee of the Syndics including Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Shri Varinder Singh be constituted to work out the related financial implications for consideration of the Board of Finance.

**Recommendations of the  
Faculty of Arts dated  
19.12.2016**

**10.** Considered and

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016 (Item 14), that the following addition be made in Regulation 1 at page 184 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 with regard to admission to M.Phil Course in Public Administration with effect from the academic session 2017-18, **as per Appendix-VI:**

<b><u>PRESENT REGULATION</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u></b>
<p>1. A candidate for the degree of Master of Philosophy in the Faculties of Arts, Languages, Education, Science, Design &amp; Fine Arts and Business Management &amp; Commerce should have passed the master examination from the Panjab University or any examination which has been recognized as equivalent thereto, by this University in the first or second division (50% marks in the subject concerned). For M.Phil. in Gandhian Studies, Master's degree in the subjects will be determined by the Board of Control (with the approval of the Dean of University Instruction). For M.Phil. in Guru Granth Sahib Studies, the candidate should have obtained a Master's degree in any Faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate from the Panjab University or from any other University examination of which has been recognized as equivalent to the corresponding examination of this University. For M.Phil. in Sociology, a candidate should have obtained Master's degree in the subject of Sociology or Anthropology (Social Anthropology) with 50% marks.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No Change</p> <p><b>For M.Phil. Course in Public Administration, a candidate should have obtained Master's Degree in Public Administration or Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology with at least 55% marks.</b></p>

- NOTE:**
1. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council and Regulations Committee has approved the recommendation (No.14) of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016.
  2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-VI**).

**Withdrawn Item**

**11.** Considered proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Shaminder Sandhu, Syndics, for re-employment of teachers after superannuation in Aided and Un-aided affiliated Colleges of Panjab University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he wanted to say on this item to explain this item.

The Vice Chancellor said that that item only came that day. This item, he personally feel needs a detailed look.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that yes.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that no salary tag has been attached with that.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever has to be done regarding this item, DPI (Punjab) and DPI (UT) should participate in it, because their governments are involved.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that is the later issue. The first thing is that the item like that should not come as table agenda. It is very unfair to them (members), such item is put as table agenda to whom they had not seen and surprised to see that what it is. In this item, giving teachers re-employment, giving upto 65 years age service, where the students will go who are doing Ph.D. and M.Phil., where will you throw them. What is that and for what? It has no justification, no rationale. Government issue is later thing, he strongly opposes it. He is not even ready for discussion on this issue. It should be brought as a main item so that they could come prepared. He was just thinking that what that was. That was wrong thing.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that that is absolutely right. The young students had that opportunity only.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that yes.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that after doing Ph.D. they (young students) come on contract salary of Rs. 16,000- Rs. 18,000 on the vacant post. If they start re-employment there, they will lose that opportunity also.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he understands regarding the issue of Principals, in that there is some weight, in this case nothing is there. It is totally not logical. What message will go to the youth who is studying and getting degrees?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that permanent recruitment is not being done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if that decision of Syndicate goes in the morning's newspaper, he thought they will not be able to face anyone what they had done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right, he wants to say something as he had brought that item. Ultimately for some subject, first thing is that they had not said given to all, everyone and everywhere. Second thing is that it is right, one has to deliberate and

then only finalize that what should be done. Some subjects were there.

The Vice Chancellor said there cannot be any subject specific.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that which subjects were there. Give justification which subjects one can taught and other cannot.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he had done M.Sc. Every year so many people come out completing their M.Sc. and Ph.D.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that you are giving the power to management to re-employ anyone.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that had this item come on any persons demand or as a resolution? If it had come as resolution, it should have come differently.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they talk about the resolution, what he was saying is that they should think about that it cannot be given to all persons, it is clear. It can be given at that place, where it is required. One thing is that, when they go for the inspection, in many colleges they are continuing. They do not get persons so they had re-employed the person. Simultaneously, it is that they had re-employed and there is no such rule for reemployment.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there is no objectivity of it. The problem is that, if a person suits the Principal, whether he is required or not, he (Principal) will re-employ the person.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they are giving the power to the management, which is totally wrong. That will spoil the colleges as they had said to reemploy any one upto the age of 65. Don't do that. That will be disfavor to the student community.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that is he (Vice Chancellor) permitting on discussion? Either withdraw this item or permit for discussion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that discussion must be there. After discussion they can decide whether to form committee or to reject or whatever to be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that item is placed before them. So, they wanted it to be brought in the next meeting i.e. one option. Option two, is preliminary discussion happens and then they decide to come it next time. Third is, indefinitely defer it and he allows them (members) discussion among themselves and then it is resubmitted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said discussion will be held ultimately. When they talk about discussion, discussion may be formal, not informal.

Shri Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that bring that in the next meeting.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that what Shri Gurdip Kumar Sharma has said, his suggestion is same. These 3 items, not 12 but

13 number items needs to be discussed. They had not read the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment. Those 3 items may be taken in the next meeting.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they should form a resolution.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that next meeting is right. He wants to suggest that let there be a sub-committee to do detailed discussion.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they accept in principle, whether there should be discussion or not. Committee for what, this is totally wrong thing. Committee cannot be formed on this.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that main thing is that when some resolution comes, first committee is formed, committee decides on the issue and after that it comes in the Syndicate, mostly. Second thing is that the issue will remain sycophancy, who will do the sycophancy will get the re-employment. Who will re-employ a person of Rs. 1,50,000 in place of Rs. 21,600. It will be good if young blood comes.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that so many students are doing post-graduation courses, clearing NET, where will they go. Already there are no vacancies in colleges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is telling; let him read some part of that.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that indefinitely defer that item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said there is one thing; he is not saying that they can take up all. If the re-employment is sought in his/her respective institute, the same can be decided by the college management. However, a person can be re-employed/appointed on contract from other institute also; if no suitable candidate is found once the position has been advertised. At least that part, if any college advertised the positions.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is in the management, he interviewed the persons, he can say no suitable person found.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no, no, that is not the management rather people do not apply.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that where is that college in which no one applies.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he want to say something. The problems are coming to the colleges. Suppose they had 150 grant-in-aid posts. The strength has become so that they had to appoint 100-125 temporary teachers. They are thinking on that angle that the temporary person, the contract person they appoint, the problem they are facing is that once a person is temporary appointed, he brings the order of the High Court and they cannot relieve him. This is their problem. The management has this big problem. As they are saying, government did not have, they give money to them.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the salary that they are giving to the re-employed persons, be given to those young persons.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they do not get the young persons.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he (Principal B.C. Josan) may tell him for which post person is required; he will send him (Principal B.C. Josan) that person.

Principal B.C. Josan said that if they had appointed 100 persons, it will become their liability.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that re-employment is also their liability. They do the interview every year for the contract posts.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the High Court has told that they cannot remove a contract person. He was saying true. He had faced this.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he (Principal B.C. Josan) does interviews every year, his that argument was wrong.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that 99.9% they appoint persons every year.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they cannot relieve those persons appointed by them on contract. Managing Committee has that problem. He is not talking about the grant-in-aid course.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Dean, College Development Council is sitting there, ask him how many positions in which they do the calling and no one applies. Are they too many, ask him.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they may deliberate on it, form the committee and check it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the thing is that they should not see it only at the management angle. What is their personal problem, he doesn't know.

Principal B.C. Josan said that this is the problem for all.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that where earlier was teaching, teachers were there, today also teachers are there and students are coming by doing Ph.D. Which subject has no teacher?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that only 50% teachers are there. Only 50 % teachers are working there.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that there are a lot of subjects, give the teacher of English. Teachers are not coming in the rural areas. He had just advertised grant in aid post, only one candidate had come there.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that no persons came in his college for the post of Computer Teacher. He had aided posts.

Principal B.C. Josan said that a committee may be constituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he doesn't want to be chairman of the committee. He is thinking in principle, if they continue with the old persons, where will the newcomers go.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that to look into the problems they may reframe it. He is saying to do it after doing discussion.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they do that first withdraw the item and then bring it. Do not do like that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said form the committee. The committee will deliberate the issue.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they want discussion on the issue.

The Vice Chancellor recalled that Shri Satya Pal Jain Ji had categorically stated that matter which require detailed discussion prima facie, they should not be put it as a paper agenda. So considering that this matter requires a detailed discussion that should not have put up at table agenda, he accepts it. So, that item should be deferred at the moment and given whatever discussion happened, if at all this item has to come up, it should come up with detailed note, justification, some data, some discussion. It cannot be just in the form of a resolution without an adequate write up.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that then why to defer it, withdraw the item and bring it as a new item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that either say it withdraws or some other, ultimately when any resolution comes, it first goes to information.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that don't do that in the table agenda.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if there is any emergency only item should be done in table agenda.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that naturally if there is resolution, a committee is formed before resolution. It had been withdrawn, when committee will be formed.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not correct. Once it was withdrawn, there is no question of forming a committee. The Syndicate members will get together and have more details, come up with a detailed note on it, everything on it that effectively replaces committee. No committee was being formed. Four-five of them sit together and come up with details, then do something which could be justified. There should not happen that it is rejected in the Senate. So, safeguard yourself of any possible embarrassment. Do a serious through job on the issue. At the moment, do not do anything because of financial position of the University. Let it not gets entangled with whether the University is giving re-employment. Re-employment was a issue, re-employment is not an issue with their University but what has happened in Punjabi University, what has happened in Guru Nanak Dev University, new VCs have to be employed there. He does

not know what shape that would take. Do not do like that the existing re-employment of the University is put in danger. So, don't do that now. It is not a prudent thing to push it further.

The Vice Chancellor said that so avoid it. They don't withdraw this, he (Vice Chancellor) withdraws this item.

**RESOLVED:** That the item be treated as withdrawn.

**Enhancement in remuneration of question papers, etc.**

**12.** Considered minutes dated 01.03.2017 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to representations received from teachers to enhance the payment/rates of setting of question papers of Under/Post-Graduate Courses, M.A./M.Com./M.Ed./M.Sc. practical exam, M.E./M.Tech. thesis, M.Phil./Ph.D. viva-voce, etc. and thereafter in view of Syndicate resolved on 21.01.2017 and Board of Finance held on 13.02.2017 for non-teaching staff and making recommendations in this regard.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 01.03.2017, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Deferred Item**

**13.** Considered minutes dated 08.03.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding the UGC's amendments (3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> Amendment), Regulations, 2016 and suggest modifications in the templates and applications forms for direct recruitment as well as Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) promotions.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate and Senate at its meetings held on 22.07.2016 (Para 3) and 03.09.2017 (Para VI) respectively have adopted the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> amendment, Regulation 2016.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he want to give a suggestion. A committee was formed has given his recommendations and those are also coming in the meeting. But, when they talk about the Committee, it was a very big committee; there are some matters which are related to the Colleges. The problems will come again, the recommendations of the committee will come again and they have to do that also. The first thing is that the complete item had not come. A lot of formats are missing in that. He feels that in the committee all the persons were from the University and even the input from the colleges had not been taken. Although they had done there that it relates with the people of colleges also. They had to do it timely and as the item had come that day, a committee may be formed on that. That committee will bring it in the Syndicate next time so that the input from colleges will also be received. The item will be again discussed in the Syndicate. A concrete proposal will come. A committee must be made on the issue so that a complete document may come seen thoroughly by the concerned persons before it come again.

The Vice Chancellor said that the item came to him in the morning; he could not read all of it. It has a lot of details.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that they should defer this item.



The Vice Chancellor said that half the people of Committee could not attend the meeting. Following people could not attend the meeting that includes Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Anil Monga, Professor Akshaya Kumar and Professor Promila Pathak. So, half the people did not attend the meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no person from the colleges was there in the committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that no one from the colleges was in the meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal that's why he was saying to form a committee, who will look the matter. Whatever the recommendations of that committee, that's all right.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the committee be formed of Dr. Dalip Kumar, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu, Principal N.R. Sharma. These 5-6 persons will see that item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they will do the discussion to see their recommendations.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay, that is fine.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the item be deferred.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the following Committee of Syndics be constituted to evaluate the recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding the UGC's amendments (3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> Amendment), Regulations, 2016 and suggest modifications in the templates and applications forms for direct recruitment as well as Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) promotions:

1. Professor Navdeep Goyal
2. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu,
3. Principal N.R. Sharma
4. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal
5. Dr. Dalip Kumar
6. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
7. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu

**(At this stage, discussion on Item No.8 continued again, which has been made part of that item.)**

## **Routine and formal matters**

**14.** The information contained in Items **R-(i) to R-(v)** on the agenda was read out and ratified, i.e.-:

- (i)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Dr. Jyoti Sood, as Assistant Professor at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., purely on temporary basis, for the period during which she has actually worked i.e. w.e.f. 04.05.2016 to 30.06.2016 and 07.07.2016 to 31.12.2016, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible,

as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions according to which she had worked previously during the session 2015-16.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Board of Control dated 06.02.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following rules for admission to B.A. Honours in Economics and Admission criteria for B.A. Honours in Economics to be incorporated in Handbook of Information-2017:

Rules for admission to B.A. Honours in Economics:

Eligibility Conditions:

1. Given the quantitative requirements of the program, only students who have passed mathematics at the Class XII level are eligible for admission.
2. The candidate must not be above 20 years of age as on 1<sup>st</sup> August of the year in which admission is sought to the First Semester (22 years in the case of SC/ST).

Admission criteria for B.A. Honours in Economics to be incorporated in Handbook of Information-2017:

- (i) On merit basis.
- (ii) (a) The merit will be calculated on the basis of the marks secured in best five subjects, which must include Mathematics & English.
- (b) 2% additional weightage of marks obtained at (a) above will be given to students who have studied economics at +2 level.

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Board of Control dated 06.02.2017 (**Appendix-IX**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following admission Criteria for M.A. Economics in the Department of Economics to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information-2017:

Admission Criteria for M.A. Economics in the Department in Economics:

1. The admission to various courses in the Department of Economics will broadly conform to the conditions as per Panjab University Calendar. However, in view of the fact that the students of M.A. Economics from the department compete with the students from Delhi School of Economics, Jawaharlal Nehru University and other reputed Universities, the members of Board of Control unanimously decided that:-

It is imperative that the students entering the department for Master's course must have

studied economics equivalent to the students who graduate from Panjab University with Economics as one of the subjects in B.A. Accordingly, the following must be incorporated in the admission criteria and calculation of merit at the time of admission. It was, further, reiterated that this condition must be applicable to the students seeking admission in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh:

- (i) On merit basis
- (ii) Students who have studied economics less than 25% of the aggregate marks at the undergraduate level of Panjab University or any other recognized University will be considered as having studied inadequate economics, therefore, the student will be awarded zero out of 600 marks.
- (iii) Honours weightage would be given only to students who have studied at least four papers of Economics in Economics Honours in addition to their fulfilling the adequacy condition in Economics as defined in (ii) above.

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Academic Committee dated 14.02.2017 (**Appendix-X**) regarding criteria for PU CET (PG) Entrance Test for admission in M.A. History Semester-I, for the session 2017-18:

- The Candidates should have passed the written Entrance Test conducted by Panjab University, Chandigarh. The merit list will be prepared considering the marks obtained in the Entrance Test and the Qualifying Examination as per the following criteria:

Written Test	:	50%
Qualifying Examination	:	50%

The pass percentage of entrance test in history is 35% (30% in case of candidates belonging to SC/ST/BC/PWD) w.e.f. the session 2017-18.

**(v)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed to introduce M.Phil. in the subject of Human Rights & Duties in the Centre for Human Rights & Duties, P.U., from the academic session 2017-18, with a condition that no more Guest Faculty be inducted.

**Routine and formal matters**

**15.** The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(v)** on the agenda was read out and noted, i.e. –

**(i)** In pursuance of orders dated 27.01.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1286 of 2017 (Mr. Jayanth N. Pethkar Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which is fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, along with CWP No. 26187 of 2016, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 14.02.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Mr. Jayanth N. Pethkar, Associate Professor, School of Communication Studies, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.03.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 28.02.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

**(ii)** In pursuance of orders dated 13.02.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 2534 of 2017 (Dr. Smriti Sood Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which is fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Smriti Sood, Professor, University Business School, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.03.2017 as applicable, in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & other similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 28.02.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure

subject to the final outcome of this case filed by her. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.

- (ii) all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. Smriti Sood Professor UBS	26.07.1982	28.02.2017	<p>(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and 15.2 at pages 131-132 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007</p> <p>(ii) Furlough as admissible (maximum) for six months under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of P.U. Cal. Vol-I, 2007, and</p> <p>(ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to him/her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.</p>

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

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Balbir Singh Assistant Registrar Accounts Branch	10.09.1975	28.02.2017	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Neeru Malhotra Superintendent (Proof Reader) General Branch	05.08.1980	31.03.2017	
3.	Shri Raj Kumar Dogra Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	07.01.1985	31.03.2017	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
4.	Ms. Prem Lata Joshi Superintendent Accounts Branch	08.03.1982	28.02.2017	
5.	Shri Ranjit Singh Superintendent Central Instrumentation Laboratory	11.03.1982	28.02.2017	
6.	Shri Rajendra Singh Record Lifter University School of Open Learning	04.07.1981	31.03.2017	
7.	Shri Shankar Datt Record Lifter Examination Br.-IV	17.12.1981	28.02.2017	
8.	Shri Gulwant Singh Section Holder (Bindery) P.U. Press	22.10.1982	31.03.2017	
9.	Shri Iqbal Singh Security Guard P.U. Extension Library Ludhiana	01.11.1972	31.03.2017	
10.	Shri Surinder Singh Security Guard Security Staff, P.U.	02.07.1984	28.02.2017	

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

- (v) To note letter No. VPS/15/1/2017 dated 03.03.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to the Vice-President of India, New Delhi, along with e-mail dated 27.02.2017 of Professor Vijay K. Chopra, DES-MDRC, P.U. regarding alleged mismanagement and irregularities in P.U.

**General Discussion**

1. Professor Mukesh Arora said that he had an opportunity to go to the Health Centre, he was not feeling well. It has become very good. Once, he wanted to give appreciation. Machines of all types doing tests were available. Earlier he had gone there, they used to say to get the tests done from outside. He got done all most all the tests there. But he noticed one lapse that there were only two Doctors available.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no regular doctor, someone is a reemployed doctor and someone is on fixed wages.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he wanted to say that there was one Dr. Dhawan Saheb and one Dr. Rupinder. Two doctors were there. He asked them if there were only two doctors. He was informed that there is Doctor Lal Saheb also that he is more than 67 years. He is also very helpful.

The Vice-Chancellor said that honorarium is given to them. He tried to increase 20 to 25 percent, but they had disapproved it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it should be increased. They are doing good service.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how can they increase that.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that bring it in the Syndicate again.

Principal B.C. Josan said that get it done from Board of Finance.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that ask Shri Subhash Ji, he is the member of Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they say it has financial implications and, put it down.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that only those three persons are serving to a lot of employees. He is just requesting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he cannot do anything, he pleaded.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that just listen what he wanted to say. If Lal Saheb's case cannot be done, it is all right. He wanted to say that when a doctor is retired, they are not able to reappoint any person. The Central Government has increased their retirement age to 65, Haryana Government has also done that.

Principal B.C. Josan said that Punjab Government has also increased their retirement age to 65.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they should at least save the doctors which are remaining. This is his request, if it can be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he cannot do this too. Again you would refer the black book, Calendar about which you insist. There is no provision in the Calendar. Doctors are separate, teachers are separate and non-teaching staff is separate, there is only class 'C' employee class to whom they can increase retirement age from 60 to 65 years age. That is what is provided in the Calendar.

Professor Mukesh Arora said he felt that they should help them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have talked about the re-employment of college teachers; because of that there will be unemployment. When there is age of retirement 65 for the college teachers of the Delhi University and the Delhi constituent colleges then there is no problem. There is 65 years age in U.P. then there is no problem. There are 23 states, 6-7 Union Territories in India. More than half the states and Union Territories of India where the retirement age is 65 years. There is no problem. They are also the part of the same India.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that there are so many amendments going on in regulations; it can be done in their case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how many amendments they do in the regulations, all that goes in dead sea, in Delhi. Not even a single regulation has been passed in the last five years. He is here for the last four and half years, he has not received even a single regulation coming back. Mr Bhandari told him there are fifty lying in Delhi and fifty they have sent more.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that what they have passed today regarding M.Phil .

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would not come back.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they will do the admission in the next year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the changes are allowed in academic regulations. But, where there is administrative issue that is not being allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no response would come. It has been deposited Joint-Secretary's Office, MHRD Office. Formerly they put it and throw in the Office of the Joint Secretary of UGC and the responsibility of MHRD ended. MHRD said that they are not competent to examine such matters; it is UGC which is competent to examine such matters. They say no other University's regulations come to them, it's only Panjab University, whose regulations come to them, they have no Officer to look into these things. It is an additional burden dumped on them; they had nobody to look



into it. Please understand that the governance of this University is a very complex task. The rules and regulations of this University had been written when there was no teacher employed on behalf of this University. Teachers were got employed on behalf of the University only, when this University moved to its Chandigarh location and slowly everything had to be added, hostels had to be there, medical facilities had to be there. This medical facility is a wonderful facility. Panjab University has now one of the most liberal medical facilities that any public institutions in India have. They should read the history of it. When was it commenced? He found it from the University books only. Law College was in Jalandhar. Then faculty of law felt that they must have a good medical facility for the teachers of the University. And then they proposed, they should be a model Institution which provides good medical facilities to the teachers. It is written there. He was surprised to read all that. So, they started a very good scheme, very liberal scheme. They add everything in that. They don't have medical hospital like Aligarh Muslim University has or the BHU has. Their medical hospital was initially P.G.I. Chandigarh, because the P.G.I. was affiliated to us. They go there and admit anyone there. But all those things are gone, all that has been finished. They tried to diversify. Their families are there, they need gynaecologists, they want pathologists and some chest specialist should be there. All specialists should be there. They tried to get them on part-time basis. They employed 4-5 doctors. These doctors were given preferential accommodation, they were also put on other duties. They had put boards of duties of doctors that so and so doctor is available on the so and so day. All that has now been finished because all the doctors have been retired at the age of 60 and they had vacated the campus accommodation. So, they don't have doctors staying on the campus. The very purpose of having this wonderful Health Centre and having the Medical Officers staying on the campus had been finished. They lost what they had created and they kept squeezing. Did the V.Cs. attend to it? V.C. has no time. Somebody like him comes here, he has three years job. He would come and face the hostile environment. He would not be allowed to even work for first one or two years. When he will understand, then the campaign will start to get rid of him. So, who will look after it? Only permanence that is there, is the governing body of 15 to 18 members who are continuing. But the calendar does not permit you any right because in some sense you are like cabinet, but actually you are not a cabinet. Duties are not assigned to you. They just assemble there to comment what V.C. puts out before you. There is no portfolio attached to it. Portfolios would have been attached to them as a body, if they respect the Calendar. The members of Syndicate of Science Faculty would look after science related matters, members of Arts Faculty would look arts related matters. Whatever the distribution is done, they have the understanding that they have such and such matters and that person of syndicate will look after science related matter, that matter is related to public administration will be seen by Arts Faculty member. General cultural matters and this that, the person of Language Faculty will see. Like this, the Management related, who will come from Combined Faculties. They had not installed that system. Had there been a system

installed properly, where there is a VC, there is cabinet of the Vice-Chancellor, they could have collectively worked. Presently, they have a strange system, there is really a strange system. That needs the modification. But, who will do it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that Syndicate will do as proposed by Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that yes they should perform in that way.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are the governance reforms which are needed. DUI has to be a member of the Syndicate by default. Because he is the one who is giving the opinion on the University matters, but DUI is not the member of this House. DUI has to be a member of this House so that he should implement the things by listening you. DCDC has to be a member of this House. DCDC should be a member of Syndicate; DUI should be a member of Syndicate. DPI (Colleges) of Punjab and DPI (Colleges) U.T. are members of this House but they do not come. They are supposed to protect, they are supposed to give the government's view in that House. They never turn up in the meeting.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said they might have work to do.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should do what they can do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is what he is saying. So the governance of this University which is large and complex raises serious results and you people should look into it and you people do something as this is the new Senate, so that in these four years should see a change. Already they are facing financial crisis. Use this as an opportunity to install a reform. Otherwise, his term would be over, but they are here for three more years; you will stay with this financial crisis and we don't see the solution to the financial mess immediately in sight.

2. Professor Mukesh Arora said that the posts of Superintendent, Assistant Registrars and Deputy Registrars posts are there, are they being promoted now.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nothing is stopped.

Professor Mukesh Arora said automatically, okay, Sir. He thought that this has been blocked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they need officers to man. There has to be Deputy Registrar (Establishment), there are to be Deputy Registrar (Secrecy). There has to be Deputy Registrar where posts exist.

3. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that a competition of shooting range players' is being held in Delhi and their exam is also today, if they be given some other date.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they have already taken a special chance. But by chance, they have again competition on today's date of exam.

It was informed that this be sent to the Director Sports and his recommendations will come.

4. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the Department of Psychology, there is a one day delay/condonation case for submission of synopsis. They were saying that they cannot do it as it is against rules, they could do it through the governing body. The related document was handed over.

The Vice-Chancellor said OK, that it is your body; you are responsible for the governance of this thing. What the issues are, come discuss and do not hesitate. Do not go back at home thinking that there should be discussion on that and they have not discussed. It is your forum.

5. Shri Jarnail Singh talked about retired College Principal's Ph.D. case. There is delay in the case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that person has already retired. He asked to make a case under compassionate ground and said that somebody should submit the details and put up before the Syndicate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the person will not have any benefit, but he wants to complete his Ph.D.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has the detail with him and he will provide the same to the Vice-Chancellor in the next meeting.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in the case of re-employment of the Principals, it should be of 3 years at first and 2 years thereafter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such thing should be done at this time of financial crunch.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is no link with financial crunch.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it will open the pandora's box.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Shri Varinder Singh told is right. He wants to say that presently there is system of advertising after first 2 years and then next 2 years and for the last 1 year. There is difficulty in advertising for last one year. Hence, the advertisement should be given after 2+3 years or 3+2 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not suggesting anything; he is not the government of the University after all. Make the consensus among yourselves. It should not happen that Subhash Ji says entirely a different thing.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that we may follow two and half years plus two and half years.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that either it will be two plus three years or three plus two years.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that whatever it is, do it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is your matter, you must resolve.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it cannot be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no, it is just discussion. It is not final today. For final approval, they will bring the proposal.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that make the consensus on it. This may not happen and message may not go that the Principals sitting there and they increase on their own and think of their benefit only. A lot of Principals are sitting here.

Shri Varinder Singh said that some people think so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first of all it should be 65 for all. This is wrong thing to give the freedom that state may do whatever want, someone has done 60, someone has 62 and someone has done 58. PEC has 58, Punjab has 58.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that is it not 62 in PEC.

Professor B.C. Josan said that it is 62 in PEC. Even it is 60 in Punjab.

The Vice-Chancellor said that CCET has done it at 58. There is one government and salary has to come from same place. What is going on? NCTE will say it 70. UGC will not even give 65.

6. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he had requested on that day and they agreed on that. There is block 2 of Arts Block-II, on the name of Shaheed Bhagat Singh. It was his proposal in 2002 and that has been done. But, till date its plaque has not been written. It should be there.

It was informed that it has been noted.

7. Dr. Vipul Narang said that he had asked to form the NCTE norms committee in the last meeting.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that to do that there is confusion of 50 to 55 years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in that he would give some background. Actually, some old cases were also pending. A committee was formed for that. That committee had cleared some cases. The issue is that there is a teacher, he is an approved teacher. But, as on today's date, there is a

problem of eligibility between the age of 50 to 55. Sangha Saheb was the Chairman of that committee and he told, they have written that it is not applicable on the present teachers. Regulation is not clear and actually they are allowing that is already approved. It is not for those who are already a teacher; it is for the new recruitment. That is there, but the problem is that till date the University has not given any circular. When there is a Selection Committee, they say that it is written 55. In those cases he would suggest a committee be formed of 2-3 persons including Sangha Saheb, they will immediately look into the files and send the clarification to all.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be done immediately as some posts of aided colleges are there.

8. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he had another request, it is totally personal. He doesn't know how all will react. One thing has come to his mind that our anthem is a little long.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it cannot be changed.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that who has written it is our student, he can be told to make a little precise.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be as it is.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it's all right.

9. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that Sir, would the implementation of 4<sup>th</sup> amendment of UGC regulation be done when they fulfil all their conditions, as there is list of journals, list of publishers and all others lists.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for this purpose they have constituted a committee and recommendations will be made after deliberation.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that their implementation is required to be given.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have no option in that. That is mandatory. They have already adopted that on 11<sup>th</sup> of July.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he would like to know about those cases which were due after 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, how they would fulfill the conditions. They are not able to do anything till today. They were at a big loss.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said the UGC amendment for the journals is applicable for future. The person who has already given their option, they were not aware of it. It is for future only.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whose journal has been published should be seen, old should not be seen.

It was reported that they have specifically discussed this issue with the concerned Under Secretary, UGC regarding that condition of specified journals. This condition was notified in the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment which was gazetted on 11<sup>th</sup> July. 11<sup>th</sup> July was the date of notification of UGC. The gazette notification, which is relevant, was published on 13<sup>th</sup> July. From that date this journal condition will be applicable and previous to that journal condition will not be applicable. Prior to that will be journal of ISBN.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said previous to that 3<sup>rd</sup> amendment was going on.

It was reported that 3<sup>rd</sup> amendment will be applicable.

Regarding implementation of 4<sup>th</sup> amendment of UGC regulations in journals, it was informed that it took 4 months in getting the journals specified it was in January. The UGC has not given any clarification regarding people who have published research papers in ISBN journals during the transition period. Similar cases are being sent to the UGC from various universities. There is a need to get a clarification in this regard from the UGC. for this, you have to do follow-up. Till such a clarification is received, the legal status will stand as earlier i.e. 13<sup>th</sup> July.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said till date in many subjects these have not been issued.

10. Shri Varinder Singh asked about the structure of Ankur School.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the school is CBSE approved.

Shri Varinder Singh asked about the role of University in the school as it is in the University campus.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a society which is a Student's Aid Society. It is a separate entity. In the calendar of schools, it is written that Vice-Chancellor's wife will be the chairperson of the Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh asked if they could merge the school with the University and some seats be reserved for the wards of the teachers of the University and others.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said yes, it should be there. He is right.

Shri Varinder Singh said that place is theirs. They can upgrade school as much as they want. There are other private schools who take a large amount as fees, they may also take. Good income can be generated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that school has typically children from lower or middle lower class. Upper middle class children do not come there.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is right. But, if they give some percentage or reserve some seats for the non-teaching and teaching employees of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these things were not imposed on them when this was started.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it can be talked about, when the matter has come there, that it should be like this.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the School is using the land of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not impose the conditions because of the use of the land. It would be on the same lines what the Centre is saying to the University that the University is asking the money from it. They have let these things evolve, something has evolved and it is successful and now they want to poach on it. That is not correct.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that something is to be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, then it has to be studied as to what it is. They are assuming certain things, they could go and have a look at it as what is the profile of the students. A full study of the same has to be conducted.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there are other poor students also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first of all they have to see all things and they should not make off the cuff statements. He did not think that at this time they could impose such things like that the land belongs to the University. There are some conditions under which the land has been given. Now they could not arm twist, that the land belongs to the University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is not saying so. He just wanted that the University should also get some benefit.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it is a part of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they should study the background. He has no idea and did not want to interfere. The people in the governing body of the school are all connected with the University and some of them must have studied in this school itself as they grew up, like Dr. Manjit Kaur, Dr. Madhu Paul Kaul, the daughter of Professor R.C. Paul, etc.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was a problem as has been pointed out by Shri Varinder Singh. The U.T. Administration and the CBSE provided some norms relating with the admission process and those have to be followed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the school did not follow the guidelines of the CBSE or U.T., it could be in trouble.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in the schools like Strawberry Fields, there are some seats reserved for the management quota.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the seats are not reserved, but the admissions are made in some other way.

Shri Varinder Singh said that such schools reserve some seats for the poor or disabled students and when such seats remain vacant, these are converted and filled up by the managements.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that since the fee of Strawberry Fields School is Rs.1,16,000/-, the poor students could not take the admission there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a separate section for poor students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could have a look at it and could talk to Dr. Manjit Kaur and Dr. Madhu Paul. He has put such people in the management who have built up the school, whose children have studied in the school so that it is not dependent on the wife of a given Vice-Chancellor in running the school since the school has to have a continuity.

11. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in continuation of the discussion on the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment, there is a clause in that the list of journals is to be prepared by the University and the same is to be sent to the UGC for information only and there is no need of approval.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would discuss it with Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the matter is pending since July 2016 and it is now March, meaning that a period of 9 months has lapsed.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu to give him a note and he would talk to Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he had sent an email to the Vice-Chancellor about 2-3 days ago.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into it.

12. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, a legal opinion was to be sought on the issue of re-advertisement or corrigendum for the positions of the Constituent Colleges, it should be expedited.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Registrar to expedite the matter.

13. The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part of the Senate had been sent to the members.



Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a few of the members have sent their response. One thing is that as they are talking about 44 positions. It be not mentioned that only 44 positions are to be filled up. It could be mentioned that whenever any position falls vacant, that may be allowed to be filled up for general category in addition to the other categories.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a note be given and it would be modified.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was discussed that, he did not know as to how to go about it, at the moment they are not retrenching anyone.

14. Shri Varinder Singh said that the University should be made vehicle free and efforts should be made in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is good but how it could be done.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a Committee could be formed in this regard including the Registrar and some other others. It is very essential.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the details of the vehicle would have to be prepared. In the first instance, it could be done as a test case.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is no need of a test case. It is not the case with other universities like Punjabi University, Kurukshetra University and Guru Nanak Dev University.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there was a news report about implementation of the odd-even formula, whether that has been implemented or not.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a Committee be constituted for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. The Committee could include Professor Akshaya Kumar, Professor Shelley Walia, Professor Kiranpreet Kaur, Chief of University Security and Registrar.

15. The Vice-Chancellor said that the MoU with Punjab Government has not been signed till date.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the MoU has not been received, then they would have to see whether the Colleges should be continued or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has sought an appointment to present the case to the new Chief Minister separately for the University, new Constituent Colleges, old Constituent Colleges, Regional Centre, Muktsar for which 5 acre land has been allotted and Regional Centre, Kauni. When the Punjab Government for the first time did not meet its 40% is 2001. At that time, Shri Parkash Singh Badal was the Chief

Minister. Then Shri Amrinder Singh came for the period 2002 to 2007 and said that they would give Rs.16 crores. That amount of Rs.16 crores was not released. When the Task Force came at that time, the new Chief Minister came as the term was over. It went on for 10 years and the Constituent Colleges were added. But the MoU could not be signed in spite of every file being chased. He was told that the file was with Mr. Satish Chandra and he spoke to him who did not reveal that he had written to the Ministry of Human Resource Development. He spoke very nicely but did not reveal anything at all and till that time he had completed all the formalities and the file had been sent. According to him, there is a consensus in the political and bureaucratic class that Panjab University is not to be given anything on the premise that the amount that Punjab Government gives to Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University is very small as compared to the money that Panjab University receives from the Centre. So, there is a consensus in the Government that the money is not to be given. He did not understand as to why the consensus is there.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the Vice-Chancellor would be known as a fighter Vice-Chancellor. He has seen that the Vice-Chancellor has done so much efforts, whether the Government releases the grant or not is a separate matter.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Professor Mukesh Arora is a very senior member. He has seen so many Vice-Chancellors but not a person like the present Vice-Chancellor. He said while appreciating the efforts of the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a note of 19<sup>th</sup> January in which it is written that if a MoU is to be signed with the Panjab University, the other universities would also demand for the same MoU. So, what is the wrong if the other universities are also demanding the same MoU. If the Government is asking the Universities to perform tasks on its behalf, then the demand of the grant (s) is also genuine.

Shri Varinder Singh said that when the Vice-Chancellor would leave the University, he would also leave the Syndicate/Senate. Till now, he has not seen such a good Vice-Chancellor like the present one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the former Chief Minister personally called him 2-3 times telephonically that the Principal for the Constituent Colleges should be appointed. Now he (Principal I.S. Sandhu) has been appointed as the Principal and now he has to become the torch bearer of going and taking along the present Principals to convey that the MoU that the University is asking for these Colleges is genuine, because they are serving the masses. It is a part of the national effort that the GER should be enhanced. It is not a call of the present Government, but it was the call of Dr. Man Mohan Singh. So, play this card that they are implementing what Dr. Man Mohan Singh wanted. He requested Principal I.S. Sandhu that, independent of the efforts that they are making, he along with the other Principals of the Constituent

Colleges and the two Coordinators, should seek an appointment with the Chief Minister.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he would try to do it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Government has declared there should be a Government College in every Block (in 85 Blocks of the State).

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to convene a meeting of the Principals and the Coordinators of the Constituent Colleges and they should talk to Shri Manpreet Singh.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the help of the members is also required.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma could also help in the matter as he is close to Shri Manpreet Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Principal I.S. Sandhu should act as the captain as he belongs to that area and he (Vice-Chancellor) could not convey with that emotion that he (Principal I.S. Sandhu) could convey. If a Principal would take up the matter, he would be listened to.

(G.S. Chadha)  
Registrar

Confirmed

( Arun Kumar Grover )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR