

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 20th August 2017 at 11.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

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

Shri Lakhmir Singh, DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

- (i) Rajamata Smt. Mohinder Kaur ji, revered mother of Captain Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister, Punjab and Ex-officio Member of PU Senate, on 24th July, 2017.
- (ii) Professor Yash Pal, former Chairman, University Grants Commission, New Delhi and an iconic PU Alumnus, on 24th July 2017. Prof. Yash Pal had graduated in Physics from Panjab University in 1949.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Rajamata Smt. Mohinder Kaur ji and Professor Yash Pal and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- i) Hon'ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu ji has taken over as Vice-President of India on August 11, 2017. As Vice-

President of India, Shri Venkaiah Naidu is also the Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- ii) Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public Administration and Fellow, PU, has been appointed as Vice Chancellor of Punjabi University, Patiala, for a period of three years by the Governor, Punjab and Chancellor, Punjabi University, Patiala. He assumed office on 15th of August.
- iii) The Association of British Scholars (ABS), Chandigarh Chapter, elected Professor B.S. Ghuman, Dean, Faculty of Arts of the Department of Public Administration, PU, as its President for a period of two years. ABS is a non-profit organization working under the British Council, Delhi to promote the Indo-UK relations.
- iv) Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU and President, Chandigarh Region Innovation Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), has been appointed as member of Group of Eight Australian Universities-India Ph.D Advisory Taskforce, announced by the Australian Minister for Education & Training. The objective of the Taskforce is to provide advice for universities and government on strategies to increase two-way mobility of Ph.D. students between India and Australia.
- v) Prof. Virinder Kumar Walia, Department of Zoology, has been awarded with gold medal by the Indian Academy of Environment Sciences, Haridwar, for his contribution to the cause of environment and zoology in general and discipline of entomology.
- vi) Renowned Punjabi sufi singer, poet, actor and composer - Dr. Satinder Sartaaj has been designated as the Brand Ambassador of Panjab University. He visited the PU Campus on July 26, 2017 to interact with the students and faculty on an invitation from PU Alumni Association. He did his Ph.D. from the Department of Music and also taught as a guest faculty before achieving great heights in music field as a sufi singer. He has performed a lead role of 'Maharaja Duleep Singh' in the recently released Hollywood movie 'The Black Prince'. He was also honoured at the inaugural of 'The India Awards-2017' held at the Houses of Parliament, UK, London.
- vii) UGC Networking Resource Centre Programme (UGC-NRC) sanctioned to University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences in 2009, has been approved for Phase-II for a period of five years i.e. 2017 to 2022 with a allocated budget of Rs. 5.00 crores.
- viii) Fresenius Kabi Oncology Limited, (FKOL), a multinational from Italy, having office at Gurgaon, has set up a microbiology laboratory at the Cluster Innovation Centre (CIC), operational under the supervision of Dr. Rohit Sharma as Coordinator. A 3-D graphics laboratory was also inaugurated on the

occasion by FKOL Secretary and Director, Shri Nikhil Kulshrestha. CIC is co-located along with Department of Microbial Technology in Sector-25.

- ix) Panjab University has signed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Department of Biochemistry of Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada for a joint research in the field of biochemistry on July 24. This MoU would facilitate the students and faculty exchange in the area of Biochemistry between the two universities.
- x) Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar, has appointed Mr. Birbal Waddhera of Sport Department, PU, as a Coach of Tennis Team of their University participating in the World University Games scheduled to be held at Taipei, Taiwan from August 19-30, 2017.
- xi) Panjab University has appointed Dr Rakesh Malik, Dy Director, Sport Department as Manager of the National Athletics Team participating in the World University Games scheduled to be held at Taipei, Taiwan from August 19-30, 2017.
- xii) University Business School had organized an interaction session with the faculty of Nottingham Business School (NBS), the famous business school of UK, on July 24, to explore the possibility of collaboration between the two Institutions for exchange of faculty, students and joint research projects.
- xiii) Centre for Policy Research (CPR), a DST project which enjoins PU to promote Industry-Academia Interaction nationally, held a very successful three day event at PU Campus from August 17-19, 2017. All the five CPRs in India were reviewed on the first day by an expert team lead by Chairman, DST Policy Research Cell, namely, Prof. Baldev Raj, Director, NIAS, Bangalore and Chancellor, Academy of CSIR which is a deemed university now. On the second day, he chaired a committee to review proposals of new Medical Instrumentation Hubs and reviewed existing Hubs in India. PGI is likely to get a Medical Instrumentation Hub in next phase. On the third day Dr. V.K. Saraswat, Member, NITI Aayog and Chancellor, JNU, Dr. Girish Sahni, Director General, CSIR & Dr Baldev Raj participated in Round Table Meet (RTM) on 'Country Specific Models for Public Private Partnership (PPP) to rejuvenate R&D in India'. This RTM was attended by R&D Industry giants from all over India, which included Directors from Reliance Industries Limited, Navi Mumbai, HCL Technologies, Noida, Representative of Research Parks at Indian Institute of Technology, Madras (IITM) and IITD,. The Automotive Research Association of India, Pune, (ARAI), BIRAC (DBT), senior officials from other Departments of Central Government (DST, DBT, BCIL), Directors of CSIR Labs and officials from British High Commission,

etc. also were the partner of this Round Table Meet. It lasted the whole day.

Dr. V.K. Saraswat spent the whole day at PU and visited other sites on the Campus. Prof. Rupinder Tewari, Coordinator, CPR, very effectively organized the three day back to back events with the assistance of the new young staff of CPR. Dr V.K. Saraswat was very appreciative of the progress made by CPR at PU during the first phase of three years. The second phase of CPR for three years also stands approved.

- xiv) The Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund Account has been opened and the first two contributions have been received in it, i.e., one from Professor Bambah, Fellow and former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University and other from Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji, former Member of Parliament. Professor R.P. Bambah gave one time contribution of Rs. 7 lakhs. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji had offered to contribute Rs. 2 lakhs every year. As per his promise, he deposited Rs. 2 lakhs as his contribution for the first year.
- xv) Professor Rajinder Jindal, Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh has been awarded Gold Medal by the Indian Academy of Environmental Sciences, Haridwar, on the occasion of the National Conference on Biodiversity Conservation and Coastal Management organized by the Department of Zoology, Vevekananda College, Agasteewaram (Kanyakumari) during August 10-12, 2017.

Before proceeding further, the Vice-Chancellor said that they are going to discuss many things including the item on Board of Finance, the meeting of which was held on 1st August, 2017. After that meeting, the High Court on 11th August had again taken cognisance of whatever happened in the meeting of the Board of Finance. The High Court is satisfied that the budget would get balanced this year. The Haryana Government has filed a reply in the High Court saying that they have sent a communication to the Union Home Ministry promising their participation and that they would contribute as much as Punjab contributes, etc. These are the developments that would happen as the time goes by. The next hearing in the Court is in the month of September.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired whether Haryana Government is demanding something or would provide unconditional support.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever the Haryana Government wanted is that whatever had happened earlier that should be reversed not for the whole of Haryana but for some districts of Haryana.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a special function could be held to felicitate the Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has sought a meeting with the Chancellor. As yet, he has not received any date. The Chancellor's office had asked him to come at 10.00 a.m. on 15th August which was not possible for him. He has again asked for another date which is 24th August. The Chancellor is moving to his office-cum-residence on 21st August and after he has moved in, he would take a call whether the appointment could be given on 24th August. He (Vice-Chancellor) would be in Pune for two days returning to Chandigarh via Delhi on 23rd. If the appointment is granted, he would meet the Chancellor. For the first meeting, he has sent a communication to the Chancellor that if nothing else, the Chancellor should preside over the Convocation in February/March, 2018 on a date convenient to him. Normally, the Chancellors are very kind to Panjab University. The Vice-President is the Chancellor of only three universities, i.e., University of Delhi, Panjab University and University of Pondicherry. So, they are expecting a positive response.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Hon'ble M. Hamid Ansari be felicitated for the services as he had been the Chancellor of the University for 10 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had gone and met Hon'ble M. Hamid Ansari and given three mementoes on behalf of Panjab University and conveyed wishes on behalf of the fraternity of Panjab University and gave a coffee table book which is based on the colloquia lectures which were delivered at Panjab University during the last 5 years. On behalf of the staff of Panjab University, he has presented an album on biodiversity of Panjab University. On behalf of the Alumni Association, he has presented a book on Ruchi Ram which is authored by Dr. Neera Burra. Prima facie, he has done this. But if the members wanted anything else to be done, he would be happy to do it.

The members said that they should recognise the services of Hon'ble M. Hamid Ansari.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the issue of Haryana is a sensitive one. Therefore, the Syndicate and the Senate should think over it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it would also become a big political issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that they could discuss over it by bringing an item and the same could be placed before the Senate. Right now, whatever happens regarding the Panjab University, any changes relating to this, that responsibility is of the Centre. He has been told, though not formally given an official letter, that the Chief Minister of Haryana has already written a letter to the Home Minister. He has seen that letter but it has not been given to Panjab University officially.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they had discussed that they could invite the Haryana Government to help the University as earlier also the Colleges of Haryana were affiliated to Panjab University.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Hon'ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu ji on having taken over as Vice-President of India & the Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh;
 - (ii) Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public Administration and Fellow, PU, on being appointed as (i) Vice Chancellor of Punjabi University, Patiala and (ii) on being elected as President of the Association of British Scholars (ABS), Chandigarh Chapter for a period of two years;
 - (iii) Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU and President, Chandigarh Region Innovation Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), on his being appointed as member of Group of Eight Australian Universities-India Ph.D Advisory Taskforce;
 - (iv) Prof. Virinder Kumar Walia, Department of Zoology on being awarded with gold medal by the Indian Academy of Environment Sciences, Haridwar, for his contribution to the cause of environment and zoology in general and discipline of entomology;
 - (v) Renowned Punjabi sufi singer, poet, actor and composer - Dr. Satinder Sartaaj on his being designated as the Brand Ambassador of Panjab University;
 - (vi) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences for approval of UGC Networking Resource Centre Programme (UGC-NRC) for Phase-II for a period of five years i.e. 2017 to 2022 with a allocated budget of Rs.5.00 crores;
 - (vii) Mr. Birbal Waddhera of Department of Sports, PU, on having been appointed as a Coach of Tennis Team of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar participating in the World University Games;
 - (viii) Dr. Rakesh Malik, Deputy Director, Department of Sports, PU on being appointed as Manager of the National Athletics Team participating in the World University Games;
 - (ix) Professor R.P. Bambah for contributing a one-time sum of Rs. 7 lakhs to the Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund Account;
 - (x) Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal for having offered to contribute Rs. 2 lakhs every year and

having contributed Rs.2 lakhs for the first year to the Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund Account; and

- (xi) Professor Rajinder Jindal. Department of Zoology, on having been awarded Gold Medal by the Indian Academy of Environmental Sciences, Haridwar;
2. The information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (viii), (ix), (xii) and (xiii) be noted.
3. The Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 23.07.2017, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 01.08.2017

- 2.** Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 01.08.2017 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19 and 20):

Item 1

That:

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

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

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

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

- (ii) Vice-Chancellor is authorized for allowing re-appropriation from one budget head to another with condition that the total expenditure would remain within overall sanctioned revised estimates.

(iii) University shall send two separate proposals to UGC:

- i) for seeking permission for filling up of posts of Dean College Development Council and Chief of University Staff;
- ii) for the posts of Assistant Professors which got vacated after completion of 65 years.

NOTE : 1. Head wise detail of Expenditure and Income is enclosed as **(Appendix - I & II)**, respectively.

2. The detail of budget heads where revision is proposed (upward/downward) is enclosed herewith as **Appendix - III**.

3. The detail of Demands for Non-Recurring Capital provisions for Specific works/projects is enclosed herewith as **Appendix - IV**.

4. Status of Income & Expenditure as on 31.03.2017.

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

5. The audit of balance sheet for the 2016-2017 is in progress.

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

Item 2

Noted and ratified the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for allowing the utilization of already sanctioned amount of Rs. 50,000/- out of "Development Fund" for purchase and installation of RO+UV water purifiers and a water cooler instead of CCTV cameras in

Syndicate Proceedings dated 20th August 2017

the Amrita Shergill Girls Hostel, P.U.R.C., Ludhiana which was sanctioned in the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 13-02-2017.

NOTE: The Director P.U Regional Centre Ludhiana stated that they had already purchased and installed 8 cameras during the financial year 2016-17. Now it is dire necessity of RO+UV water purifiers and one water cooler for the resident of Hostels.

Item 3

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

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

Item 4

That:

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

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

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

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

the duly constituted Selection Committee to meet the immediate requirement of New P.U. Constituent Colleges as a very special case.

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

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

5. In view of the audit observation the matter of payments to the said Guest

Faculty was considered as a very Special case.

Item 5

That:

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

1. Non-Recurring Provisions:

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

2. Recurring Provisions (Revenue Account):

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

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

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

Item 7

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

Item 8

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

Item 9

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

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

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

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

Item 10

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

- NOTE:**1) The Syndicate at its meeting held on 19.07.2015, Paragraph 18 approved the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University Chandigarh including financial Clause "**4.9-Revenue Sharing**".
- 2) The formula of **Revenue Sharing** as per Clause 4.9 of the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University Chandigarh was placed in the meeting of Board of Finance dated 13-02-2017 vide Agenda Item No 3 wherein it was suggested that this matter be taken up in the next meeting of the Board of Finance **(Appendix-XVIII) (Page-51-52).**
 - 3) In the meeting of Syndicate held on 19.07.2015 (Paragraph No.18) it was discussed that if the University may like to enhance the ratio of sharing from 70:30 to 80:20 or more it may consult IIT Ropar and Bombay.
 - 4) The Director CIIPP had requested through e-mail dated 05.07.2017 **(Appendix-XIX)(Page- 53-54)** to IIT Mumbai, IIT Madras, IIT Kharagpur, IIT Ropar, Banaras Hindu University, Hyderabad, Delhi University, BBAU, Lucknow to provide the policy being followed by the respective

Institutes/Universities for revenue sharing between institute and the inventor. Only IIT Ropar has informed that their IPR Policy is still under the process of drafting.

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

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

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

Item 11

That the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 30.03.2017 for sanctioning additional amount of Rs.26,68,173/- out of below mentioned budget head on account of incentives to the outstanding sports person during the annual sports prize distribution function held on 30.03.2017 as under:

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

- NOTE:**
- The University has improved its performance in the sports field from 13,800 point in the year 2014-15 to 43,880 during 2015-16 with scoring of 2nd position for award of MAKATrophy during the year 2016-17. University sports persons further excelled their performance by securing more positions and it is expected that the increase in points is likely to be more than 30%.

2. As per PUSC rules, outstanding players who get positions International, National and Inter-University level tournaments / games are allowed incentives in the form of cash award.
3. As the Panjab University sports persons got more positions as compared in the year 2015-16 the amount of cash awards has also increased.
4. The audit has observed that the above excess expenditure incurred out of Sports fund account may be got noted from the Board of Finance.

Item 12

That:

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

1	Honorarium to Teachers 180 days X 4 periods= 720 @ Rs.1000/-	=	Rs. 7,20,000/-
2	Office & General expenses	=	Rs. 50,000/-
3	Running, repair & Maintenance of Equipments etc	=	Rs. 50,000/-
	Total expenditure:	=	<u>Rs. 8,20,000/-</u>

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

- NOTE:**
1. On the recommendations of the Faculty of Arts in its meeting held on 19.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXI)(Page-58 to 64)**, the Syndicate approved the reintroduction of Post Graduate Diploma in Women's Studies (Semester System) in the Department-cum Centre for Women's Studies & Development, from the academic session 2017-18.
 2. The department has confirmed that no additional manpower shall be asked for.
 3. The examination and other evaluation fee will be as per University rules.

Item 13

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

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

Item 14

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

- NOTE:**
1. The proposal regarding up-gradation to 100Mbps was sent in November 2015 and with the increase in the number of students (users) and other campus requirements bandwidth requirement of 170 Mbps was processed in December 2016.
 2. The audit has observed that the up-gradation of Internet Lease Line Connectivity (ILL) from 20Mbps to 170 Mbps instead of 20Mbps to 100 Mbps be got approved from Board of Finance.

Item 15

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

Sr. No.	Details of Expenditure	P.U.C.C., Dharamkot	P.U.C.C., Ferozepur
1	Salary(GuestFaculty @ 25,000/-) April 2017 (I month)	1,75,000/-	2,25,000/-
	July 2017- March 2018 (9 months).	36,00,000/-	36,00,000/-
	Pending payments of Guest Faculty for the session 2016-17.	6,00,000/-	2,00,000/-
2	Office & General Expenses (Including	2,50,000/-	2,50,000/-

Syndicate Proceedings dated 20th August 2017

	Advertisements, Admission Prospectus etc.)		
3	Out-sourcing of Clerk- cum- DEO, Helper, Cleaner & Security Gaurd	4,00,000/-	4,00,000/-
4	Running, Repair, Maintenance & Purchase of minor Equipment/ Furniture e.g. Black Board/ Projector, Water Cooler, RO system, audio-address-system, Hiring of buses etc	6,00,000/-	6,00,000/-
5	Electricity & Water Charges	3,50,000/-	3,50,000/-
	Total Expenditure	59,75,000/-	56,25,000/-
	Revenue Receipts	40.00lac (approx.)	40.00 lac (approx.)

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

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

Item 16

That after the retirement of Assistant Registrars and Superintendents promoted against ex-gratia posts, no further promotion be made on Ex-gratia posts and such posts be restored in the respective cadre.

- NOTE:**
1. There is an estimated enhancement financial effect to the tune of Rs.4,89,744/- per annum as per the existing pay-scale for these sanctioned Ex-gratia posts.
 2. A self explanatory office note giving the background with regard to sanction of the Ex-gratia post to maintain the equilibrium of ratio of 4:1 from amongst the cadre of Superintendents and Personal Assistants for their promotional avenues to the posts of Assistant Registrars is enclosed as **(Appendix-XXIV) (Page-80 to 83)**.
 3. The officiating arrangement against the sanctioned Ex-gratia posts of the Assistant Registrars (4) and Superintendents (3) shall continue as such as per the existing policy after the deletion of the word Ex-gratia from the existing strength of

the sanctioned posts of the Assistant Registrars in the Budget Estimates 2017-2018.

Item 19

To note that the action with regard to the issue of payment of secretariat pay to certain categories of employees of Panjab University be taken on the basis of clarification to be issued by the Punjab Government.

- NOTE:1** The above matter was discussed in the meeting of Board of Finance dated August 1, 2016 vide agenda item 20 in the light of a para framed by the Office of Principal Director of Audit (Central), Chandigarh with respect to admissibility of secretariat pay to University employees on par with the employees of Punjab government posted in secretariat. After detailed discussions, the members unanimously resolved that University should again send a reply to the CAG in the light of above discussions with all supporting documents to settle the para. Till then the status quo be maintained **(Appendix-XXXII) (Page 118 -119).**
2. In compliance to the above decision of the Board of Finance, the University again submitted a detailed reply to the Office of Principal Director of Audit (Central), Chandigarh vide letter No.3616/FDO dated 05.09.2016 **(Appendix-XXXIII)(Page 120 to 122).**
 3. The UGC vide its letter dated February 01, 2017 informed that the Secretariat pay payable to the Punjab Government employees, posted in the Secretariat cannot be paid to Panjab University employees. The letter of the UGC is attached herewith as **(Appendix-XXXIV)(Page-123).**
 4. In response to above letter, the Panjab University vide its letter dated February 09, 2017 **(Appendix- XXXV)(Page-124)** informed that the University had already submitted full facts of the case with all supporting documents to CAG. It was also informed that as and when the final decision of the CAG would arrive, the University shall take necessary action accordingly with due intimation to all concerned. However, the final reply of the CAG is still awaited.
 5. The matter was again discussed in the meeting of the Board of Finance of Panjab University on 13.02.2017.

In the above referred meeting, the nominee of Government of Punjab, Department of Finance stated that since the Panjab University has allowed the secretariat pay based on the Punjab Government instructions, therefore, they should seek fresh instructions from Government of Punjab in the light of observations of the CAG. The nominee of the Government of Punjab has also observed that **“although previous recovery might not be affected but the current pay should be re-fixed”**.

In view of the discussions held in the aforesaid meeting of the Board of Finance, it was resolved that:

fresh instructions be sought from Government of Punjab regarding the continuance of secretariat pay to Non-teaching employees of Panjab University in the light of above discussion and it was further decided that University shall take the necessary action as per the advice of the Punjab Government.

The copy of the relevant extract of the meeting of Board of Finance dated 13.02.2017 is enclosed herewith **(Appendix-XXXVI) (Page-125)**.

6. In compliance to the above decision of the Board of Finance, the University vide letter No.970-72/FDO dated 23.02.2017 has sought the advice of Government of Punjab as to whether the status quo be maintained with regard to payment of secretariat pay to non-teaching employees or the same may be stopped till final decision of the CAG on this issue is received by the University **(Appendix-XXXVII) (Page 126-127)**.
7. The University has also requested the Office of CAG to expedite the process of examination of reply of Panjab University so that final necessary action may be taken by the University **(Appendix-XXXVIII)(Page-128)**. The final reply of CAG is awaited.
8. The Punjab Government vide its letter No.7/38/2017-1-IE2/10/6981/ dated 06.07.2017 **(Appendix - XXXIX)(Page-129 to 138)** has forwarded the copies of various notifications of Punjab Government whereby the secretariat pay was sanctioned to various categories of employees of Punjab Government. However, the specific

query which was requested as per the decision of the BOF dated 13.02.2017 was not received.

9. The University has again requested the Government of Punjab vide letter No.1755 dated 17.07.2017 to give fresh instructions regarding the continuance of secretariat pay to non-teaching employees of Panjab University (**Appendix-XL**) (**Page 139-140**).

Item 20

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

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

certain conditions. The copy of relevant extract of UGC regulation is attached as **(Appendix-XLII)(Page 142-143).**

6. It is relevant to mention that her case was referred to UGC for clarification in response to which the UGC vide letter dated 01.02.2017 informed that the UGC regulation on this issue is clear and self explanatory and accordingly the case may be examined by the University **(Appendix-XLIII)(Page 144).**
7. Dr. Namita Gupta fulfils all the conditions of counting of her past service for promotion under CAS except that there was a gap of 19 days between the date when her term as Assistant Professor expired on 01.07.2010 and the date when she joined as regular faculty i.e., on 20.07.2010. So far as the gap of nineteen (19) days i.e., from 01.07.2010 to 19.07.2010 is concerned, it is submitted that the process of appointment of a faculty member involves due administrative procedure, which the University has to follow. Thus the gap of nineteen (19) days had caused due to time taken in completion of administrative procedures, while following the various channels of hierarchy. Otherwise there is no gap in between the termination of temporary service and the approval of regular appointment by the Selection Committee as well as by the Syndicate, because the regular appointment stands approved before the date of termination of temporary service.

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

NOTE: A copy of representation dated 08.08.2017 of the Secretary and President of P.U. Non-teaching Employees Federation relating to Items 16 and 19 is enclosed. **(Pages 16-A to 16-C)**

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are the recommendations of the Board of Finance. As an introductory remark, he said that the difficulties of Panjab University commenced last year while approving the recommendations of the Board of Finance of last year and recommended the budget for the year 2016-17 in which situation was that they were showing their income by taking into account the contribution of Rs.20 crores from the Punjab Government and

projecting a deficit and were requesting the deficit to be met from the Central Government without any assurance from the Central Government that they would meet the deficit of the University. They had difficulties in the sense that contribution from the Central Government was pegged to the level of support that they received in the year 2014-15 and at the end of 2014-15 whatever they received was inadequate even for that year. Another year passed, since the level of support did not enhance, they had more deficit. So, in the previous year, if they were to get the same level of support then they were to have so much deficit of last year that they would have found it difficult to pay the salaries after December. It was that thing that was taken cognisance of and several things happened. But at the end of the last financial year, the budget for last year was balanced. This year has commenced with the Central Government saying that they have announced before the start of the year that they would give 5% more what they had given the last year. The proposal for this year's budget has come in that the Central Government would give so much support. The Punjab Government also came in and said that they would also give the funds to Panjab University more than last year. The Central Government said that they would give Rs.208 crores. There is a certain estimate of this year's income. So, the present budget is an attempt to balance this year's budget saying that this much is the income of the University, this much enhancement would be given by the Punjab Government, the Central Government would give the enhanced grant. There is a proposal of balanced budget. But this proposal of balanced budget is dependent on their being able to successfully generate the income that they are saying. The income of the University is a projection which is based on the fact the number of students writing the examinations would not go down and the number of students taking admission on the Panjab University campus would not reduce and they would give an income to the University that they have calculated. It is hoped that the budget would be balanced in the background of this thing. What does it presuppose is that they would not be paying salaries to more number of people that they did last year. This is a presupposition. But the employees are retiring and they have critical shortage at some places and in view of the freedom given by the Central Government to articulate that whenever extra persons are required, it should be articulated which would be examined by the Central Government. If the Central Government allows to recruit people, then they could add more people. Even if the Central Government permits the University to recruit more people, it would take a long time to complete the whole process. Even if they recruit few people this year, their effect on the budget is going to be only for the last few months of the year. So, that is not a bar on the budget. At the moment, the situation is that prima facie, it is a balanced budget. They would be paying the same salary to everybody as they have paid in the previous year. Hopefully, they would be able to generate income. After 11th August, they have already gone and met the MHRD and the UGC and unofficially held consultations as to what should be the strategy so that the Panjab University gets answers to its needs whether it is the need of the security or recruiting Dean College Development Council or the appointment of Deputy Registrars. The MHRD/UGC has asked (us) to prepare each of the requirements separately.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the 7th Pay Commission recommendations are also to be implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said that still the recommendations have not come. They have a Think-Tank to worry about it. He has formed separate Committees on this issue of charges from the students of the affiliated Colleges, Constituent Colleges and the University. These Committees would meet soon after today's Syndicate meeting and take cognisance of it. He had a meeting with the Chief Secretary, Punjab two days ago in some other context. In view of the thing that the other two universities of Punjab now have the Vice-Chancellors in place, he has requested the Chief Secretary who has agreed that a meeting of the three Vice-Chancellors shall be constituted soon and a holistic view would be taken on matters related to affiliated Colleges as well as the campus because the Government has not only to support the campus but the affiliated Colleges also. The Government is conscious of the fact that the service conditions of the teachers belonging to different universities in the State, there is no rationalisation in that. So, the Government is conscious that as a State, there should be a synergy and there should not be much differentials in the three universities. They have to see how it would evolve, but, the Chief Secretary seemed aware of the problems. He had also a chance meeting with Professor B.S. Ghuman and made him aware about it. They would follow up. He has also contacted Professor Jaspal Singh and hopes that the things would move on in Punjab with two new Vice-Chancellors, with one of them till recently being with the UGC who would bring in support from Delhi. Hopefully, a new beginning would get made. Punjab Government is conscious that the number of Colleges in the Government sector as well as the Constituent Colleges which are also supposed to be funded by the Punjab Government. The Government is also conscious that when the money for the Government Colleges and the Constituent Colleges is coming from the same exchequer, the service conditions could not be different. If the faculty has to be appointed with the same level of qualification following the same UGC rules and norms, then how could there be so much differential. So, the Government is aware of this. How this would progress, only the time would tell. But everything has been flagged.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired as to how would they meet the requirement of Rs.18 crores.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the Court has taken cognisance of it and asked the Punjab Government, because the Centre has asked the Punjab Government and the University to put together the previous deficit. The previous deficit was a large amount. Now, the University has already contributed money from its own income to meet the previous deficit. So, the plea to the Punjab Government is that in view of the Centre's directive that the deficit should be met by the University from its own income and an enhanced contribution from the Punjab Government. So, they are the two parties that are supposed to meet the deficit. The University has shown its contribution and has made an appeal to the Punjab Government to do something. The counsel of Punjab Government in the High Court said that he would consult the Government. The hearings in the High Court are not over. The matter goes back to the High Court in the month of September. At the moment, it is an evolving thing. Nothing is being given up.

While referring to **Sub-Item 1**, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that under the table of revised estimates 2017-18, it is mentioned that the Government of Punjab has announced an increase of Rs.7.00 crores.

This is a statement of 20.06.2017. The meeting of the Board of Finance was held on 1.8.2017. He enquired whether anything in written has come.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not doubt the Government. It is a proposal in the budget and unless it is rejected, it should be valid.

While referring to **Sub-Item 4**, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the Note No.2, it is mentioned that in the first instance, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the appointment of non NET qualified faculty for the first semester up to 31.12.2016. He enquired whether this date is correct.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the period of appointment was up to 31st December. But the posts could not be advertised and the session was over and these persons were to be paid the salary.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that then the appointment was extended up to 31.08.2017.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the representative of the U.T. Administration in the meeting of the Board of Finance had said that these guest teachers should be paid @ Rs.500/- per lecture. But they pleaded that Rs.500/- is a very less and amount it could be somewhat less than Rs.1000/- per lecture. Therefore, the amount was fixed at Rs.800/- per lecture and the representative of the U.T. Administration said that the upper limit should be fixed at Rs.15,000/-, but now the upper limit has been fixed at Rs.20,000/- p.m. Now, they are supposed to advertise again the posts. If they fail to do so, then these persons would continue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for future, the notification issued by the U.T. Administration would be applicable.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that this should not be applicable.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that since the Vice-Chancellor has allowed the continuance of non-NET qualified faculty up to 31.08.2017. He suggested that they should have some liberty to further the guest faculty.

Principal I.S. Sandhu put some facts related to it and said that through a Committee, they have decided the honorarium to be paid to the guest faculty @ Rs.1000/- and the upper limit has been fixed at Rs.25,000/- p.m. and workload would be as per UGC norms. He has been discussing time and again that if the payment is made on per lecture basis, there would be problems. As far as the issue of appointment of non-NET is concerned, the decision has been taken for appointment up to 31.08.2017 with an upper limit of Rs.20,000/-, that is okay. In the further resolved it is mentioned that for future, the notification issued by the U.T. Administration would be applicable. This is objectionable because the workload in the U.T. Administration is only 2 periods and the persons are treated as resource person instead of guest faculty. He did not want to go into the issue whether they should follow the U.T. Administration or the Punjab Government, but he wanted a solution to the problems being faced. The Punjab Government is paying a salary of Rs.21,600/- to NET-qualified as well as non-NET qualified teachers. He had suggested that there should

be some, but not much, difference between NET qualified and non-NET qualified for the reason that when recently the interviews were conducted, in the subject of Commerce, all the vacancies have been filled except one at Sikhwala due to non-availability of eligible persons. In the subject of Physical Education, for 7-8 vacancies they could find only two eligible candidates, the other vacancies could not be filled up. For about 10 vacancies in the subject of English, they could not find even a single qualified person. Similar is the case with the subject of Computer Science and Applications where no qualified candidate was found. He pointed out certain problems. Dharamkot is a place like a village and they would not be able to find suitable candidates in the areas located within about 50 kms. He cited the case that a lady was selected as a guest faculty for a College and she was to be paid Rs.15,000/- but she refused because she was already getting Rs.13,000/- in a school located in her home-town. A person from Faridkot joined the College at Sikhwala in the subject of Political Science as a guest faculty who is to be paid Rs.15,000/-. That person has rented a room for Rs.4,000/-. In addition to this, he would have to incur about Rs.5,000/- on food. How could a person work for a salary of Rs.15,000/- by spending so much money on boarding and lodging there. However, it could be possible for a local person to work for Rs.15,000/- at Chandigarh because he/she would not have to incur expenses on boarding and lodging. He had suggested that there should be a difference of pay for NET qualified and non-NET qualified candidates and the upper limit now fixed at Rs.20,000/- is justified and should be paid in future also. He suggested that note of the condition of future emoluments as per U.T. Administration should not be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that they would put a rolling advertisement and continuously looking out for some persons. If an eligible person is found, the appointment could be made and until then the persons would continue on the honorarium of Rs.20,000/- p.m.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang, Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that the guest faculty should be engaged at least for 2 semesters.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not that if a person is found eligible and engaged and they could hold the interview the next day. They could hold the interview as per their convenience.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he agrees with the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor. The upper limit of Rs.20,000/- should remain for the current academic session and if there is need, the interviews could be held again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would advertise the position and the interview could be held only if eligible persons apply. With this, they would have less problems.

Dr. Dalip Kumar and Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the note regarding applicability of U.T. Administration for future should not be put in.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part relating to this is that they would put in an advertisement of a rolling type where people could submit their resume at any time and they would take a decision turn by turn.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that the note regarding applicability of U.T. Administration for future should be removed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is overridden. If this authority of overriding was not with the Syndicate, then the recommendations of the Board of Finance would not have come to the Syndicate.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the note regarding applicability of U.T. Administration for future should not remain.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are overriding it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are resolving not to accept this note.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that to avoid the audit objection, the date should be clarified which presently is up to 31.08.2017.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the session has commenced, obviously it would apply up to the end of August. Those already appointed would continue to draw the honorarium of Rs.800/- per lecture with a ceiling of Rs.20,000/- and would continue up to the end of first term of first semester. A rolling advertisement would be given. If they get applicants, they could hold interview and if suitable candidates are selected, the earlier appointed persons could be relieved. If suitable candidates are found, then these persons would continue.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that since the appointments are made for academic session, they should also make these appointments for the full academic session instead of semester.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever they want is being done.

While referring to **Sub-Item 7**, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that another related issue should also be tagged with it and considered together.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is their resolve when the Board of Finance has not approved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the reason why the Board of Finance did not approve it was that there was a cut-off date. If they do not follow that, then there would be problem as there are around 500 people who are asking for relaxation in cut-off date. This person was suspended at the time when that cut-off date was. Another thing is that when he joined back, he should have applied for these benefits immediately or may be within six months but he has applied for this benefit after 4 years. If they accept it now after four years, then others who want that cut-off date relaxed, there would be a problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is the reason why the Board of Finance did not accept it. If this person wanted a relief, then only the Court could give the relief. They are not in a position to provide him a relief because they have not done anything with any mal-intent but the person is accusing that the University is unfair to him. The University is not unfair to him but given the very difficult circumstances that the University has and also the fact that the

Central Government is no longer paying the pension funds at all. All the expenses for the pension have to be paid from the internal income of the University. Any enhancement in the liability of internal income would cause problems in this thing. All deficit of the University now has to be met by internal income of the University and the Punjab Government. If the Punjab Government does not come to the help of the University, then they would be enhancing their own burden. The matter of enhancement of the liability on the University should go back to the Think-Tank. Unless a very concrete proposal comes from the Think-Tank of the University keeping in view the overall scenario, according to him, the Syndicate should not get into trouble because the buck stops at the Syndicate because it is the governing body. So, the governing body has to take everything into account.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Punjab Government even did not allow to change the option once exercised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a big representation from him (Shri J.S. Rathore). He has not read it. They have not done anything with any mal-intent.

While referring to **Sub-Item 8**, Dr. Dalip Kumar enquired whether they refer all such cases to the UGC as there are guidelines laid down for this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that problems are created by the local audit office. The UGC is not causing any problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the cases whose Ph.D. is not as per UGC Guidelines, 2009, no such case has not been approved by the audit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that audit would not approve any Ph.D. granted by the Indian Institute of Science, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research or Bhabha Atomic Research Centre. The audit is going by a narrow definition of things. These are not the matters which the audit should be deciding. But the problem is that in India, the audit has become such an overpowering thing that nobody wants to touch. Anybody, who questions the audit, is accused of doing things with an ulterior motive. Even his own Ph.D. may not be valid according to the audit.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if the audit is giving any reasons, they should not get clarification of these from the UGC, but a Committee should be formed to look into it. If the audit has raised any objection, they are sending the matter for clarification. This is a very wrong system. If there is any audit objection on the Ph.D. done from TIFR, Indian Institute of Science, according to him, there is nothing unfortunate than this. They should try to find out as to what type of objections the audit is raising. When there are clear-cut guidelines defined, nobody could challenge those guidelines. The UGC Guidelines are a mandate. Even the U.T. Administration is allowing the things. Then how the audit is objecting. They could not simply forward a case if the audit has objected. According to him, they should deliberate on it and such cases should be dealt with in fast mechanism within the University system only and they should not forward this case to the UGC just for clarification. There would be just a clarification from the UGC saying that there is a Regulation and

the University should act accordingly. This is the only one line reply which the UGC would give.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let this reply come from the UGC and then the ball would be in the University court. Right now, they do not have a freedom to take any decision. Since the Chairman and the Secretary of the UGC have changed, may be there must be a new thinking in the UGC. During the last five years, they have faced severe problems. The objections are from local audit. The UGC audit and local audit are hand in glove. Maybe the things would change.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there might not be some clarity and that is the reason that they are facing the problem.

The Vice-Chancellor asked whether he should send the matter for clarification or not. If it is not sent, then the problem is more.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after going through all the channels, it has been objected to by the audit.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested that the follow up of the clarification being sought be got expedited.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would surely follow up the case. The problem is that he audit does not have the understanding how the academics work. There is a famous saying of Homi Bhabha that "do not let the tail wag the dog".

While referring to **Sub-Item 16**, the Vice-Chancellor said that the members should read the discussion. The matter is very clear. At some stage, in order to attend to the internal ratio between two cadres of the people of the University, to maintain the ratio of 4:1, some ex-gratia posts were created. When that happened, whatever the University had done, there was no financial implication because the salary grade was the same for the two posts. But with the arrival of the 6th Pay Commission recommendations, grade pays became different. So, there is a financial implication now. The people would retire. Whatever the University did, a financial implication was not envisaged at one time. But now there is a financial implication to that. They are doing the things which they are not permitted to do in terms of positions that they have. The Government is saying that since it has a financial implication, they should go back to what is right which means that the ex-gratia positions that were created, whosoever is serving let them serve, but when their term would end, no more appointments be made (in one cadre) and they should go back to the same number that they had. So, this is a financial position of the Government of India. The Government is saying that whatever the University is doing, it would be violative of Government financial norms and at the moment he did not want the University to be seen violating the GFR. Even they do something with it, the U.T. Special Secretary Finance, would put a red flag to it. Once he puts a red flag, it is a minor matter, but it would put that the governing body of the University is arbitrary and take decisions whatever suits it without caring about the Government financial norms. Then there would a audit para from CAG that taking a plea that there is no financial implication, the University has taken a decision. When the issue of financial implication arose and the matter was pointed out to reverse the decision. The reversal is not in the sense that someone should be removed. Only this thing is being asked that as and when

the persons retire, they would go back progressively to the situation that should not have financial implication. This is the matter. Now for such a small matter, they could take a confrontation attitude with the Central Government but in the long run, it would have harmful effect. So, this is the problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when this decision was taken, the PA cadre in the University was not progressing whereas there were promotions available to the clerical cadre. The PA cadre persons must have demanded that they be merged for the Assistant Registrar and given promotion. The PA cadre in the Secretariat has promotion to the post of Under Secretary, Deputy Secretary, etc. But the same was not available in the University. At that time, their demand was that with the merger, promotion be granted. While granting the promotions, the ratio got disturbed. When the ratio of 4:1 was to be fixed, the other cadre said that their positions would get reduced. Keeping in view that thing, this decision was taken. Earlier he was not aware of this but came to know only when someone brought it to his knowledge. This was the whole situation when this decision. That factor was nowhere in the discussion. So, keeping in view that part that it was so, they do not approve the item as such, but they must look into it again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, they are not removing anybody. Whenever anybody retires, only then the number should remain the same. If somebody should have a look at this ratio of PA cadre and the other cadre, how to come up with a new proposal that the ratio of 4:1 is maintained while keeping in view the fact that there is no financial implication. Whatever the financial implication is at present, that has to be reversed. So, there should be no financial implication. They go back and re-look at the whole thing how the ratio between the two cadres is maintained while keeping the number of positions the same. That means that the ex-gratia positions which were created which have a financial implication, that decision has to be respected otherwise they are violating the Government financial rules.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma pointed out to a representation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a Committee could be formed on the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that without violating the Government financial rules, how to satisfy the aspirations of the employees, let them re-look into it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there is a financial liability of Rs. 4, 89,744/- While in the representation at pages 16-A, 16-B and 16-C of the agenda, the employees in the representation have written in bold that on promotion the Assistant Registrars will be given 2 extra increments but at the same time they will be losing some allowance and practically the whole process will involve very little extra finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the problem is that right now in principle the Government has objected to it. If there is an involvement of financial implication of even a rupee extra, then the Government takes it as a violation of Government financial rules. It is not a matter of money as it is a very little financial implication. But the Government says that the University is not supposed to be doing such

things. Then he has to give the justification. But now the financial implication is involved. In view of the changed scenario, they go back and have a re-look. At the moment, nothing is going to change. A new proposal be prepared. At the moment, nobody is being reversed as this is not a recommendation.

Professor Mukesh Arora enquired as to how this issue went to Board of Finance as earlier everything was going on smoothly. Whether there was any complaint? He just wanted to know it for his own knowledge.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are under close scrutiny everything that they do. Whatever they wish to do is reported in the newspapers earlier than the decision is taken. The complaints are also made. The people who are involved in this decision making know that there are some soft points here and there. When they do not have a role in decision making process, they use such ways of making complaints. What could be done?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the decisions are taken after long struggle and with negotiations and the issue has gone through the Board of Finance, Syndicate etc. It is a human nature that when any benefit being enjoyed by a section or community is deprived of that, then it is but natural that there would be unrest. Keeping in view the autonomy granted to the University, the decision has been taken in the JCM and the Board of Finance. Therefore, they should defend the interests of the employees and they be given an opportunity of hearing. As is being discussed, a Committee formed to sort out the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he also wanted to get it examined by a Committee. He has forcefully argued that no one is to be reversed. He had argued very vehemently. But the IAS officers who came to attend the meeting had to point out something. No representative from Punjab or Chandigarh came to attend today's meeting.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as earlier said by Professor Mukesh Arora, the non-teaching employees also have a feeling that there was no need to take up the issue of ex-gratia to the Board of Finance. If this was not taken to the Board of Finance, it would not have become such an issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since it has a financial implication, otherwise they would have run into trouble. Similarly, what is the logic of taking an issue of grant of an increment and addition of 5 years service for retirement benefits.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that a Committee be formed.

While referring to **Sub-Item 19**, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Professor Mukesh Arora, Principal I.S. Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that a Committee be formed on this issue also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on the issue of Secretariat Pay, while coming for the meeting, he has been handed over a document which clearly says that a circular regarding Secretariat Pay has been issued in 2011. The lady representative of the Finance Department of Punjab had said in the previous meeting of the Board of Finance as

well as the meeting held on 1st August that the Secretariat Pay should be stopped on the plea that it is not available in the Vidhan Sabha. Since the Secretariat and Vidhan Sabha are situated opposite to each other, if a person is transferred from Secretariat to Vidhan Sabha, the Secretariat Pay would not be paid. According to him, the representative has misled. Since the representative has misguided them, he is going to ask her to validate it or she should say that the circular is wrong. If she keeps silent, then he would take it that the circular is valid and they would not stop the Secretariat Pay. Then they would think that the circular is genuine and would not stop the Secretariat Pay. If she says that it is invalid and there is a later circular which invalidates it, then the matter would come back to the Syndicate.

The members agreed to it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the representation, the employees have mentioned about the circular of the Punjab Government

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get the clarifications.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the persons dealing with finance are working hard to compile and maintain the record for the Board of Finance meetings. He had earlier also pointed out that some employees have retired and some are going to retire. Due to the fire incident, the retirement benefits are not be released to them. The Finance and Development Officer is also helping. He suggested that maximum of the benefits be released by withholding an amount of about 10%. He pointed out the case of Dr. Gulshan Kumar, Associate Professor, UILS who was promoted from Stage-3 to Stage-4. His increment is due since the year 2014. The audit has also approved it. He requested that the dues be released to that person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be expedited.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that a special cell has been created to deal with such matters and extra staff has been provided.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 01.08.2017 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 20) be endorsed to the Senate for approval;
- (ii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a small Committee to look into the issue under Item No.16 with the proviso that extra gratia posts would not continue in the long run and the desired ratio of promotees amongst the two cadres would get maintained; and
- (iii) a clarification be sought in respect of Item No.19 from the Punjab Government whether the circular issued by the Punjab Government in 2011 for allowing the Secretariat Pay to the employees working in Vidhan Sabha has been invalidated later on by the Punjab Government by issuing any other circular. If so, the said circular may be supplied by the Punjab Government and the matter will again be placed before the

Syndicate otherwise the University ought not to stop the Secretariat Pay presently being paid.

Leave cases of teaching staff

3. Considered minutes of the committee dated 17.07.2017 (Item Nos. II and IV) (**Appendix-II**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff:

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) has resolved that the Vice-Chancellor, be authorized to appoint a Committee to look into the leave cases of members of the teaching staff before, these were put up to him for consideration

RESOLVED: That minutes of the committee dated 17.07.2017 (Item Nos. II and IV) (**Appendix-II**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff, be approved.

Confirmation of Shri Sukh Pal Sharma, Assistant Manager, Panjab University Press

4. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that Shri Sukh Pal Sharma, Assistant Manager, P.U. Press, be confirmed as such in his post w.e.f. 14.08.2008.

NOTE: 1. Shri Sukh Pal Sharma was appointed as Assistant Manager, P.U. Press on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.7220-220-11660 on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University, subject to the decision of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.9865/2007 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 12.08.2007 (Para 24).

He joined his duty w.e.f. 14.08.2007 (forenoon).

2. Shri Subhash Chander Sharma who was one of the applicant for the above said post, challenged the selection by filling the CWP No. 9865 of 2007.

3. The Hon'ble Court on 24.09.2013 in CWP No.9865 of 2007, passed orders as under:

"Learned counsel for petitioner states that the present writ petition has been rendered in infructuous since he has filled a subsequent writ petition bearing CWP No.11305 of 2008.

Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous."

The Hon'ble Court on 05.05.2017 in CWP No.11305 of 2008, passed orders as under:

“Keeping in view the entire factual matrix, I am not persuaded to grant any relief to the petitioner. Consequently, this writ petition is dismissed.”

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

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate Shri Sukh Pal Sharma, Assistant Manager, P.U. Press, be confirmed as such in his post w.e.f. 14.08.2008.

Code of conduct for re-employed teachers

5. Considered following recommendations dated 17.07.2017 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as authorized by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 12.02.2017) on the issue relating to legal notice served through e-mail to the Chancellor, Panjab University by Professor V.K. Chopra, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., to frame a code of conduct for re-employed teachers to air their grievances:

1. Code of Professional Ethics as elaborated in the UGC Regulations on Minimum Qualifications for appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education, 2010 and adopted by the University be made applicable in case of re-employed teachers.
2. In case of breach of the said ethics by any re-employed teacher, action may be taken by the competent authority, under the existing provisions of Panjab University Calendar as applicable to the regular teachers of the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its special meeting dated 12.02.2017 considered the issue relating to Legal Notice served through e-mail to the Chancellor, Panjab University by Professor V.K. Chopra, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U. and authorized the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Syndicate, to constitute a Committee to get framed a code of conduct for re-employed teachers to air their grievances. The Vice-Chancellor offered to seek suggestions from former and present Presidents, PUTA which the Syndicate appreciated.

2. The Committee in its meeting 10.07.2017 (**Appendix-IV**) constituted the Sub-Committee to work out the modalities in this regard. The Sub-Committee in its meeting dated 11.07.2017 (**Appendix-IV**) made the above recommendations, which have duly been endorsed by the Committee in its meeting dated 17.07.2017.

Dr. Dalip Kumar while initiating discussion on this item said that the framing the code of conduct for teachers. He said Regulation 17 of the UGC regulations relates to this item and it should be reproduced in the modalities. It specifies to the teacher-student relations, teacher-non-teachers relations, relations of the teacher with the authority. This defines whole professional ethics of the teacher. Therefore, he stressed to mention it in the modalities and reproduced there. If it is implemented in a serious manner, nobody can defy anything.

The Vice Chancellor said that the bundle of papers prepared in this regard which was sent everywhere. They sent it to the Home Department who sent it to UGC. UGC sent it to U.T from where it came to them. All of them had said a defamation case be filed against Professor V.K. Chopra. They asked their Counsel if a defamation case could be filed against him. He said that if they file a demotion case against him, Professor Chopra would get more mileage. The Vice Chancellor informed that the next hearing in the case is fixed for 30th August. Let us see what happens on 30th August. The point is, bring a dossier for the mistakes done by him. They have seen that he has done so many wrong things.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they have asked for the record and they would shortly convene the meeting.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested to withdraw his name from the Committee constituted to look into this issue of which Principal Gurdip Sharma is the Chairperson.

The Vice Chancellor suggested the name of Dr. Shaminder Singh to replace Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma. This would give a fresh look also.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations dated 17.07.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as authorized by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 12.02.2017) on the issue relating to legal notice served through e-mail to the Chancellor, Panjab University by Professor V.K. Chopra, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., to frame a code of conduct for re-employed teachers to air their grievances, **as per Appendix**, be approved and Regulation 17 be also added.

Before Item No. 6 was taken up for discussion, the Vice Chancellor abstained from the meeting and Professor Pam Rajput was requested by the House to Chair the meeting during his absence. Accordingly, she chaired the meeting only for this item.

**Letter dated
09.08.2017 of
Chairperson, Panjab
University Committee
Against Sexual
Harassment (PUCASH)**

6. Considered letter dated 09.08.2017 (**Appendix-V**) of Chairperson, Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH):

Initiating the discussion on the item, Professor Pam Rajput informed the members that they have to discuss letter dated 9.8.2017 of Chairperson, Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH). On a question whether they have received any reply from the MHRD letter on the letter written to them, the Registrar said that they have not received any reply from the MHRD so far. The Registrar informed that he has gone personally and met the Director there. They informed that they have forwarded the letter to DoPT. They said that there was another point that since it was on the direction of NCW and they have to form a fresh Committee and thus needs to be communicated to National Commission for Women (NCW) also. The Registrar informed that accordingly a letter has also been sent to the NCW. Professor Pam Rajput opined that in view of the forgoing, they are required to wait for a reply from the MHRD.

The Registrar said that one option is that the PUCASH could conclude it and put it in a sealed envelope. They should do their job.

Professor Pam Rajput said that as a matter of fact the Act already stands violated. The 90 days limit is already over. She further said there is no other way, but to wait, as a communication has already been sent to MHRD and NCW. She said that they should wait and as soon as that reply comes, it would be communicated to the PUCASH and asked the House if it is OK with them.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked for how long they should wait for the communication from the MHRD/NCW and desired that they should expedite the matter.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there should be an effort from the University as to how they can get the communication at the earliest.

Professor Pam Rajput said that what more they could do is that they should send another communication as it is already delayed and that they have already crossed the time limit. They may be requested to send a clearance in this regard at the earliest. She further said that another communication be sent to MHRD mentioning that the Syndicate at its meeting held on 20.8.2017 has desired to expedite the matter and direction be given in this regard at the earliest so that they could proceed with the case.

Principal N.R. Sharma while taking part in the discussion said that as of today there are two issues, one is of sexual harassment and the other is that of SC. If somebody is asked to work, the sexual harassment comes in the way and if somebody did not get promotion or admission, the SC issue comes up. He mentioned the name of Principal Khosla and said that the University has been sending him various letters with regard to some castiest remarks allegedly made by him. He said that to his knowledge, Dr. Khosla is an eminent scholar

and he is not at fault at all. There is no mechanism to deal with such cases. He informed that he was a member of the panel for making appointment in his college and none approached them for appointing anyone. All these things are being published in the newspapers daily which is not fair.

Professor Pam Rajput said that this is not a part of this item and requested them to let the Vice Chancellor join the meeting.

Professor Pam Rajput further said that the letter to the MHRD be sent tomorrow itself and they should not wait for the confirmation of the minutes as the matter has already been delayed which is a violation of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

RESOLVED: That a communication be sent to the MHRD requesting them to expedite the reply as the matter has already been delayed beyond the permissible limit of 90 days which is a violation of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

Tenure of Professor Emeritus

7. Considered minutes dated 19.07.2017 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as authorized by the Syndicate at its meeting 25.06.2017) (**Appendix-VI**) to determine the limit on the tenure of Professor Emeritus:

NOTE: The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 29) (**Appendix-VI**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have recently approved the appointment of five Emeritus Professors. While they did that a question came up whether there should be a limit on their term as at present, there is no limit. But there are many institutions in the country where there is a limit, typically of five years. It not increased, but in some institutes, the limit is enhanced for five years at a time and son. So, in the background of all this, the issue of tenure of Emeritus needed to be looked into within the University, because at one time, the number of Emeritus Professors in this University was very small. But during the tenure of his predecessors, a decision was taken that every Dean University Instruction and every Vice Chancellor should be considered for Emeritus Professor. This opened the flood gates of nearly doubling the number of Emeritus Professors. Now, in principle, there could be as many as number of Emeritus Professors as they want, but when it comes to providing some resource to the University, in particular, those Professors, who are appointed as Emeritus Professors, immediately after they complete their term, they would have a temptation of their full office space, laboratory space and so on. With the passage of time, the space is not occupied on a regular basis as somebody comes once in a month or somebody comes once in six months. So the resources of the University stand less used. These are some of the issues and Committee constituted for this said that the term of Emeritus Professor should be for three years. While approving the appointment of Emeritus Professor, they have also said that this will apply to them

and the matter would come back to the Syndicate. Therefore, it is in that background that the matter is before the Syndicate. Continuing, he said that personally he has a reservation that three years term is too small. In PGI, it is five years. They have specified no limit. He said that there is no sense for a term of less than three years. It should be at least for five years.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that when Emeritus Professors are made in other Universities, their parameters could be different. If a person is made Emeritus Professor after he vacates the post of DUI and if he did not have any interest in research, what is the use of that, he asked. The Vice Chancellor informed him that now they have stopped this. He quoted the example of Professor Madhu Raka who was not made Emeritus Professor after she vacated the post of DUI. Shri Jarnail Singh further said that earlier there was a very less number of Emeritus Professors and only those persons were made Emeritus Professor who have contributed a lot in research and teaching.

Professor Mukesh Arora pointed out that there are some Professor Emeritus who do not come for years together to which the Vice Chancellor said that he will look into it.

The Vice Chancellor informed that Professor Hans was made Emeritus Professor when he was seventy five years of age. Even after fifteen years of his retirement, he used to come to the department. The people who continuously and selflessly work for the University, they were made Emeritus Professors. But now they have changed the norms due to which the problem has arisen.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while reading out the minutes of the meeting dated 19.7.2017, said that in the minutes it is written that the Committee is of the unanimous opinion that such terms and conditions may also be applicable uniformly to all those who have been conferred the title of Professor Emeritus already, to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is not true. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it will create a peculiar problem as some of the department would ask to vacate the accommodation immediately.

While clarifying this, the Vice Chancellor said that there would not be any change in the terms and conditions of the teachers who are already appointed Professor Emeritus. The teachers who have been conferred the lifelong award of Title of Professor Emeritus, how they can get it back from them.

Shri Jarnail Singh while endorsing the view point of the Vice Chancellor asked, how they can get it back from Professor R.P. Bambah who has been conferred with this title for life.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that earlier a decision was taken that every DUI or Vice Chancellor may be made Professor Emeritus. He opined that this would lessen the sanctity of the post. Now they have taken a good decision of not making every DUI or Vice Chancellor as Professor Emeritus.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not do anything in a disgraceful way on behalf of this Syndicate. He suggested that he should be given an authorisation and he will convene a meeting of all the Emeritus Professor and discuss the matter very frankly with them.

The Emeritus Professors are supposed to be the guardians of the University. He would put this issue before them and seek how they should do it and the University resources are effectively utilized. They should do it gracefully. He said that he would try to convene the meeting before the meeting of the Senate so that he could be able to provide inputs to the Senate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he agreed to fix the tenure of Professor Emeritus as five years, but he stated that the Committee which has already deliberated upon the issue and made recommendations, should be taken into confidence to which the Vice Chancellor said he will do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the space which is provided for three years is enhanced to five years. The Vice Chancellor said that that the Professor Emeritus made before taking the decision of making DUI and VC as Professor Emeritus should define the definition of Professor Emeritus. What is the definition of a Professor Emeritus. He further said that Professor Emeritus could be made only those people who stand equal to those who have been appointed as Professor Emeritus long back ago. As per the definition of the Emeritus Professor, it should be continuously seen to be rising. If there are fifteen Emeritus Professors, look at their stature and the person who is to be added should not alleviate that stature. There were Emeritus Professor like Professor D.V.S. Jain and Professor Kessar, the new person should not decrease this stature, at least he should be equal to them. This is what which was articulated in the meeting. If some person wants to become Emeritus Professor in the field of Organic Chemistry, he should be better from the person already working there as Emeritus Professor in the same field. If not better then at least, he should be equal to that. He stressed that the stature should not decrease, whatever may be the field.

On a question whether the decision of making the DUI or the Vice Chancellor as Professor Emeritus is in vogue, the Vice Chancellor said that after his joining, the Syndicate he has not made any such person as Professor Emeritus.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that injustice would have done to the persons who have not accepted the DUI ship and who have otherwise contributed a lot to the University. He mentioned the name of Dr. Inder Singh Luthra.

Prof. Pam Rajput said that one thing which the Committee has not seen is that a sum of Rs. 25000/- is given to a Professor Emeritus, but in the minutes of the Committee, it has been written that 'No financial commitment' to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is wrong and this should be given to them. They do not want to curtail anything.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the terms and conditions of the Professors Emeritus already in place would remain unchanged;
- (ii) the office space shall be provided by the respective Chairpersons initially for a period of five years;

The Vice Chancellor said, let her be given the stature of Associate Professor. She is not entitled for promotion as Professor under CAS as member of HRDC. Even if she gets the promotion as Professor under CAS later, she cannot claim to be a Director of HRDC.

However, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should not stop the promotion under Career Advancement Scheme to which the Vice Chancellor agreed, but the Vice Chancellor clarified that she cannot claim for Director, HRDC as a matter of right and the Director's position will be decided by the Syndicate, as is being done previously.

Continuing the Vice Chancellor said that she can be designated as Professor on the basis of her credential, if it is accepted by the Syndicate, but she cannot claim to be the Director of the Centre under rotation. The Vice Chancellor said that she would not be entitled for pension.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while reading out the relevant portion from the decision of the Senate dated 8.12.2007 said that in this decision it has been mentioned that the staff shall be taken over to the Non-plan side and will be adjusted within the sanctioned faculty/ administrative staff strength of the University w.e.f. 1.4.2012. He, therefore, requested that since this decision was taken in 2012, it should be implemented from that date.

However, the Vice Chancellor did not agree to it and said that they are taking the decision today and it cannot not be made applicable from the back date. It will otherwise open a Pandora's box which he did not want. If this is done, it will make another Rathore like case.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that then this would be deemed to have been applicable from today (20.8.2017), i.e. the date of decision of Syndicate meeting.

The Vice Chancellor further clarified that she will not be entitled for pension. She is an Associate Professor and even if she becomes a Professor, she cannot claim the Directorship. If the scheme folds up, in that case, since they have accepted her, they will make her a member of some department and even can be made an adjunct member in that department even from today. On the request of the members, the Vice Chancellor said that she can be made an adjunct member of the Centre for Public Health so that she can participate in the Academic Committee meetings of the Centre. But she is embedded in HRDC.

The Vice Chancellor further asked Professor Navdeep Goyal to put up a proposal in this regard to him.

He said let the Centre develop. The Centre can be made a part of the HRDC as the time progresses as there is no other way round.

RESOLVED: That in pursuance of earlier decisions, Dr. Jayanti Dutta, Deputy Director, Human Resource Development Centre, be designated as Associate Professor in the Human Resource Development Centre subject to the following conditions that:

- (i) she would not be entitled for pension;

- (ii) she would be entitled for CAS promotion as per UGC norms for teachers in University Departments;
- (iii) if the scheme of HRDC is discontinued by UGC at any time in future, she could be adjusted at an equivalent position in the Centre for Public Health. As at present, she could be offered Adjunct position in the same Centre;
- (iv) she would not stake claim for the Directorship of Human Resource Development Centre via CAS provision.

Conferment of Honorary Professorship on Professor Kulinder Pal Singh

9. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Professor Kulinder Pal Singh, Senior Professor, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR), Dr. Homi Bhabha Road, Colaba, Mumbai, Maharashtra at Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. The Academic and Administrative Committee of the Department of Physics in its joint meeting dated 14.07.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) has recommended that Professor K.P. Singh be appointed as Honorary Professor in Department of Physics.
 2. Section-18 of Panjab University Act appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:
 18. Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes.
 3. Curriculum Vitae of Professor K.P. Singh enclosed (**Appendix-VIII**).

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Chancellor that designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Professor Kulinder Pal Singh, Senior Professor, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR), Dr. Homi Bhabha Road, Colaba, Mumbai, Maharashtra at Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**Replies submitted by
Dr. Devendra Kumar
Singh**

10. Considered replies dated 14.07.2017, 15.07.2017, 17.07.2017 and 18.07.2017 (**Appendix-IX**) of Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh, Associate Professor in Political Science, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, in response to Memorandum issued vide No.4800/Estt.I dated 10.07.2017 (**Appendix-IX**).

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).

The Vice Chancellor said that he hoped that the members must have gone through the item. It is very unfortunate thing that the people behave in this way. Therefore, Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh deserves some reprimand like displeasure of the Syndicate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the passport of Dr.Devendra Kumar Singh should be requisitioned where it would be clear when he left for abroad and when he came back. Perhaps he thinks himself very clever. When he was to go on 22nd how he can leave on 14th. He could go eight days before after taking the permission. Nobody was going to stop him. Why he has been doing this, that is the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that now if they try to show him some displeasure, he is now engaged in spoiling the working atmosphere of the Centre. He is in the habit of making complaints against his colleagues.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and some other members said something some solution needs to be done to mend him.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested to form a Committee to look into this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he should be censured and red entry be made in his service book as has been done in the case of Professor. V.K. Chopra. At the moment, as of today, there would be no implication on his pensionary benefits. In case he commits such mistake again, that will be seen later on. But now let he be pardoned at this time with a warning that he would not repeat this in future.

RESOLVED: That 'censure' be imposed on Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh and accordingly a red entry be made in his service book for proceeding on leave without prior permission of the competent authority and a warning be issued to him not to repeat this and to be careful in future. However, this will not affect the retirement benefits of Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh.

**Representations of
Shri J.S. Rathore**

11. Considered two representation dated 10.08.2017 (**Appendix-X**) of Shri J.S. Rathore, Assistant Professor, DCMS, USOL, one regarding award of Self Pension and his mother Family Pension Immediately and another with regard to non negligence in Service Book Maintenance.

The Vice Chancellor said that this item has already been considered.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 20th August 2017

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired what has been done on the issue.

RESOLVED: That in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Finance dated 1st August 2017, the request made by Shri J.S. Rathore, Assistant Professor, DCMS, USOL in his representations be not acceded to.

**Naming of Girls Hostel
No.10 as Neerja
Bhanot Hostel**

12. Considered the recommendation (**Appendix-XI**) of the Vice-Chancellor, that Girls Hostel No. 10, P.U., be named as Neerja Bhanot Hostel.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that people might not be aware of Ms. Neerja Bhanot and requested that some background about her sacrifice should be there.

The Vice Chancellor informed that there is a national award in the name of Ms. Neerja Bhanot and a movie has also been produced on her. A plaque and portrait shall be installed on the entrance of the hostel, as has been done in the case of others, but the building is not still ready. The XEN has told him that the building will be completed by the end of September, but he doubts that it might not be ready by September. The lift has not been installed there so far. The U.T. Architect has said that he would not give them the occupation certificate until the lift is made operational. The Vice Chancellor further informed that he has spoken to the Managing Director of the Kone Company which has to supply and install the lift. He has requested him to leave aside all the other orders and install the lift as soon as possible. The Managing Director has promised him to install the lift on priority basis. This is all, he has to say about it, but it might not be possible to complete this work by the end of September.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the students who are in the waiting list for hostel accommodation, they used to ask them whether the hostel accommodation will be made available to them by 30th of September.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that it might not be possible to make this hostel functional by 30th September.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they have given a lot of work to XEN Rai, due to which he is not able to complete it in time. But the Vice Chancellor did not agree to it and said that not that much work has been given to him.

The Vice Chancellor further said that when Mr. Rai wants to do the work, he can deliver. So it is better to work with him so that he continues to deliver. There is only one way to get the work done. The senior officers of the University have to work with him continuously, then he will deliver because it is not that he does not have the experience of delivering.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested for the unveiling of plaque installed at the entry point of the Administrative Block. He said that it should be done at the earliest as it has already been delayed much.

The Vice Chancellor said that everything is in his mind. Some damage had been done due to fire incident at the first floor and he is waiting for the clearance of debris and completion of the repair work. He further said that Smt. Sushma Ji and her husband might like to visit that section where her father-in-law used to sit when he was serving at Panjab University. He is just waiting that everything is set right at the place where the fire had caused some damage. He wants her to address the Senators in the Senate Hall. This is the grand plan. Her daughter has promised that she will get her mother here.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that some facts relating to her sacrifice be engraved at the entrance of the proposed Neerja Bhanot Hostel to which the Vice Chancellor said that this shall indeed be done. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further said that he has earlier requested many times that something should also be written about Shaheed Bhagat Singh at the entrance of Arts Block-II to which the Vice Chancellor said okay. For this purpose, the help of Professor Ronki Ram could be sought who is Shaheed Bhagat Singh Chair Professor or Shri Chaman Lal could also be requested.

The Registrar said that he will get it done at the earliest.

RESOLVED: That Girls Hostel No. 10, P.U., be named as Neerja Bhanot Hostel.

Recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 19.07.2017

13. Considered the following recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 19.07.2017 (**Appendix-XII**) (Item 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29 and 30):

ITEM 2

That amendment in Regulation 11.1 for M.A. Public Administration appearing at page 91 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>11.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education. (i) to (iii) xxx xxx xxx Provided that-</p> <p>1(a) For the Public Administration course, a person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible:-</p> <p>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology or History.</p>	<p>11.1 No Change</p> <p>(i) to (iii) No change</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>1(a) No Change</p> <p><u>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology.</u></p>

ITEM 3

That reintroduction of Postgraduate Diploma in Women's Studies in the Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies (effective from the session 2017-2018), be approved and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

NOTE: The Regulations for the said course would be the same as already available at pages 177-178 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007.

ITEM 5

That addition in the eligibility criteria for M.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine (effective from the session 2015-16), be made as under, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. 1st year in Nuclear Medicine will be B.Sc. from a recognized University with Physics and Chemistry (Non-medical stream) or Chemistry and Biology (Medical stream) as core subjects. The candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine and Biophysics shall also be eligible for admission to the course.</p> <p>Admission to M.Sc. course in Nuclear Medicine will be through Entrance Test, to be conducted by the Panjab University. The candidates should have passed the graduation (B.Sc.) from a recognized University/Institute with at least 50% marks. While deciding the final merit of the entrance test, a weightage shall also be given to the B.Sc. marks obtained by the candidate, as per the University rules. The cut off percentage marks secured in the entrance test will also be as per the University Rules.</p>	<p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. 1st year in Nuclear Medicine shall be B.Sc. with at least 50% marks in the aggregate from Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto with Physics and Chemistry (Non-Medical stream) or Chemistry and Biology (Medical stream) as Core subjects. The candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine/Biophysics/Radiation Sciences shall also be eligible for the admission to the course.</p>

NOTE: 1. Earlier too the above said eligibility criteria was placed before the Regulations Committee at its meeting dated 30.12.2015 and the same has been referred back to the concerned Faculty with the observation that the minimum percentage of marks for candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine/Biophysics/ Radiation Sciences and the

weightage to be given to marks obtained by a candidate in B.Sc. have not been mentioned.

2. Accordingly, the Coordinator, Centre for Nuclear Medicine, U.I.E.A.S.T. has written that the weightage shall also be given to the marks obtained in B.Sc. by the candidate, as per the University rules, has already been included in Proposed Regulations.

ITEM 6

That:

- (i) addition in the eligibility criteria for M.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. 1st year in Nuclear Medicine shall be B.Sc. with at least 50% marks in the aggregate from Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto with Physics and Chemistry (Non-Medical stream) or Chemistry and Biology (Medical stream) as Core subjects. The candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine/Biophysics/ Radiation Sciences shall also be eligible for the admission to the course.</p> <p>Admission to M.Sc. course in Nuclear Medicine will be through Entrance Test, to be conducted by the Panjab University. While deciding the final merit of the entrance test, a weight-age shall also be given to the marks obtained in B.Sc. by the candidate, as per the University rules. The cut off percentage marks secured in the entrance test will also be as per the University Rules.</p>	<p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. 1st year in Nuclear Medicine shall be B.Sc. from a recognized University with Physics and Chemistry (Non-Medical stream) or Chemistry and Zoology/Biotechnology (Medical stream) as Core subjects. The candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine/Biophysics and B.Sc. degree in X-Ray/Medical Technology. shall also be eligible for admission to the course.</p> <p><u>B.Sc. through correspondence/open University stream is not eligible.</u></p> <p>The candidates should have passed the graduation (B.Sc. from a recognized University/Institute with at least 50% marks.</p>

- (ii) the item be sent back to the Faculty of Science with the observation that the subject of **Radiation Sciences** be included in the eligibility criteria from the session 2018-19 as in the opinion of the Regulation Committee the students with Radiation Physics cannot be debarred from taking the admission to M.Sc. (Nuclear Medicine).

ITEM 7

That amendment in Regulation 3 for B.A. B.Ed. (effective from the session 2017-2018) be made as under and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>3. Minimum qualifications for admission to first Semester of the course shall be:</p> <p>(a) 10+2 examination of any Board/University, which is recognized by the Panjab University as equivalent, to it with at least 50% marks (45% marks in case of SC/ST).</p> <p>(b) The candidate must not be more than 20 years of age as on 1st August of the year in which admission is sought to the first Semester (22 years in case of SC/ST).</p> <p>(c) The admission shall be on such criteria (academic merit or entrance test or both etc.) as may be prescribed by the Syndicate/Senate from time to time.</p>	<p>3. Minimum qualifications for admission to first Semester of the course shall be:</p> <p>10+2 examination of any Board/University, which is recognized by the Panjab University as equivalent, to it with at least 50% marks (45% marks for SC/ST).</p>

ITEM 10

That amendment in Regulation 2(d) for Diplomas in (i) French (ii) German and (iii) Russian appearing at page 229-230 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2015-16) be made as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join these courses :-</p> <p>(a) Certificate in French/German/Russian of the Panjab University;</p> <p>(b) B.A. Part I examination with French/German/Russian as an elective subject of the Panjab University;</p> <p>(c) For admission to Diploma Course in Russian, Elementary Technical</p>	<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join these courses:-</p> <p>(a) to (c) No change</p>

<p>Translation Certificate in Russian;</p> <p>(d)*For admission to Diploma Course in German, the Certificate in German for Science Students with 50% marks;</p> <p>(e) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a), (b), (c) or (d).</p>	<p>(d) The students passing Deutsch Niveau (Level) A2 examination of Goethe Institute/Mueller Bhavan shall be admitted to Diploma Course in German.</p> <p>(e) No Change</p>
--	---

ITEM 11

That addition in Regulation 2(d) for Advanced Diploma Courses in (i) German (ii) Russian and (iii) French appearing at page 235-236 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2015-16), be made as under, and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join these courses :-</p> <p>(a) Certificate in French/German/Russian of the Panjab University;</p> <p>(b) B.A. Part I examination with French/German/Russian as an elective subject of the Panjab University;</p> <p>(c) For admission to Diploma Course in Russian, Elementary Technical Translation Certificate in Russian;</p> <p>(d) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a), (b), (c) or (d).</p>	<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join these courses:-</p> <p>(a) to (c) No change</p> <p>(d) For admission to Advanced Diploma Course in German</p> <p>The students passing Deutsch Niveau (Level) B2 examination of Gethe Institute/Max Mueller Bhavan shall be admitted to Advanced Diploma Course in German.</p> <p>(e) No Change</p>

ITEM 15

That amendment in Regulation 11.6 for Master of Social Work be made as under and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

REGULATION (effective from the session 2007-08) (Sent to Govt. of India)	PRESENT REGULATION (effective from the session 2010-2011) (Approved by the Syndicate dated 29.6.2010)	PROPOSED REGULATION (effective from the session 2016-2017)
<p>11.6 Master in Social work (MSW)</p> <p>(i) Bachelor in Social Work or Bachelor in Arts with Sociology or Psychology as one of the subjects from any University recognized by U.G.C. with a minimum aggregate of 50% marks.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) Masters in Sociology or Psychology or Social Anthropology from any University recognized by U.G.C. with 50% marks in aggregate.</p> <p>(iii) Other eligibility conditions shall be as per P.U. Regulations and Rules.</p>	<p>11.6 Master of Social Work</p> <p>(i) Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 50% marks in any discipline from a recognized University/Institute.</p> <p>(ii) The candidates belonging to SC/ST categories shall be allowed 5% relaxation in the eligibility requirements.</p> <p>(iii) The candidates who have appeared/are appearing in the final year of the Bachelor's degree are also eligible to apply subject to their result with minimum percentage required.</p>	<p>11.6 Master of Social Work</p> <p>(a) Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 50% marks in any discipline from a recognized University/Institute.</p> <p>(b) The candidates belonging to SC/ST/BC/PWD categories shall be allowed relaxation in the eligibility requirements as per Govt. of India reservation policy .</p> <p>(c) Other eligibility conditions shall be as per P.U. Regulations and Rules.</p>

ITEM 16

That the Regulations for M.Com. (Business Economics) (effective from the session 2015-16), **be approved, as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 17

That Regulations for B.Sc. Fashion Designing (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved, as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

NOTE: 1. Earlier too the item has been placed before the Regulations Committee in its meeting dated

29.10.2015, 3.11.2015 and 3.12.2015 and it was decided that the item be referred back to the concerned Faculty with the following observations:

After going through the appendix it has come to notice that except the eligibility conditions, pass percentage for admission to the course, no Regulation have been included with regard to duration, medium of instruction provision of re-appear, classification of division etc. Hence, the item should be referred back to the Dean, Faculty of Science for re-framing the Regulations in a proper manner.

2. The Coordinator, UIFT has redrafted the Regulations accordingly.

ITEM 18

That Regulations for B.Sc. Nursing (Four-Year Course) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved**, as **per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

- NOTE:** 1. Earlier too the Regulations for the said course has been placed before the Regulations Committee in its meeting dated 30.12.2015, and it was decided that the item be referred back to the concerned faculty with the following observations:

- (i) The wording of Regulation 2(c) should be read as under:
A candidate who has passed 10+2 examination with Physics, Chemistry, Biology and English with minimum of 45% marks of the aggregate (40% marks in case of SC/ST/BC) from the recognized Board or any other examination recognized by the syndicate as equivalent to it.
- (ii) The Regulation 4 should not be a part of Regulations.
- (iii) The wording underlined in Regulation 10 and 11 requires deep look.
- (iv) The underlined wording under Regulation 14 required deep look. The office is in the opinion that the fourth year should also be there as the duration of the course is four years including six months internship during the fourth year.
- (v) The Regulation 15(a) also requires deep look as generally the wording of Regulation reads as under:

Those who obtain 75% or more : First Division with
of the aggregate marks. Distinction

(vi) The Regulation 17 requires deep look, as the Rule appearing at page 434 of Panjab University Calendar Volume III, 2009, the Re-evaluation is not permissible in the Faculty of Medical Science. However, the provision of Re-evaluation has been made only in the BDS course on the basis of Dental Council of India.

2. The Convener, Board of Studies in Nursing has made the necessary changes/corrections as per observation of the Regulations Committee.

ITEM 19

That Regulations for Master of Dental Surgery (MDS) at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital (effective from the session 2015-16), **be approved, as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 20

That Regulations for B.Voc. courses running in the affiliated Colleges (effective from the session 2017-2018), **be approved, as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 21

That Regulations for B.Sc. (Home Science) (Three-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved, as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

NOTE: 1. Earlier too the Regulations for the above course have been placed before the Regulations Committee in its meeting dated 29.10.2015, 3.11.2015 and 3.12.2015 and it was decided that the item be referred back to the concerned Dean, Faculty of Science with the following observations:

- (ii) Regulation 11, 12, 15 and 17 required deep look as these Regulations are to be made a part of syllabus.
- (iii) There is no regulation with regard to re-appear/promotion in the next semester.
- (iv) The Regulations 22 & 24 has been framed by the office as these Regulations should be there.

2. Accordingly, the Board of Studies in Home Science at its meeting dated 21.10.2016 has redrafted the Regulations keeping in view of the observations of the Regulations Committee, which has been approved by the Dean, Faculty of Science.

ITEM 23

That change in nomenclature of Bachelor of Clinical Optometry (B.Optom) to Bachelor of Optometry (B.Optom) (effective from the session 2017-2018), be made as under and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

PRESENT NOMENCLATURE	PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE
Bachelor of Clinical Optometry (B.Optom)	Bachelor of Optometry (B.Optom) (effective from the session 2017-2018)

ITEM 25

That Regulations for LL.M. (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved, as per Appendix**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

NOTE: 1. Earlier too the Regulations for the above course have been placed before the Regulations Committee in its meeting dated 29.10.2015, 3.11.2015 and 3.12.2015 and it was decided that the item be referred back to the Faculty with the following observations:

1. The word (**Honours**) and (**Integrated**) should be in regulation 2.1 (a).
2. The Regulation 2.1(b) should be read as under:

Any equivalent examination of another University recognised by the Syndicate with 55% marks for this purpose.
3. The Regulation 2.2 should be reads as under:
The inter-se merit of the candidates seeking admission to LL.M. 1st Semester shall be determined as decided by the Syndicate and Senate from time to time.
4. The wording of Regulation 3.1(c) required give deep look.
5. The wording of Regulation 3.2 (b) and (c) should be reads as under:

b) **Additional 10** by the Vice-Chancellor

(c) **In additional to Vice-Chancellor upto total of 50 by the Syndicate.**

6. The Regulation 4.2 (a) to (h) should also be a part of syllabus as well as Regulation as some portion marked as underline is not a part of Regulation.
 7. The word '**including submission of dissertation**' should also be included in Regulation 4.2(K) after the words in the paper/s.
 8. The Regulation 6.2 should be a part of syllabus.
 9. The wording '**as per University Rules and Regulations**' seems superfluous and it should be deleted in Regulation 7.3.
2. The Chairperson of the Deptt. of Law has re-drafted the Regulations keeping in view of the observations of the Regulations Committee.

ITEM 27

That Regulations for Shastri (Three-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved, as per Appendix**, and in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

- NOTE:** 1. Earlier too the Regulations for the above course has been placed before the Regulations Committee in its meeting dated 2.2.2017 and it was decided that the item be referred back to the concerned Faculty.
2. The Chairperson, Deptt. of Sanskrit has redrafted the Regulations which is duly approved by the Dean, Faculty of Languages.

ITEM 29

That addition in Regulation 2 for M.Sc. (Honours) course in Chemistry (Semester System) (effective from the session 2016-17 and 2017-18), be made as under and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATIONS	PROPOSED REGULATIONS
<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join M.Sc. (Honours School) Semester System:</p> <p>(i) B.Sc. (Honours School) examination of the Panjab University in the subject of M.Sc. (Honours School) course provided</p>	<p>2. No Change</p> <p>(i) to (ii) No Change</p>

<p>that BCA/B.Tech./B.E. (Computer Science/Engineering) with 50% marks or any other examination recognized as equivalent thereto shall also be eligible for M.Sc. (Honours School) Computer Science.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. or B.Sc. examination of the Panjab University or any other examination recognized by the Panjab University as equivalent thereto, for admission to M.Sc. (Honours School) in Anthropology.</p> <p>Provided that admission of the eligible students other than B.Sc. (Honours School) from Panjab University will be based on their merit in the Entrance Test (OCET) for B.Sc. (Pass or Honours) examination with 50% marks from Panjab University or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto/the fulfillments of such other requirements as may be laid down by the Syndicate.</p>	<p><u>For M.Sc. (Honours) course in Chemistry (from the session 2016-17)</u></p> <p>(a) B.Sc.(Honours School) examination of the Panjab University in the subject of Chemistry.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(b) B.Sc.(Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks (45% marks in case of Sc/ST/BC) from Panjab University or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry (ii) Physics (iii) Mathematics or any other Science subject during all the three years of graduation .</p> <p><u>For M.Sc. (Honours) course in Chemistry (effective from the session 2017-18)</u></p> <p>(a) B.Sc.(Honours School) examination of the Panjab University in the subject of Chemistry.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(b) B.Sc.(Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks (45% marks in case of Sc/ST/BC) from Panjab</p>
---	---

	University or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry in all the three years /six semesters and (ii) any two Science subjects during two years/four semester during of graduation.
--	---

NOTE: 1. Earlier too the proposed eligibility condition for M.Sc. (Honours) in Chemistry (effective from the session 2016-17) was placed before the Regulations Committee in its meeting dated 2.2.2017 and the same was referred back to the Chairperson, Department of Chemistry to re-draft the eligibility conditions especially to review the **“during all the three years of graduation”**.

2. The Chairperson, Deptt. of Chemistry vide letter dated 10.5.2017 has informed that:

(i) the eligibility conditions with the wording **“during all the three years of graduation”** was reconsidered at the admissions of 2016-17 batch itself and admission was done accordingly; and

(ii) the re-drafted eligibility conditions as approved by the Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 shall be implemented from the admissions of 2017-18.

3. The weightage as mentioned in the clause ‘C’ should not be part of Regulation, as the percentage of weightage shall increased and decreased from time to time.

ITEM 30

That amendment of Regulation 2 for Bachelor of Laws appearing at page 387 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
2. The minimum qualification for admission to the first year class of the LL.B. course shall be one of the following :- (a) A Bachelor’s degree in any faculty of the Panjab University with at least 45% of	2. The minimum qualification for admission to the first year class of the LL.B. course shall be:- A Bachelor’s/Master’s degree in any discipline with at 45% marks

<p>the aggregate marks;</p> <p>(b) A degree in any faculty of any other University recognized as equivalent to the corresponding degree of the Panjab University, with at least 45% of the aggregate marks.</p> <p>Provided that in case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate, through Modern Indian Languages (Hindi or Urdu or Panjabi/Gurmukhi Script) and/or in a classical Language (Sanskrit or Persian or Arabic) the aggregate of 45% marks shall be calculated by taking into account the percentage of aggregate marks that he had secured at the language examination, excluding the marks for the additional optional paper, English and the elective subject taken together.</p> <p>(c) A Master's degree from the Panjab University;</p> <p>(d) A Master's degree from any other University recognized as equivalent to the Master's degree of the Panjab University.</p>	<p>in aggregate from Panjab University or any other University recognized by Bar Council of India and Panjab University.</p> <p>In case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate, through Modern Indian Languages (Hindi or Urdu or Panjabi/Gurmukhi Script) and/or in a classical Language (Sanskrit or Persian or Arabic) the aggregate of 45% marks shall be calculated by taking into account the percentage of aggregate marks that he had secured at the language examination, excluding the marks for the additional optional paper, English and the elective subject taken together.</p> <p>5% concession is admissible in eligibility marks to SC/ST/BC/PWD candidates.</p>
---	--

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 38) (**Appendix-XII**) while considering the recommendation of the Regulation Committee dated 19.07.2017 approved the recommendation relating to Item No.28 and recommended the same to the Senate.

It was further resolved that the consideration of all other items (items 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29 & 30) of the Regulation Committee dated 19.07.2017 be deferred.

While referring to **sub-item 5 and 6**, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that so many elective subjects are being taught in the Colleges like Bioinformatics, Biochemistry, Industrial Chemistry and Microbiology. He requested that these subjects be also included as eligibility for admission to M.Sc. Nuclear Medicine so that the students studying these subjects could get an opportunity.

This was agreed to.

While referring to **sub-item 2**, Shri Jarnail Singh said that it needs to be checked as the present and proposed regulation having 45 per cent marks does not exist. Even the students having compartment are also allowed admission.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if a candidate has not studied the subject at the undergraduation level, then there is a requirement of 50% marks. The other requirement is that if a candidate has got compartment and for admission to a particular subject, the candidate must have 45 per cent marks in that subject. Therefore, it needs to be checked.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it needs to be amended as there is a requirement of 50 per cent marks.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that when the course in Public Administration was started, then these subjects were included as eligibility criteria. Now, the subject of Public Administration is also being taught at the undergraduate level.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is no logic of removing the subject of History from the eligibility criteria.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that the eligibility criteria for admission to M.A. Public Administration should also be the same as applicable to other PG courses. Now they have shifted from the annual system of examination to semester system and amendment in the eligibility criteria has to be made. If a candidate has 50 per cent marks in bachelor degree, that could take admission in master degree in any subject, then why not in Public Administration. Another thing is that if a student has compartment in Political Science and has studied Public Administration as one of the subjects and has 45 per cent marks in aggregate, even then the student is eligible for admission in Public Administration. He suggested that the eligibility for admission to M.A. Public Administration should remain the same as for other social science subjects.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that it could be considered in the next meeting.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that there might be some other Regulations which also needed amendments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since this item has to go to the Senate, therefore, the amendments should be done. He requested Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Dalip Kumar and Shri Jarnail Singh to take the help of the Controller of Examinations and other concerned check the items thoroughly and submit the suggestions.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a meeting was held on the issue of allowing the students having compartment to take admission in PG courses which is required because of the semester system. In the meeting the students having compartment in two semesters out of the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th semester were allowed to take admission in PG courses. He had pointed out that the first term could also be included. Earlier the students were given two chances to clear the compartment otherwise they were reversed to the lower class. There is no such reversal in the semester system. Now they have provided a total period of 5 years to the students to complete the undergraduate degree of the duration of 3 years. It was said that if a candidate has compartment in 3rd semester and availed two chances and appeared in the 5th semester, he/she could take another chance whereas a student of 1st year could not take the chance. Now they are facing problems because a student having compartment in two semesters is

eligible whereas a student who has compartment in 1st and 2nd semesters but has cleared the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th semesters is not being allowed admission in the PG course. This problem is being faced by the Controller of Examinations. He requested that the students having compartment in 1st and 2nd semesters should also be allowed to take admission in PG courses.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal pointed out that earlier the students were provided two chances in a year but now only one chance is given.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a student having compartment in B.A. and admitted to M.A. would clear the compartment within the permissible limit of 5 years. If the compartment is not cleared, then the result of M.A. would not be declared.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to look into the whole issue and get it amended accordingly.

Professor Mukesh Arora pointed out a case of a student from some other University took admission in Panjab University in the 3rd semester and was having a deficient subject in which he could not appear due to clash of date sheet. He has cleared all the papers of the 3rd and 4th semesters. That student is not admitted to 5th semester due to the deficient subject. However, the student was later on admitted. He requested that a rule be framed so that such students could be granted the admission.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma submitted a representation in which a student could not clear one paper of the 1st semester but has cleared all the papers of all the subsequent semesters. The student could also not avail the special chance which has been given by the University. He requested that a special chance be given to the student.

Shri Varinder Singh requested that a special chance should be given to the students who have cleared all the papers of all the semesters but could not clear only one paper of a semester so that a precious year of the students is saved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a proposal be submitted and such a decision should not be taken in an ad hoc way.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 19.07.2017 (Item 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29 and 30), **as per Appendix**, be approved;
- (ii) recommendation of the Regulations Committee dated 19.07.2017 (Item 5), **as per Appendix**, for the session 2015-16 be approved. From the session 2018-19, the subjects of Bioinformatics, Microbiology, Biochemistry and Industrial Chemistry be also added in the proposed regulation; and

- (iii) a Committee consisting of the following members be constituted to look into the proposed regulation under Item 2 and submit a report to the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to approve the report:

- (i) Shri Jarnail Singh
(ii) Dr. Dalip Kumar
(iii) Principal I.S. Sandhu

Recommendation of the Committee dated 18.07.2017 regarding re-evaluation in Faculty of Medical Sciences and amendment of rule

14. Considered recommendation dated 18.07.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the re-evaluation, be allowed in the Faculty of Medical Sciences and amendment in rule 1 appearing at page 487 & addition in rule 9 appearing at page 488-489 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, be made as under.

Existing Rule 1 appearing at page 487 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016	Proposed Amendment
<p>1. Re-evaluation is permissible in case of Annual, Supplementary, Bi-annual and Semester examinations conducted by this University except in the following:</p> <p>(i) Examinations in the Faculty of Medical Sciences. However, Re-evaluation is permissible to the Students of BDS as per DCI norms which are as under:</p> <p>Re-evaluation of theory papers in all years of study of the BDS course is permissible. The answer script shall be re-evaluated by not less than two duly qualified examiners and the average obtained shall be awarded to the candidate and the result accordingly re-evaluation considered.</p> <p>(ii) Practical Examinations in different subject/s or paper/s; sessional marks internal assessment, project report, dissertations, thesis and viva voce.</p>	<p>1. Re-evaluation is permissible in case of Annual, Supplementary, Bi-annual and Semester examinations conducted by this University except in case of Practical Examinations in different subject/s or paper/s; sessional marks, internal assessment, project report, dissertations, thesis and viva voce.</p>

Existing Rule 9 appearing at page 488-489 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016	Proposed Addition
<p>9. The answer books shall be got re-evaluated by one examiner. The score of the candidate after re-evaluation shall be the one which is to the advantage of the candidate i.e. the better of the two (Evaluation or Re-evaluation). In case of difference between the scores of evaluation and re-evaluation of more than 15% of the maximum marks of the paper, the answer book will be referred to the third examiner. In such a case the average of the best two awards (out of the three) of the candidates shall be taken into account.</p>	<p>9. (i) The answer books shall be got re-evaluated by one examiner. The score of the candidate after re-evaluation shall be the one which is to the advantage of the candidate i.e. the better of the two (Evaluation or Re-evaluation). In case of difference between the scores of evaluation and re-evaluation of more than 15% of the maximum marks of the paper, the answer book will be referred to the third examiner. In such a case the average of the best two awards (out of the three) of the candidates shall be taken into account.</p> <p>(ii) Re-evaluation of theory papers in all years of study of the MBBS/BDS courses are permissible. The answer script shall be re-evaluated by not less than two duly qualified examiners and the average obtained shall be awarded to the candidate and the result accordingly re-considered.</p>

At the very outset, Shri Jarnail Singh desired to know about the background. In the same breathe he asked if he could add something which was allowed by the Vice Chancellor. He said that the issue with regard to MBBS was discussed in a meeting of the Faculty of Medical Sciences about 5-6 years back. In that meeting, he had proposed that there should be external evaluation in theory papers in MBBS. Dr. Raj Bahadur, the then Dean of Faculty of Medical Sciences said 'No' to it. It cannot be done here. He had said that in all other universities, the theory papers are examined by external examiners so that the students may not suffer by some favouritism or dis-favouritism by the local teachers and added that all universities have done it. But Dr. Raj Bahadur said 'No' and said that they can judge from the face of the candidate whether he/she is a doctor or not. This is a very serious matter. The practice at present in their university is that the examiners come for practical examination of MBBS and answer books are put before them for evaluation. They just look at the face of the candidate and mark practical and theory

papers together. He does not know whether they read it or not from inside. The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that it is not a fair thing. Continuing, Shri Jarnail Singh said that it is a fact that all the universities have switched over to the external evaluation of the theory papers. But, it has not been done here. He said that he does not know whether they have done it or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that the University treats every organ like the science departments where there is internal system.

Shri Jarnail Singh further said and insisted that the theory papers must be got marked from the external examiners. It should go to the Faculty of Medical Sciences and they must insist that the theory papers are marked by the external examiners. All universities, namely, Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Delhi University and other Professional Universities, get the theory papers marked from the external examiners. He further said that in the two cases mentioned here, there is no provision for evaluation. Since, there is a complaint, they have to do it. Therefore, he insisted that the theory papers be got evaluated from outside examiners.

Dr. Dalip Kumar while fully endorsing the view point of Shri Jarnail Singh said that if they see the proposal of the Faculty, it has been diluted. They follow all the things which are there in the Panjab University Calendar. He read out the following portion (given at the end) of the recommendation of the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor to explore the possibility of revision of existing rules regarding re-evaluation of examinations in the Faculty of Medical Sciences:

- “(ii) Re-evaluation of theory papers in all years of study of the MBBS/BDS courses are permissible. The answer script shall be re-evaluated by not less than two duly qualified examiners”

He asked, why it is there. If they see on the left side of the proposed amendment, there is a provision of 15% difference between the first and second evaluation. If the difference is more than 15%, then they go for third examiner. But here, they are putting the answer books simultaneously to two examiners, which is wrong. Moreover, if the practical examiner is marking the theory papers also, as mentioned by Shri Jarnail Singh, on the day of the practical, it is unethical.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is just an allegation. He (Dr. Dalip Kumar) is just alleging as there is no proof whether it is being done.

Shri Jarnail Singh said he is not alleging, but the system is wrong. All the universities have done it. Can an examiner mark hundred answer books in three hours along with the practical examination.

The Vice Chancellor said, this is what he (Dr. Dalip Kumar) is alleging. The Vice Chancellor asked, Is it being done in this way to which Shri Jarnail Singh said, ‘probably’. The Vice Chancellor said ‘probably’ is not enough, prove it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it can be verified.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Controller of examiners as to what is system in place. The Controller of Examiners while explaining the procedure said that there are approved teachers. The concerned institutes send the panel of examiners approved by the Faculty. The second part is Practical examination. The practical examiners are also approved by the Faculty and they send letters only to those examiners. They conduct the practical examination.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor whether the examiners coming to conduct the practical examinations also mark the theory people, the Controller of examinations said that this needs to be verified from the college. The Vice Chancellor said that this is a serious issue. The Controller of Examinations said that only the approved teachers come for the evaluation or for the conduct of practical examinations.

The Vice Chancellor said, let this be verified. He would form a small Committee on behalf of the Syndicate. All Science Departments of the University who conduct the examinations internally, they should enforce the same thing and also enforce transparency. He, therefore, suggested to look into it and said that as of now they do not approve it. Let it be kept pending till the next meeting of the Syndicate. A small committee of the Syndicate should be formed which may consist, Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences and Dr. Amod Gupta. They should introduce a transparent system which could commensurate with the practices at the University. These good practices should be both for the medical college as well as for the dental college because at many places the dental and medical colleges are the part of the same campus. The best practice being followed in other universities, should be followed here also.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he is saying so as his daughter is an Associate Professor in Government Medical College.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there already exist a Committee where Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences is already there. Dr. Amod Gupta's name may be added in that Committee. Then they will have another Committee.

The Vice Chancellor suggested the name of Dr. A.K. Janmeja.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested the name of Dr. Ravi Gupta who is also a member of the Faculty of Medical Sciences.

Professor Navdeep Goyal further said that after doing all this, they should place before that Committee, the whole discussion that took place here and the recommendations of the Committee will be brought back to the Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they should adopt the best practices

RESOLVED: That the following members be added to the Committee already constituted to examine the issue and their recommendations to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting:

- (i) Dr. Amod Gupta

- (ii) Dr. A.K. Janmeja
(iii) Dr. Ravi Gupta

Minutes dated 28.07.2017 of Screening/Selection Committee regarding promotion of Programmers

15. Considered minutes dated 28.07.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Screening/Selection Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalize the promotional case of some Programmers.

NOTE: Earlier too, the promotion of Shri Sudhir Goyal and Ms. Veenu Mor was considered by the Committee on 16.11.2016 along with the promotion of certain other programmers and it was recommended by the Committee to keep the promotion of these two incumbents pending. The recommendations of the Committee were approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 3) (**Appendix-XIII**).

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 28.07.2017 of the Screening/Selection Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalize the promotional case of Programmers, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Recommendations of Committee dated 11.07.2017 regarding medical reimbursement

16. Considered recommendations dated 11.07.2017 along with example (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee constituted to look into the matter of P.U. employees claiming medical reimbursement from insurance as well as from Panjab University.

NOTE: The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 33) (**Appendix-XIV**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred

RESOLVED: That recommendations dated 11.07.2017 along with example of the Committee constituted to look into the matter of P.U. employees claiming medical reimbursement from insurance as well as from Panjab University, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Self appraisal report submitted by Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer-II

17. Considered self appraisal report dated 01.05.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) of Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer-II, P.U. Construction office.

NOTE: 1. A detailed office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).

2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 31) (**Appendix-XV**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred

Shri Varinder Singh said that on perusing the self appraisal report, it has been revealed that the XEN Padam has not been given the work of an XEN and requested that he should be given the work of an XEN.

The Vice Chancellor, however said that he has been given the work many times, but he does not undertake the work. He was asked to accomplish the work at Muktsar, but did not go there. He has asked to provide him some manpower, the same was provided to him, but he does not do any work. Now he says that he may be given permission for doing Ph.D. Shri Varinder Kumar and some of the members said in a lighter vein that if he does not work, then he should be given permission to which the Vice Chancellor said then why he should not be retired compulsorily.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that to his mind, virtually he has not been given any work to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is not true. When he was reinstated, three years ago, he was asked to take care of the work of hostels but that work was withdrawn from him. The Vice Chancellor said that he did not do any work.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was given the work of hostels where he used to go. It was a supervisory duty. He was asked to take care of the complaints to be submitted by the Wardens. He also made some plans. He also made a plan for the Student Centre also. Since, ultimately that was to be carried out by the XEN, but there was a gap. Whatever work he wanted to get done, it was not being done. He then requested to provide him a J.E. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has written to XEN Rai to provide J.E., but he said that he is already short of J.Es. One or the other problem at some level remained there and the work allotted to him could not be accomplished and kept on lingering. He made plans to execute the work, but it could not be accomplished further, because he has very less authority in the execution of work.

The Vice Chancellor said that except financial authority, he was having every authority. He does not sign the financial files, but, he can prepare tenders documents which does not require any financial authority.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is a Committee for P.U.R.C., Muktsar. It is on record that he visited Muktsar along with the Registrar. But after that his name does not figure in the Committee.

The Registrar said that he has been specifically given the task of work at P.U.R.C. Muktsar. He (Registrar) asked him whether he would like to be positioned there. Alternatively, if he wants to go to and fro, they will give him transportation. Mr. Padam asked for a Peon and Clerk, which were given to him. When he asked him about the details of the work done by him, no feedback was given. He asked, if he is not getting support from the XEN, then he should tell him. He used to ask for feedback after every visit made by him to Muktsar, but he did not give any feedback and further deterioration continued there. When he visited Muktsar along with Mr. Padam it came to his notice that they have written off the building by saying that it cannot be repaired. When he along with other officials visited Muktsar, they checked and decided that the roofs could be repaired and then they estimated how much money could be spent on the

repair of the roofs etc. Mr. Padam could also do this exercise. After all, he was an XEN and he expected him to apply his mind.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the XEN office has always remained in controversies. Both the XENs should be given equal powers, so that they keep on checking each other. The other XEN also remains in controversies and complaints also keep on pouring against him. They are giving them pay, then why they should not be given sufficient work and in this way they would also keep a check on each other.

The Vice Chancellor said that when he is asked to do something or when he is asked to go Muktsar, he says, he is ill, and keep on asking for leave for months together. There is no deliverance. If they want to give him one chance, give him some specific work to do. It is okay with him. Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that there is lot of work to do in the hostels. They had made proposals to make reading blocks in hostels. The Vice Chancellor said that some Syndicate member should take this responsibility that he/they will oversee, what he is delivering.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if they give him some work, he will not think of doing Ph.D.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will do Ph.D. only if they permit him to do so. The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Navdeep Goyal, when he had been the DSW, why he could not get the work done from him. Can he now take the responsibility to get the work done from him?

After having some discussion among themselves, the members desired that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma would take the responsibility of getting the work done from Mr. Padam and also oversee the works accomplished by him.

On having the view point of the members, the Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma Ji accepts that they have some deliverance from Mr. Padam. If he can work for the welfare of the hostellers, lot of work needs to be done there. The work on Muktsar Project will also be executed by him. The Vice Chancellor said that he is very happy that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has accepted the responsibility. If they get output from a University Officer, what more they can ask for.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that some work should be got done from him so that they can make good use of him.

RESOLVED: That self appraisal report dated 01.05.2017 of Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer-II, P.U. Construction office, **as per Appendix**, be noted and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma be requested to oversee the work assigned to Shri Satish Kumar Padam and submit a report to the Syndicate.

Recovery from employees on account of short supply of bitumen drums

18. To ratify that the following amount, be recovered from Shri P.K. Ghai, J.E., P.U. Construction on account of the adjustment of advances drawn by Late Shri H.L. Sharma, Executive Engineer, Panjab University as proposed by Executive Engineer-I, P.U. vide note dated 04.08.2017 (**Appendix-XVI**).

- (i) Rs.8817/- on account of short receipt of 12 drums of bitumen from Mathura to P.U. Store.
- (ii) Rs.816/- i.e. excess amount paid for the non-transported 12 drums of bitumen.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 8) (**Appendix-XVI**) considered the minutes dated 19.06.2017 with regard enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Enquiry Officer in respect of Shri P.K. Ghai and it was resolved that the enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba be accepted. Syndicate noted that three persons were pronounced guilty, however, penalty can be imposed only one of them namely, Shri P.K. Ghai, in the present circumstances. Shri P.K. Ghai is directed to deposit an amount of Rs.10,382/- in the University account being the then cost of 12 drums of bitumen and with this the case be closed.

Accordingly, Shri P.K. Ghai has deposited an amount of Rs.10382/-

- 2. The amount to be recovered as mentioned at (i) and (ii) above also stand indicated in the enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba and the Executive Engineer-I has written that the adjustment of advances cannot be got made as above mentioned amounts (Rs.8817/- & Rs.816/- needs to be recovered from Shri P.K. Ghai, J.E..

Speaking on the item, Principal H.S.Gosal stated that twelve drums of bitumen were recovered from him (Shri P.K. Ghai, J.E.). How many more drums would had been stolen, is not known. As per the rates of 1993, if the amount was Rs. 8817/-, what would be the amount if it is calculated as per the present market rates.

The Vice Chancellor said that part-1 of the note mentioned under the agenda item relating to 18 drums has already been done. Now only part-2 is to be considered which he read out.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Principal H.S. Gosal said that market rate should be recovered from him.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have already discussed and it has already been passed and that it cannot be reconsidered.

Principal H.S. Gosal said why it could not be reconsidered. They may say that they could not remember it at that time.

Some members informed that he is going to retire to which Principal H.S. Gosal said, then they should also let Ms. Pooja Bagga free.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said, that was a fraud. But in this case, whatever amount they have asked him to deposit, he has deposited.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what is to be done.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that market rate should be charged from them.

Some members said that present rate should be charged from all the three indicted persons.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the persons who have already retired, the amount should be recovered from their pension.

The Vice Chancellor asked if the amount could be recovered from all the three persons.

The members wanted to know whether the amount could be deducted from the pension of those who have retired.

The Registrar said that it cannot be recovered from their pension.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if the disciplinary proceedings have already been initiated before their retirement, it can be recovered from their pension. Probably, disciplinary proceedings were initiated before their retirement.

The Registrar said it has to be seen from the disciplinary proceedings when these were initiated. However, the Registrar informed that they have been indicted in the disciplinary proceedings.

The Finance and Development Officer said that if something like this is mentioned in the disciplinary proceedings, then the amount could be recovered from their pension.

The Vice Chancellor said 1/3rd of the amount, as per the present rate be recovered from all the persons.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor as to when this occurred, the members informed that it occurred in the year 1993. The Vice Chancellor said that it happened about 23 years ago and the rates increase after every 8 years. So, it is 2³ i.e. 8 times. So, it will be 1/3 of eight times which comes to 2.67 times. It means whatever rate has been written there, they could charge double or triple of that rate and the matter should be closed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should charge three times from each of the three persons of the rate which has been mentioned.

Principal H.S. Gosal asked as to what was their pay when this occurred and how much pay they are getting today.

The Vice Chancellor said that 23 years have passed when this occurred. The government increases salary at the rate of 2.5 times after every ten years. Three is the upper limit and 3x3 is nine. They have to take 1/3rd of nine i.e. three times amount from each person.

RESOLVED: That current market rate of 12 drums of bitumen and current market rate of transportation, of the cost at that time as mentioned at (i) and (ii) above, be recovered in equal share from each of the three persons indicted by the Enquiry Officer.

**Recommendations
dated 29.01.2016 of
the Sub-Committee of
JCM regarding
regularisation policy**

19. Considered recommendation dated 29.01.2016 of Sub-Committee of Joint Consultative Committee (JCM) that the daily wage employees, who have completed 7 years of service upto 31.03.2016 and other conditions of previous regularization policy, be regularized if they are fulfilling all conditions of qualification, work and conduct report, and Summary sheet with estimated financial implication on regularization of daily wage, employees who have completed 10 years of service as on 30.06.2017, as recommended by the JCM dated 17.07.2017.

NOTE: An office note enclosed.

Professor Mukesh Arora said it is a very good step, but this should be stopped in future. When they appoint persons on daily wages basis, they have to continue them for seven years. It is better if the persons are appointed through direct recruitment. Last time, they had decided 31.3.2016 as the date to count the number of days for those who have completed 7 years. He requested that it should be extended to 31.3.2017.

However Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Shri Varinder Singh, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu requested to extend it upto today (i.e. 20.8.2017). Professor Mukesh Arora also endorsed it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu further said that the appointment of daily wagers is a backdoor entry and it should be stopped.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a list of daily wagers has been prepared by the Estt. Branch where some categories have not been included. The whole thing has to be viewed properly and modalities have to be finalized. So, in order to do all this, the best thing is that they should form a Committee. This Committee should check everything properly and ensure that the names of all the persons have been included. It might create a problem if the name of someone is left. He further said although all the other things are agreed, in principle, but order to finalize the list properly and to prepare modalities, a Committee should be formed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the J.C.M. can also do this work.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu pointed out that Assistant Librarian have not been included in this list and said that they should also be included. The daily wagers in all categories should be included and no one should be left. But he stressed that they should be included till today. He further informed that he had been the member of J.C.M. whose Chairperson was Shri Satya Pal Jain. In

that Committee he had said that this is a backdoor entry. They come through someone and then it becomes his/her right and they all say that if he/she is removed from the job, it would be an injustice to him. He, therefore, requested that such type of entries should be stopped and appointments should be made through proper channel. He further requested that they should be considered regularisation upto today. If someone is left, due to one or the other reason, he/she should also be considered.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that J.C.M. can verify the date and name.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it would take a lot of time. He suggested that a Committee should be formed here.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that fresh entry should be stopped forthwith, but those who have already completed, suppose 4-5 four years or so, they should be regularised as per the policy. Otherwise, it would be injustice to them. No person should be left who has been already working. He further clarified that those who would be appointed after today's date, they will not be regularised. This was endorsed by Professor Mukesh Arora, Shri Varinder Singh, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that those who are on the rolls till today, they should be regularized.

Shri Varinder Singh said that this process has taken a very long time and only then it could come to this stage.

The Vice Chancellor said, let him give an intermediate input. The government representative, in particular Central Government representative from the MHRD and University Grants Commission, they clearly stated that whatever they decide which has financial implications, it cannot violate the government financial norms and the central government norms, if Uma Devi Judgement does not permit to regularise people, they cannot regularize people. Anything that they do, the Central Government will examine what they are doing. The release of money i.e. Rs. 208 crores plus 6% increase every year, is subject to Central Government scrutiny sitting as a watch-dog on them all the time. Any decision that they take regarding this will need consultation with the Central Government. Otherwise they cannot do it. If they do not take a favourable view on it, they would run into serious difficulty while receiving grants from the Central Government. So, they can have a consensus and this consensus, on their behalf, must be discussed by a Committee of the Syndicate with the representatives of the Central Government, particularly, the MHRD. The University Grants Commission may wash its hands off. UT representative i.e Special Secretary Finance or Finance Secretary, U.T. and the MHRD person has to be taken on board, otherwise they would run into a problem. Something which the Panjab Government is doing is not adequate to have the concurrence of the Central Government. If the Punjab Government okays it, then all the additional burden that will accrue from this, has to be undertaken by the Punjab Government because university's internal income would not be adequate to take this burden. What is the underlying thing, that they have been given Rs. 208 crores on an input given to MHRD that employees cost of the University would be brought down. It is in that context that it was stated that the number of non-teaching

employees should be cut down or out sourced. All this has been stated to the Central Government. They (Panjab University) have given them an undertaking that they will reduce the employees cost. This (JCM recommendation) actually amounts to enhancing the employees cost. This is prima facie ok that you cannot ask people to work on low wages temporarily for whole of their life. So, there are factors which have to be taken into account. If the Punjab Government is implementing this, obviously, our people who follow everything from the Punjab Government, they will have the desire that if it being done in Punjab, it should be done here also. But the enhanced cost of this has to be borne by someone. That means the Punjab Government representative must be taken on board. So aspirations of the employees is correct and the fact that the wages of the employees cannot remain at a fixed level, when a person is almost working for 6-7 years and it is like a quasi-regular job. Even a person on a quasi regular job wants at least some increment. Right now the only increment they are entitled to is the increase in DC rate. But in whatever category they are, they are at a lowest point. It is not even this that after working for 5 years, they do not get even a minimum enhancement. They are not entitled even two promotions as time progresses. There is no increment that is available to a person while everybody who is there in the University gets an increment. These people do not get any increment. They cannot make them regular because the Central Government says if they make them regular they must give an advertisement. If they give an advertisement, then large number of them may not get selected. If they do not get in, then there would be another kind of resentment. So it is a complicated issue, but it has to be looked at from a humanistic point of view and a comparative study with their counterpart.

Principal Gurdip Kumar said that the financial burden is less than one crore to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is ok.

The Vice Chancellor said that one crore is not a much more amount for doing this. The Vice Chancellor further said that few of them sit together and look at it in a comprehensive way, work out the numbers. One crore is not a big amount.

Dr. Dalip Kumar enquired if the number of employees who have completed 10 years of service as on 30.06.2017 to be regularised which at present is 226 as per the table attached as annexure in the agenda could vary and the financial implication involved is only Rs.89 lacs.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the present list of the employees is not complete.

The Vice Chancellor said to answer all these things, have the Punjab Government on board so that Central Government may not say that they have violated this or that because one crore is nothing out of five hundred crores budget if they can get satisfaction amongst the large number of employees. Otherwise these persons will continue to work like this on low wages.

Principal H.S. Gosal requested the Vice Chancellor to do this for the poor fellows.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should do it in such a way that it may not become an issue with the Central Government for an

unfavourable view of what they are doing. The wording and package of this should be such so that the work should be complete and nothing goes against them.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested before inviting the Punjab Government and U.T. Government, they should update the list.

The Vice Chancellor said that they cannot do anything on adhoc basis. If they do anything on adhoc basis, they will be accused.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the technical staff has not been included in the list.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Navdeep Goyal to make a package of it. If the amount increases to one and half crore instead of one crore, it will not make much difference. The budget is of five hundred crores and one or two crores is a negligible amount. The problem would have been, if it was 20-30 crores. One can justify for one or two crores. He can forcibly argue, but make a comprehensive list. Answer all these questions so that they can push it through.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that a good Committee may be constituted and members like Dr. Dalip Kumar and Shri Prabhjit Singh may be included in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members to give him the names of Committee members by tomorrow after talking amongst themselves. The Vice Chancellor asked them to do a comprehensive thing so that he can defend it. The members agreed to it. The Vice Chancellor reminded the members that he has got approved the policy of regularisation after 10 years service. Continuing the Vice Chancellor said that the future recruitment is already stopped. The comprehensive list be prepared and he would convene a special meeting of the Board of Finance before March, 2018 so that it could be included in the projections for the budget of the next year.

RESOLVED: That a complete list of all categories of the employees to be covered under the policy and the financial implications be prepared and a Committee of the following persons be constituted for the purpose:

- (i) Professor Navdeep Goyal
- (ii) Professor Pam Rajput
- (iii) Shri Jarnail Singh
- (iv) Dr. Dalip Kumar
- (v) Shri Prabhjit Singh

Minutes of Committee dated 26.05.2017 regarding rules & regulations for migration

20. Considered minutes dated 26.05.2017 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as per authorization given by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) and recommendation dated 05.07.2017 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 27), with regard to frame Rules & Regulations for migration cases of other departments.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) (**Appendix-XVII**) while considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 10.01.2017 has

further authorized the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate, to form a Committee to frame rules and regulations for migration cases of other departments under the Chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari and the Dean of University Instruction may join the Committee as per his convenience.

2. The minutes dated 26.05.2017 was placed before the Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 (Item No. 35) for consideration and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred and a consideration item as per recommendations of Item No. R (xi) be again brought to Syndicate for consideration.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 27) (**Appendix-XVII**) while considering the request of Ms. Bharti Mawa mother of Ms. Ujjwal Naresh Mawa for seeking lateral admission in M.Sc. 2nd year (Environment Science) has constituted a Committee to examine the issue and submit its report.

Accordingly, a Committee in its meeting dated 05.07.2017 while considering the request of the applicant and allowing Ms. Ujjwal Naresh Mawa to get lateral admission in 3rd semester M.Sc. (Environment Science) has also opined that regulation for migration from other Universities to Panjab University be framed for all those courses for which the guidelines of regulatory bodies or law of the land does not prohibit.

4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para R(xi)) (**Appendix-XVII**) has ratified the admission of Ms. Ujjwal Naresh Mawa in 3rd semester M.Sc. (Environmental Science), Department of Environment Studies, P.U. for the session 2017-18.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 26.05.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as per authorization given by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) and recommendation dated 05.07.2017 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 27), with regard to frame Rules & Regulations for migration cases of other departments, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Status report of misappropriation of funds and subsistence allowance to Mr. Naresh Sabharwal

21. To

- (i) consider Status of actions/court proceedings/departmental enquiry (**Appendix-XVIII**) against Ms. Pooja Bagga and Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), Pension Cell with regard to misappropriation of funds by Ms. Pooja Bagga, Ex-Daily wage, Clerk, Pension Cell.
- (ii) decide the subsistence allowance being paid to Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), Pension Cell.

NOTE: 1. Shri Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (Under Suspension) vide his application dated 11.07.2017 (**Appendix-XVIII**) has requested to postpone the departmental enquiry for six months. The enquiry Officer has extended the operation of the order dated 09.05.2016 (**Appendix-XVIII**) till 20.03.2018.

- 2. At present Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), has been allowed subsistence allowance @ of 50% this salary.
- 3. Rule 29.2 appearing at pages 92-93 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016 reads as under:

“Where the period of suspension exceeds six months, the suspending authority shall be competent to vary the amount of subsistence allowance for any period subsequent to the period of the first six months as follows:

- (i) xxx xxx
- (ii) Subsistence allowance may be reduced by a suitable, not exceeding 50 per cent of the subsistence allowance admissible during the period of the first six months, if, in the opinion of the said authority.
- (iii) The rate of dearness allowance will be based on the increased or as the case may be, the decreased amount of subsistence allowance admissible under clause (i) and (ii) above.

4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).
5. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 30) (**Appendix-XVIII**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Mr. Naresh Sabharwal did not appear before the Committee. As per rules, after a period of 6 months, the subsistence allowance could be increased or decreased. He was of the opinion that they should not change the subsistence allowance.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that since the family of the person is also dependent on him, the subsistence allowance should be increased to 75% if permitted under the rules.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the status of actions/court proceedings/ departmental enquiry (**Appendix-XVIII**) against Ms. Pooja Bagga and Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), Pension Cell with regard to misappropriation of funds by Ms. Pooja Bagga, Ex-Daily wage, Clerk, Pension Cell, be noted; and
- (ii) the subsistence allowance being paid to Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), Pension Cell, be continued to be paid as earlier.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 25.07.2017 regarding repair work at PURC Sri Muktsar Sahib

22. Considered following recommendations dated 25.07.2017 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee, with regard to carry out major repairs of the roof of the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, which is in dilapidated condition.

1. The roofs of all the rooms on first floor to be replaced by lightweight Puffs Panels. False Ceiling be provided for all the rooms on first floor. Wall mounted fans to be installed and flooring to be replaced with tiles in these rooms.
2. On the ground floor similar work as mentioned in point no. 1 to be done for all the office rooms, store rooms, reception room and staff room near gents toilet and staff rooms near reception. Also the flooring of open area (near offices) at the entrance of PURC Muktsar building to be replaced by tiles.
3. Canteen will be properly renovated with flooring and false ceiling etc. and library to be shifted from first floor to canteen area.
4. The open space adjoining canteen to be renovated to accommodate the new canteen.
5. The gents and ladies toilets on ground floor and first floor to be renovated and new gents and ladies toilets (for staff) to be made.

6. Whitewash and electricity work of whole PURC Muktsar building will be carried out.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 19) (**Appendix-XIX**) considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 12.06.2017 regarding carry out major repairs of the roof of the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, which is in dilapidated condition and resolved that a Committee comprising of Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang and the Registrar to visit the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib and explore the possibility of some alternative accommodation for running the classes in near future before considering the above proposal. The matter be placed in next meeting.
2. Pursuant to the above decision Principal I.S. Sandhu, Syndic and Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang, Senator visited PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib on 15.07.2017. A copy of the visit report is enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**)

The Vice Chancellor said that they visited the Muktsar Centre sometime ago. At the moment, they worked out that the classes are going to be held over an extended period and all classes will be adjusted in the existing safe rooms. The first floor can be temporarily built by having a little bit reconstruction and putting a temporary roof on it. The XEN was also with them and the estimates have been prepared. It will be done before the end of the current semester. Then they also visited the P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib. Kauni Centre has lot of space and there is enough construction, i.e. old and new. But it is not getting utilized for one reason or the other. The old construction is not getting utilized because somewhere it has become unsafe. But if some repair work is done and some money is spent on it, there is so much of area available in the Kauni Centre. Eventually, it is profitable to shift all the postgraduate classes to the Kauni Centre and keep the Muktsar Centre premises for running the professional courses. Law classes are already there. Some more professional courses classes could be added. So, let the professional courses classes be run from the present premises of P.U.R.C. Sri Muktsar Sahib which eventually would be shifted to the 5 acres land if they can construct this. But, if they shift the postgraduate courses classes to the Kauni Centre, then they would have the postgraduate classes, running on behalf of the University in a rural area. Eventually, they can declare Kauni Centre as the Rural Campus of the Panjab University. This would be a win-win situation for the university. Then the University for its branding will be having a Campus in rural area of Punjab. Punjab Government would be happy as such a campus is not there at other places.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that even now they are happy.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that right now the enrolment there is low and since it is not serving that many people. Also they are not deriving any political mileage out of it. To derive political mileage, it has to be well functioning. He saw there is a plaque when it was inaugurated many years ago. It was inaugurated, none other than by Shri Manpreet Badal, when he was the Finance Minister in the previous government. He wants to go back with a proposal to him that as a Finance Minister in a New Avtar, he should support it and help to bring it to a level that it becomes a Rural Campus of the Panjab University and let the professional courses be run from that 5 acres land which is attached to the Government College, Muktsar. Thus, they can derive a double mileage out of it. There is Government College, Muktsar which has professional courses run by the Punjab University. First, it would enhance the value of Government College. Secondly, this Centre would not be competing with the Government College, at all. There would be unnecessary competition if the professional courses are run at the Government College, Muktsar as well as at the P.U.R.C., Muktsar. Avoid that competition, attach the professional course to the 5 acres land which they have got out of the Government College. He wanted to sell them this idea and eventually work towards this agenda. He has also tried to convince the Chief Secretary that in every Constituent College, which the Punjab Government asked the University to open, every college must have a Principal's residence and make the job transferable. The tenure could be fixed at 3 years or 4 years or whatever it may be and make the living conditions convenient for the Principal. Shri G. Vajralingam, IAS, Principal Secretary, was also there. He also appeared convinced that it is a very small investment. With this the colleges will get stabilized. By this way, they can derive mileage by saying that they have made higher education permeate. They do realize that there is a competition. The Himachal Government is doing well. The number of Government Colleges in Himachal Pradesh is one hundred. They are doing better than the colleges in Punjab.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there are a few private colleges in Himachal Pradesh.

Some members informed that many of the private colleges have been taken over there by the government.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that they also feel the completion at State level. If a neighbouring State is doing well, then, at some level, they also want seen to be doing things for the public

Professor Mukesh Arora intervened to ask the Vice Chancellor that when he visited P.U.R.C., Sri Muktsar Centre, he was also to come to P.U.R.C., Ludhiana and that they kept on waiting for him.

The Vice Chancellor said that he got late at Muktsar and thus could not come, but he promised that he will go there. He informed that his visit to Muktsar has inculcated some confidence in them and the proposal as at this item (item 22) is in that background.

As Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to say something, the Vice Chancellor asked him to give his inputs. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that as stated by the Vice Chancellor, a Committee had visited Kauni Centre and that Committee has opined that an amount of about Rs. 25-30 lakh would be spent. He has also

enquired from the XEN (Shri Padam), he has also said that about Rs. 25-30 Lakh would be spent. The estimate of Rs. 60 lakh is on the higher side. If they start the construction now, it would take a lot of time. But if they just change the roofs and other things should be left, then they can spend the balance money on their own building.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what could be left.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal further said that the expenditure of Rs. 8.5 lakhs on library, and Rs. 11.50 lakhs for toilets could be saved because these toilets were being used till now. Further expenditure to be incurred on canteen could be saved. The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that the toilets there are in a bad condition and further said that he (Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal) can go there and see to it. Continuing, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in 2-3 years, their own building will be ready. Why should they spend this money there. The report for doing these works with an amount of Rs. 25-30 lakhs is submitted by the Committee which has gone there. However, the Vice Chancellor said that they are themselves not ready to get that work done there.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested the Vice Chancellor to issue the money, but the Vice Chancellor said that he cannot give them cash. It has to go via tender and proper procedure has to be followed.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that if they ask the private contractor to do that work, he can do it. But such contractors do not have permission of government system. He can just give his PAN card. However, the other members said that he can fill up the tender.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked if they start it today, how much time it would take.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot say exactly, but he has said that it will take at least six months.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this session will over by then.

The Vice Chancellor informed that he has talked to the faculty. They have gone there and taken the estimate as to how many rooms are there. The classes which start at 9.30 a.m. would now start at 8.00 a.m. The classes will run upto 5.30 p.m. The time table shall be adjusted in a make shift manner. Half of the college teachers will come in the morning and half in the evening. By sort of readjusting the time schedule temporarily, this semester will go through this way. This is what they talked to faculty and this has been agreed to by all of them. This was got done.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested if they can take a ply a bus to Kauni for ferrying the students etc.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, nothing could be done because it would take at least 5-6 months to set the things right there. In Kauni, until and unless some residential accommodation for Principal and staff is not made, nothing could be done. Whatever accommodation is there, it requires a massive repair. The roof of the main building has to be re-put. Right now 25% of the main building of Kauni is not accessible because the plaster of roof is falling down. He

asked them to go to Kauni, see it, and then they will realize that it will not be possible immediately shift to Kauni.

On a point asked by a member whether there is ownership of the building or it is on lease, the Vice Chancellor informed that the building is on indefinite lease. The Vice Chancellor further said that they have to make construction at the part of the Government College campus and they also need money for that and it will also take time. Nothing could be done in just 3-4 months. But the people who are functioning on behalf of the Panjab University from that premises, some minimal working conditions have to be there for them.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked the Vice Chancellor, if their building could be constructed in two years to which the Vice Chancellor said 'No'. Moreover, they do have money for that and for that tender has also to be issued.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, they should not think of Rs. 5-10 lakhs. He informed that if the work is got done from a Contractor, he would also spend about Rs. 30 lakhs.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the budget is not of 30lakhs but it is between 25-30 lakhs. The estimate is of Rs. 60 lakhs. However, the Vice Chancellor said that they cannot do it. However, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal agreed to it that they have to follow the procedure as per the University rules and tender has also to be floated.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that there is difference between the cost of construction between a private builder or a government agency. He informed that once they have got a building constructed at the for Rs. 30 lakhs. But someone frightened them that they could not construct the building from the private contractor. Then they got it constructed from the P.W.D. and the expenditure for which was to the tune of Rs. 70 lakhs. This is the difference.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he has not seen the building of Rural Centre, Kauni but, what Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal is saying, he is right. But, when he visited that Centre, whatever, he felt that somewhere, there is a problem from the staff side, because he is a teacher and they are also teachers. They do not want to be shifted from P.U.R.C., Muktsar to Kauni. He talked to Professor. P.S. Dhingra, who is his friend and colleague and also Mr. Mishra ji about it. If he is talking in the Syndicate, it has some meaning. He said if M.A./M.Phil classes are started somewhere else, the seats may not fill, but he can say with confidence that the Panjab University has a trade mark and all the seats of M.A., Phil or Law will be filled. If, a candidate belonging to Malout, could come to Muktsar, why not he would come to Kauni. Plying of buses is a secondary thing. There will be no need of detailing buses. When a student knew that these classes will run at Kauni, he would apply at Kauni only. He again said that if he is talking this in the Syndicate, he can say with full confidence and all the seats will be filled there. If the classes are to be run at Kauni for two years, these could run, but if there is no building available at Kauni, then they are helpless.

The Vice Chancellor said that that is why he has to go to Shri Manpreet ji and give it in writing to him with regard to the issue of building at Kauni. When he met him some M.L.A.s were also there.

They have to give him a concept paper so that they can see the advantage into it.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that the repair work could be delayed for sometime so that the proposal mentioned by the Vice Chancellor could mature.

The Vice Chancellor said that the work cannot be delayed as the classes are in progress and they have to give satisfaction to students. He said let the work go on and they should work on the proposal concurrently. Make sure that the money is spent on making the premises of the Kauni Centre functional. They should sell this idea to Shri Manpreet Badal ji that construction for the professional courses should be done.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu pointed out that it would not be a good idea if they spend an amount of 50-60 lakhs for running the classes at Kauni Centre just for two years. If such a big amount is to be spent, they should make the proposal to hold the classes there at least for 10 years. This was endorsed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

The Vice Chancellor said that even if they get the Government College premises made, it will take few years. In 2-3 years if they spend 20-30 lakhs, it would be cheaper than hiring the building on rent. Nobody will be willing to rent out equivalent space for two lakh per month. This would come out to Rs. 24 lakhs for one year and for three years it would be Rs. 72 lakhs. So, he said that he does not know how to reduce this over estimate. Reduction in this over estimate would require motivation of some contractor.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that estimate of repair/renovation is inclusive of expenditure on front yard, backyard, lights etc.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Shri Jarnail Singh suggested if they would like to shift the classes there, then they should do it in a proper way.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is why he is convinced that the size of the land at Kauni is really large and it is almost on the main road.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked if they are facing any problem in cutting down a tree to which the Registrar said, No, there is no such problem, they will get the permission.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if they have to spend the money, they should utilize the building at least for ten years.

RESOLVED: That recommendations dated 25.07.2017 of the Committee, with regard to carry out major repairs of the roof of the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, which is in dilapidated condition, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Resolution proposed by Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Fellow for grant of Central University status

23. Considered resolution proposed by Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Fellow, P.U. for grant of Central University status to P.U. pursuant to the recommendations of the Committee dated 12.07.2017 constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.04.2017 (Para 12).

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 12) considered the proposal of Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Fellow and it was resolved that the relevant data be collected by the Finance & Development Officer from the University of Allahabad and Dr. H.S. Gour University, Sagar, which have been converted into Central Universities to find out what kind of additional support these Universities have got after the grant of Central University status and the item be again placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.
2. The office has not received the data of other Universities which have been converted to Central Universities, so far

The Vice Chancellor said that now they are a quasi Central University in the sense that they are getting financial support from the Central Government which is of the order of about Rs. 200 crores. Who is our peer institution nationally, say Allahabad University. What is the input given to the Allahabad University. It is Rs. 250 crores and not 2000 crores. So, Rs. 200 crores are given to Panjab University and Rs. 250 crores to Allahabad University i.e. Rs. 50 crores more than Panjab University. In addition to it, they got developmental grants in the last five years which figure out between Rs. 130 and Rs. 140 crores. If they divide it by 5, it will come out to 27-28 crores per year approximately. Whereas, they get Rs. 12 crore for 5 years from the University Grants Commission. So, the difference between Panjab University and Allahabad University is: Rs. 50 crores plus Rs. 25 crores, i.e., total of Rs. 75 crores. But they do not get grant from the State Government. So the difference between Panjab University and Allahabad University is of the order of Rs. 50 crores. Therefore, they are a quasi Centrally Funded University. They are not a Central University in the sense that they are governed by some central Act which, if it comes in, could lead to lot of changes in the governance structure, which nobody wants. Given the heritage of the University, nobody wants. Governance reforms is one thing and governance structure is another thing. Governance reforms is different from constructs of the governance body. Nobody wants changes in the construct of the government body in the sense that the representative character of the governing body should get change. Right now it has input from all categories in a very well defined way. Nobody wants change in the basic structure. So, now how to get some developmental grant for the University, so that the pressure on the internal income can be kept within the limits. Actually, what is happening now, all our internal income is now spent on paying salary. They are not left with any money for the development of the University. They did not have money to construction hostels or to maintain any other structures. All those things, the newly made

central universities are getting. So, while it is a good thing to articulate that they should be a Central University, but even if they are not made a Central University, if they get developmental grant, with the current Interstate Body Corporate status, still it will serve their purpose. So, they should discuss today as to how to proceed with this agenda of trying to get more resources for the University while retaining the current way of governing the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee consisting of five members from the Syndicate and some other members was formed to look into the issue of grant of Central status to the University. The input which members would receive from the members is that the University could be converted into a Central University. In the input provided, they talked about the governing structure, salary structure and other things. Whereas few of the other things are that they got some of the benefits also. When they look at what has been recommended by that Committee, it is similar to what is there in those Central Universities and what their expectations were. Anyway, since the resolution has come from a member of the Senate, the best thing is that they should discuss it in the Senate in detail. The concept note and all those things which have been prepared, on behalf of Syndicate by the Committee can be sent to the Senate so that some material is available to the Senate members for discussion.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor as to what should be done, Dr. Subhash Sharma said enough discussion had taken place in the Committee formed for this purpose, now let the Senate decide, what to do.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said, as the Vice Chancellor has himself stated, that without disturbing the democratic and representative content of the University, they should try to get developmental grants because the sentiments of all of them are attached with the present governing structure of the University. Just for a very small thing of 1882, if they change it and make this University a Central University, it is not a good service. He stated in Pakistan, in spite of being military regime there, they have kept intact the democratic content of 1882. They have kept intact almost the whole content of 1882.

However, the Vice Chancellor stated that they have changed their Act five times. He had submitted all this by downloading it from the internet.

Continuing Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Syndicate and Senate there are the elected bodies. Even the students' representatives are in Senate. That is why he is saying that if they can retain it, then why the Panjab University cannot do it. It is a great heritage and they should not disturb it just for the sake of some money. He requested that it should remain intact and efforts should be continued for getting grants.

Dr. Dalip Kumar Sharma said that in the resolve part of the concept note which was prepared on behalf of the Syndicate, it has been stated that rights of all the stake holders i.e. all colleges, students and non-teaching staff etc., should be protected. All these things were finalized in the last meeting of the Committee where President PUSA was also invited. Their only reservation was that their

service conditions be not changed and it was agreed by the Committee also. They wanted their service conditions as per Punjab Government rules and this was also included in the concept note. He wanted to know whether from this title, were they be able to increase their finances. He said to his mind, this cannot increase the finances of the University. It is better if they go ahead with their efforts which they are making.

The Vice-Chancellor intervened to say that they can always make a case for themselves that they should be given more funds for out development needs. Yesterday, (he does not know whether it is a right thing to say or to quote him), Dr.Saraswat who was being listened to by the government, when it came to the agenda related to Make in India, Made in India, Skill Development in India, Corporate Participation in Higher Education, he said that the University like theirs, how can it be shut down. It cannot be allowed to shut down. He took him to both Sector-14 and Sector 25. He saw everything here. So they can make a case for more funds. He (Vice Chancellor) told him about everything and he was convinced. He unofficially asked him to give him a note and told that he will try to put their view point across the board. So, they can make a case that they should be given developmental grant. Where it has been written when the Central Government said that beyond the grant of Rs. 206.8 crores, they will not be given any grant? They said that they will give this amount to you and if you need some additional posts, justify it. The thing is that whatever is their existing budget, where they project that they will give salary and electricity/water charges out of it. But if they have to make something new, it has not been written anywhere that it would not be given. So if in a participative way, it can be said that they can just contribute this much of amount out of the University income and for rest of the money, the government should help them. Since they are a centrally funded institution and their Chancellor is the Vice President of India. The other Universities of India of which the Vice President is the Chancellor, if they are given the developmental grants, because they are the responsibility of the Central Government in some way, if Pondicherry and Delhi University is being given extra money, then why their needs be not fulfilled by releasing grant either directly by the Central Government or through the Union Territory. The Governor is reported to have said in the press that he is going to convene a meeting where the needs of the Panjab University would be discussed. Why is the Governor taking initiative to discuss the needs of the Panjab University and which needs of Panjab University are to be discussed any further. There is nothing to discuss about the salary. Then what is left. Whatever has left are the developmental needs. So if the Governor is taking the initiative that the needs of the Panjab University need attention, because they are the integral part of the Union Territory. So if Smt. Kiran Bedi, Incharge of the Union Territory of Pondicherry, is able to provide for the Pondicherry University, then why should the Administrator U.T. Chandigarh not argue their case to the Home Ministry. He said that he thinks that the issue is multipronged. He informed that Kiran Bedi Ji is coming next month to deliver J.C. Anand Memorial Lecture. She was a student of Professor J.C. Anand of the Department of Political Science. She did her M.A. in Political Science. During the teachers' day week, she has agreed to come and asked for the date. When she will come, he will use her good offices to get it articulated to Shri V.P. Singh Badnore Ji that the needs of Panjab University should be got forwarded ahead.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Governor, Punjab and Administrator U.T., is helping the Director PEC University of Technology, in trying to convert their Institute in an IIT. They have met MHRD Minister on this issue and they are hopeful of its being done very soon. Similarly, they could also meet the Governor, Punjab and Administrator U.T and convince him about their needs. If they are able to convince him, they could do it for which he was very much hopeful.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they look at the whole discussion part, there were many suggestions. If they take the whole discussion part, it is not necessary that they should only make the University a Central University. It was also discussed that if it is not a Central University, then it could be a Institute of National Importance. If they are successful in getting the status of Institute of National Importance, it is a good thing and they will be able to get much advantage.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has been encouraged that they should make a good application on behalf of the University for Institute of World Class Institute of Excellence. Shri Saraswat ji also said that they should include something new. When he alongwith the Registrar met Mr. Parveen Kumar, Joint Secretary who is the incharge of it, has said that their proposal should not be incremental. Put something really new and they deserved to be considered for this, but bring something new. Just the incremental needs will not serve the purpose. Bring such a proposal that should appear somewhat different from others and that they have good chance for it. If this proposal is cleared, then for the next ten years, they would get Rs. One thousand crore and with that amount all their developmental needs would be met. So they should not lose heart and make concerted efforts from all sides.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that just for the sake of money, they should not spoil their heritage. When they go to a person for asking for money, he has his own terms and conditions and not theirs. Only his rules and regulations will be applicable and not theirs. If they request to make it a Central University, even for this, the Central Government has to give the money. Pakistan is not going to give money for that. It may not happen that in the hope of getting more money, we may lose our heritage. So they should protect their heritage and efforts should be made to get money from the Centre Government for fulfilling their developmental needs. The status/democratic content of Panjab University should not change and by remaining within this set up, they should make efforts to get more resources.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu while endorsing the view point of Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said Dr. Dalip Kumar has briefed about the report of the Committee that the interests of all the stakeholders would be kept in view. He said, suppose they succeed in getting the Central Status for Panjab University, but even then nobody in the Centre will take care of their stakeholders as they will implement their own rules and regulations.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that they should first read it.

Continuing, Principal I.S. Sandhu said, suppose, if the Panjab University becomes a Central University, they should forget that the

concerns of the non-teaching employees will be redressed and the governing structure will remain the same. Then, only the Central government will be applicable and they have to work according to that Act.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma also endorsed the view point of Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and added that after the grant of Central Status, their terms and conditions will not be applied.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said they have been wasting their time in every Syndicate meeting for the proposal of one or two persons.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that when they were winding up this, they have decided that they would not like to convene more meetings for this.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if the Vice Chancellor wishes, he could ask the Syndicate members to raise their hands to know whether they are in favour of grant of Central Status to Panjab University. He further said that he is sure that 80% of the Syndicate members would say that they do not want Central Status for the Panjab University. They should make efforts for getting the status of University of National Heritage or Institute of National Importance and not for grant of Central Status. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and some other members also endorsed Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu on the issue.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that some heritage which is lying there should be collected and a good plan be prepared.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the University will be benefited if it is granted either the status of Heritage University or Institute of National Importance. Nothing will change with this and they should make efforts for that.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they have already worked a lot on this issue and there is no harm if they make some more efforts.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it cannot be considered under this agenda to which Professor Navdeep Goyal requested that they should recommend the other status and make efforts for that only.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out about the conditions imposed by the Punjab Government and said that they have not thought about it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu requested the Vice Chancellor to decide on the floor of the house by asking the members to raise their hands to know as to how many persons are with this agenda. He further requested that this proposal should be dropped and a new proposal be prepared. Why this proposal is coming again and again? He proposed that they should first say 'yes' or 'no' to this proposal. They are duty bound to first consider the item and then send it to the Senate. Every item should not be sent to the Senate.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 20th August 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said to first read the proposal. He, however, said that he is also saying the same of not sending this proposal for further consideration.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they could send the agenda for further discussion to the Senate only if they agree to it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that views of all the members be taken.

Professor Pam Rajput said that they should make efforts for the World Class University to which the members said that this has already been done.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the word 'Central University Status should not be written.

The Vice Chancellor read out the following paragraph at page 28 of the agenda papers of this item:

It should be very clear that the denomination 'Central University' is not homogeneously defined, and that there are variations. For instance Allahabad University Act declares "the University of Allahabad to be an institution of national importance"

So, he said that Allahabad University is an institution of National Importance and their claim is more stronger.

"Similarly the three State Universities converted into Central Universities through Central University Act 2009 are defined as 'bodies corporate'.

For that matter, every University is a Body Corporate. They are an Interstate Body Corporate because their domain is Union Territory and a State.

"These newly converted universities retain their previous names. Our case for central status gathers greater merit for our being a heritage university or an institution of national importance. The uniqueness of our university can well be retained and preserved if we become central".

This is dubious. If they become central, as per the Central Act, they would not be able to preserve their unique character of the University. The resolution for the same is already under consideration of Syndicate (Annexure-IX) at page 38 of agenda. After reading out this resolution, the Vice Chancellor said that this resolution does not have clarity.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the resolution is clear as resolution wants the Panjab University to be a Central University.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said 8-9 years ago he has raised the same issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Central University Status would not allow them to retain the present governing structure.

Shri Jarnail Singh while clarifying about the resolution said that he (Dr. Gurmeet Singh) proposed the resolution, but later he amended it. He requested the members to go through the amended resolution.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would show them the amended resolution.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should discuss things with open mind and see what he has said in the resolution.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that once they sent it to the Government of India, who will take care of what they had desired in the resolution.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that their agenda item is regarding grant of Central Status to Panjab University. He does not know why they are putting other things here. This issue is now with the Syndicate, let the Syndicate take a decision on it. He requested that this item should be dropped and a new proposal should be brought. This was endorsed by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and some other members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked if they can modify it to which Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said what is to be modified in it. First this should be dropped and a fresh proposal should be brought.

The Vice Chancellor said that the practical way to move forward is that all of them, by discussing the matter amongst themselves, will send him a new resolution within one week. He will, then circulate this new resolution, by email to all of them and that new resolution, with their endorsement, will go to the Senate meeting to be held on 20th September. The Vice Chancellor clarified that the agenda item is not to be dropped, but the original resolution has been dropped. The Vice Chancellor reiterated that whatever is written at page 38 of the agenda is not approved. Only that would be approved, what the Syndicate would give him. He said today is the 20th of August and they should send it to him by next Friday so that he could send the new resolution to all of them, through email, by Friday evening and ask for their concurrence or modification by Monday.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there was no proposal from the members of the Syndicate. The proposal was from the mover of the resolution. Somebody has to take the responsibility to tell him that he should change the resolution.

The Vice Chancellor while addressing to Shri Jarnail Singh said that he had chaired the meeting. In the minutes of that meeting sentiments of the members were recorded. The sentiments have to be get reflected in the resolution. Therefore, he needs that modified resolution which respects the sentiments. The Vice Chancellor requested that Professor Navdeep Goyal will make the draft and Sh. Jarnail Singh will concur with the draft and send it to him by Friday. He will then send the draft to all the colleagues.

On a point raised by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that the earlier draft be dropped, the Vice Chancellor said that the earlier draft is already dropped. Dr. Rabinder Nath further asked as to why they

should ask the person who has moved the earlier resolution to move a fresh resolution.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the resolution will be moved by someone else. On behalf of this Syndicate, a Syndicate member, namely, Professor Navdeep Goyal will make a draft and he will submit that draft to another member of the Syndicate who had chaired the previous committee, namely, Shri Jarnail Singh. Shri Jarnail Singh Ji will send him the concurred draft to him. He will, then send that concurred draft to all of them and give them 48 hours to opine on it, so that everything is finalized by next Monday i.e. 28th of August. It would be sent for the Senate meeting to be held on 10th of September.

Principal H.S. Gosal asked, what for the new resolution will be moved. What would happen with it. Along with him, some other members opined that it will not change the status of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said this is what they have to write.

Some members were of the opinion that the heritage of the University should be preserved.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that personally, he was also not in favour of this.

RESOLVED: That Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Jarnail Singh be requested to prepare a fresh draft Resolution on the issue of grant of status of national importance/centrally funded institution to Panjab University.

Minutes of the Screening Committee dated 24.07.2017 to review the promotion case of Dr. Rakesh Malik

24. Considered minutes dated 24.07.2017 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Screening Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the promotion case of Dr. Rakesh Malik, Deputy Director, Physical Education & Sports from Stage-3 to Stage-4 as per 2nd amendment of UGC (which had already approved by the Senate).

NOTE: Dr. Rakesh Malik was promoted from Deputy Director, Physical Education at Directorate of Sports, P.U. under CAS w.e.f. 21.12.2013 vide Syndicate decision dated 26.10.2014 vide Para 2(xii) and Senate dated 14.12.2014 vide Para III.

The audit has raised objection that the promotion w.e.f. 21.12.2013 be reviewed as per 2nd amendment of UGC dated 14.06.2013.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 24.07.2017 of the Screening Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the promotion case of Dr. Rakesh Malik, Deputy Director, Physical Education & Sports from Stage-3 to Stage-4 as per 2nd amendment of UGC (which had already been approved by the Senate), **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Resignation of Professor Manoj Anand, UIAMS

25. Considered if, the resignation of Dr. Manoj Anand, Professor, University Institute of Applied Management Studies (UIAMS), P.U., be accepted w.e.f. 31.08.2017, by waiving off the condition of short period of two days from actual requirement of one month notice, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2009.

NOTE: 1. Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

2. Dr. Manoj Anand was appointed as Professor, UIAMS, on one year probation vide Syndicate decision dated 01.05.2016 (Para 2 (xx)). He joined as such on 01.06.2016 (A.N.).
3. Request dated 03.08.2017 of Dr. Manoj Anand duly recommended and forwarded by the Director, UIAMS is enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**)
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).

RESOLVED: That the resignation of Dr. Manoj Anand, Professor, University Institute of Applied Management Studies (UIAMS), P.U., be accepted w.e.f. 31.08.2017, by waiving off the condition of short period of two days from actual requirement of one month notice, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2009.

Representation of Dr. Sarvnarinder Kaur, Dept. of Biophysics regarding denial of Chairpersonship

26. Considered representation dated 30.07.2017 of Dr. Sarvnarinder Kaur, Assistant Professor, Department of Biophysics, P.U., duly forwarded by Director, National Commission for Scheduled Caste, Chandigarh vide letter dated 02.08.2017 regarding denial of Chairpersonship to her.

The Vice-Chancellor gave the background of the item. As per the provisions of the Calendar, when the rotation of headship was introduced, it was first amongst the Professors. Then it goes to the Readers, who now are the Associate Professors. Then it goes down to Assistant Professors who have 8 years of service. If an Assistant Professor is not available, what happens does it go back to Professor? Does it go through the entire circle of first Professors, then Associate Professors and then Assistant Professors with 8 years' service? According to him, when this thing was put in, it was not the spirit of the framers who introduced this algorithm of rotation. If it was so, then this clause would not have been there that if there is someone who is waiting to become and is few months or few weeks short, then somebody could be extended for some time, till an Assistant Professor becomes eligible. According to him, that was the spirit. But somewhere there is an ambiguity. This colleague was short of 8 months or 9 months when it was her term to become Chairperson if

she had 8 years of service. So, it went back to the Professor. That Professor took it but they had said that one person one post. He was a Professor and Chairperson of one Department during the second cycle. He was the Coordinator of another independent Centre. He (Vice-Chancellor) told him to choose one either to choose Chairpersonship or continue as a Coordinator. He said that since he had been the Chairperson, he chose not to continue as a Chairperson but was keen to continue as a Coordinator. So, he gave up. When he gave up, at that time a Professor, who had already done a full term, was appointed because technically Dr. Sarvnrinder Kaur had not completed 8 years. In principle, one could have argued that the charge be handed over to the Dean of University Instruction till her term comes. But it could not be done because one could say that one the cycle starting from Professor has started, that should be completed. This is a lacuna that the rotation policy stands stated in the Calendar. This is the duty of the governing body to overcome this lacuna and bring out some reform in this so that the spirit by which the rotation was introduced could be respected. The things got complicated because this colleague kept writing and the office kept replying with their understanding of the Calendar. The office could go by whatever is written. The office is not supposed to worry about the spirit in which it was written. So, the technically answers were being given and she was not satisfied with the technically correct answers and wrote complaint to the SC/ST Commission that she is being discriminated because of caste factor and so on. He had a long chat with Dr. Sarnarinder Kaur and said that her saying that she is being discriminated on caste factor is a little far-fetch, but it is not so. He also understood her anguish. In that spirit, she should have got it but it requires consideration by the Syndicate and only the governing body could change it. He talked to the SC/ST Commission and made a call to her and told that as the reply is being sought within 15 days, but he has to apprise the governing body about this, and requested that time be given so that the governing body could consider the nuances of it and come back to the Commission. So, it was okayed and he was asked to reply by 1st September and the Commission would not take any action because they have not replied within 15 days.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the problem could have been solved then itself because she was short of 42 days.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not have been solved as still he would have to bring the matter to the Syndicate because the literal interpretation of the Calendar would not permit that.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the then Chairperson could have been given the extension and till that time her requirement of service would have been complete.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that person had resigned.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the resignation was given so that she could not get the chance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person has already done his first round and the second round has commenced.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the person did not take full term in the second round.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the person has not completed the term, could they terminate the second round in the middle. There is no clarity in it. The members have to give him the clarity on behalf of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they go by the rules framed for the Chairpersons, these needed to be changed because these were framed at a time when it was thought that there is no clarity on seniority as the persons were coming from different channels, like CAS, merit promotion or direct recruitment. Keeping all these things in mind, the rules were framed. As on today, the seniority has been fixed. Therefore, the issue of seniority is now over. When the issue of Chairpersonship comes, even the Court has time and again ruled that the seniority has to be kept in mind. Therefore, the rules have to be changed and they should change the same. The spirit of rotation, which the Vice-Chancellor is talking about, they should make it clear that in the rotation when the Professors and the Associate Professors have become the Chairperson and no Assistant Professor is eligible, in the intervening period the charge could be given for that much period only or they could say that the charge be given till further orders. The moment the person becomes eligible, the person would be appointed as Chairperson. Therefore, the rule has to be changed. He suggested that the Vice-Chancellor could authorise a Committee of 2-3 members to frame the rules which would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that whatever is one's right, that should be given to him/her. But as the Vice-Chancellor has said that a person should not have approached the SC/ST Commission, it is a wrong practice.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could express the concern of the Syndicate that a colleague should not go for such a purpose as there was no such motive.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if the matter would have come to the Syndicate, then they would have taken the same decision which they are taking now.

The Vice-Chancellor expressed regret that it is his fault that he did not bring the matter to the Syndicate when she was writing the letters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the office was also right as per rules.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the charge could be given even now.

Professor Pam Rajput said that on what basis she (Dr. Sarvnrinder Kaur) had approached the Commission.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be recorded. It is not the only Department where the issue of rotation has come up. There are some other multi-faculty Departments where the same procedure is being followed. It is not that she belongs to SC category that she is being discriminated.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 20th August 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that the rules have to be changed by forming a Sub-Committee of Syndics and provide him a resolution with an intent that this clarity in reform is desirable.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that whatever Professor Navdeep Goyal has said, it is clearly written on page 58 that for periods of leave for less than six months, temporary arrangement will be made in accordance with Rule(b) below.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that while reframing the rules, everything would be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the rules be framed and placed before the Syndicate so that he could write to the SC/ST Commission that they are ceased of this and this is being looked into.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested the names of Professor Pam Rajput, Professor Navdeep Goyal, the present President, PUTA and the next President to be elected

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) concern of the Syndicate be conveyed to Dr. Sarvnarinder Kaur, Department of Biophysics for approaching the National Commission for Scheduled Caste without first trying to sort out the issue at the University level;
- (ii) a Committee of the following persons be constituted to look into the matter and submit its report:
 1. Professor Pam Rajput
 2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
 3. Professor Promila Pathak, President, PUTA
 4. New President, PUTA (to be elected)

**Minutes of the
Committee dated
31.07.2017**

27. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 31.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXII**) of the office of the Dean Student Welfare, P.U.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the charges of Working Women Hostel like security, attendant and others were the same as for other hostels. If someone has been provided accommodation in the University, at least the expenditure covered on that should be met from these charges. Keeping that in view, the charges for the Working Women Hostel were fixed to meet the annual expenditure being done. But there arose a problem because some of the women residents were not in a position to pay the charges. So, it was thought of giving 50% concession to them.

RESOLVED: That minutes of the Committee dated 31.07.2017 of the office of the Dean Student Welfare, P.U., **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Recommendation of the Academic Council regarding introduction of NSS as an elective subject

28. Considered the recommendation (17 (i)) of the Academic Council dated 21.06.2017 (Para XIX) (**Appendix-XXIII**) that NSS (National Service Scheme) as an elective subject, be introduced, at Undergraduate level from the session 2017-18, under CBCS framework.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that it could be implemented from the session 2018-19.

This was agreed to

RESOLVED: That recommendation (17 (i)) of the Academic Council dated 21.06.2017 (Para XIX) regarding introduction of NSS (National Service Scheme) as an elective subject, at Undergraduate level under CBCS framework, **as per Appendix**, be approved and be given effect to from the session 2018-19.

Issue regarding property at Panipat

29. Considered if, the negotiation, be made with the Deputy Commissioner, Panipat with regard to utilization/disposal of the property i.e. two industrial plots Nos.E 68 of size 2427 Sq. Yard and E 69 of size 1382 Sq. Yard, located at Panipat, Model Town, donated by Shri Devan Som Nath Arora, Advocate in the year 1960, and the amount so generated be put in the reserve fund of the University for the construction of Girls Hostel in Sector-25, pursuant to the observations/facts.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 15) while considering the minutes of Committee dated 10.11.2016 constituted a Committee comprising Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Dr. Jarnail Singh and Dr. Subhash Sharma, Fellows to examine the purpose for utilization of the funds, to be generated through the sale of plots in accordance with the terms and conditions of the donor. The Committee met on 01.06.2017 and the minutes are enclosed. However, Committee could not yet make a visit to the Panipat to have assessment of the prevailing market rates for the plots.

2. The Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar, on return from Delhi on 04.08.2017, after the farewell meeting with Chancellor, visited the site of the property and reviewed the status of the premises and observed that the building is already in a very bad condition and further deteriorated as truck drivers are parking their trucks in University property area and are misusing the property. After, physical inspection and assessment of the site, the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar met the Deputy Commissioner, Panipat and sought assistance for utilization/disposal of the property. The Circle rates for this property obtained from the office of the Deputy Commissioner are as follows:

(i) Residential: 3739 Sq. yds x Rs.11,000/- per sq. yd. = Rs.4,11,29,000/-

- (ii) Commercial: 3739 sq. yds x Rs.26,000/- per sq. yd. = Rs.9,72,14,000/.

Shri Varinder Singh said that after getting the circle rate, the property could be auctioned on a reserved price so that the University could get some benefit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, they are suffering losses instead of getting any benefit.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that some portion of the 'Will' is missing and needs to be read and clarified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all these things have already been discussed and clarified in the Senate and they have the full authority to sell the property. Now the only thing left is as to how to sell it. When he along with the Registrar met the Deputy Commissioner, he said that let the Haryana Government agency purchase it. The property could be auctioned and 2-3 members could take this responsibility.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the duty of getting the property auctioned could be assigned to the Deputy Registrar (Estate). The market rate of the property could be higher than the collector rate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 2-3 Syndicate members could go and meet the Deputy Commissioner.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the collector rate is very less.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the D.C. would guide in this matter and requested Shri Varinder Singh also to visit.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal pointed out that the land is also situated at Kurukshetra.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that a Committee be formed to be headed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal

RESOLVED: That Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Registrar and few other Syndicate members be requested to visit the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Panipat and explore better options regarding utilization/disposal of the two properties of Panjab University situated there.

**Condonation of delay
in submission of Ph.D.
thesis**

30. Considered if, delay of 3 years, 5 month and 2 days as on 28.08.2017 beyond the period of eight years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Rajni, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Sociology, be condoned w.e.f. 26.03.2014 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate, as she could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in her request dated 04.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXIV**).

- NOTE:** 1. Ms. Rajni was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts on 02.04.2008. She was granted three years extension upto

26.03.2014 by the DUI of submission of her thesis.

2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded”.**

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXIV**).

RESOLVED: That delay of 3 years, 5 month and 2 days as on 28.08.2017 beyond the period of eight years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Rajni, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Sociology, be condoned w.e.f. 26.03.2014 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate.

**Agreement for
internship and
academic faculty
exchange under MoU**

31. Considered if, Agreements for Internship and Academic Faculty Exchange under the Memorandum of Understanding (**Appendix-XXV**) between Faculty of Science/Biochemistry, Panjab University and Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada, be executed.

RESOLVED: That Agreements for Internship and Academic Faculty Exchange under the Memorandum of Understanding between Faculty of Science/Biochemistry, Panjab University and Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada, **as per Appendix**, be executed.

**Request of Ms. Veena
Aggarwal, Personal
Assistant for
extension of
extraordinary leave
without pay for one
year**

32. Considered request dated 21.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of Ms. Veena Aggarwal, Personal Assistant, Dean College Development Council, regarding extension in Extraordinary Leave without pay for year i.e. w.e.f. 01.09.2017 to 31.08.2018.

NOTE: 1. Ms. Veena Aggarwal, Personal Assistant, DCDC, was granted Extraordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 03.03.2017 to 31.08.2017 vide No.3100-3101/Estt. dated 02.03.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**).

2. Regulation 11.1 appearing at page 119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

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

- (i) Syndicate- for employees of Class A for leave of more than six months.
- (ii) Vice-Chancellor- for employees of Class A for leave up to six months.
- (iii) xxx xxx xxx
- (iv) xxx xxx xxx
- (v) xxx xxx xx

3. As per rule 1.1 (I) appearing at page 74, P.U., Cal. Vol. III, 2016, the post of P.A. is a class 'A' post.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Veena Aggarwal, Personal Assistant, Dean College Development Council, be granted extension in Extraordinary Leave without pay for one year, i.e., w.e.f. 01.09.2017 to 31.08.2018, as per her request dated 21.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**).

Request of Mr. Manish Sabharwal, Senior Assistant for voluntary retirement

33. Considered if, request dated 02.02.2017 and 03.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of Mr. Manish Sabharwal, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch-II, P.U. for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 10.08.2017 (A.N.) be accepted, by treating the period from 02.02.2017 to 10.08.2017 (A.N.) as the notice period, if so, the following retirement benefits, be also sanctioned to him:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
- (iii) He may be issued letter of appreciation for the service rendered by him in the Panjab University, as per decision of the Syndicate dated 15.05.2004 (Para 55) as he was given only minor punishment of Censure without effect on his retirement benefits.

NOTE: 1. As per Regulation 17.5 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-1, 2007, three month's notice period is required for voluntary/ premature retirement.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 24) (**Appendix-XXVII**) has resolved that:

- (i) the enquiry report dated 19.06.2017 submitted by

Shri S.S. Lamba, Inquiry Officer, with regard to overstay period w.e.f. 21.11.2015 to 06.01.2016 by Shri Manish Sabharwal, Sr. Assistant, Estt. Branch beyond the expiry of permissible limit of EOL without pay granted to him w.e.f. 18.02.2015 to 20.11.2015, be accepted.

- (ii) Minor penalty of censure be imposed upon Shri Manish Sabharwal without any effect on his retirement benefits.

3. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXVII)**.

RESOLVED: That request dated 02.02.2017 and 03.08.2017 **(Appendix-XXVII)** of Mr. Manish Sabharwal, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch-II, P.U. for voluntary retirement be accepted w.e.f. the date he is relieved, by treating the period from 02.02.2017 to the date of his relieving as the notice period and the following retirement benefits, be also sanctioned to him:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
- (iii) He may be issued letter of appreciation for the service rendered by him in the Panjab University, as per decision of the Syndicate dated 15.05.2004 (Para 55) as he was given only minor punishment of Censure without effect on his retirement benefits.

Extension of validity of Advt. No.2/2016

34. Considered if, the validity of Advertisement No.2/2016 for two posts of Assistant Registrar (1 for PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur and 1 for P.U.R.C. Ludhiana), be extended suitably beyond 31.08.2017, so that the sufficient time may be available to the office to conduct the interview for the said posts.

- NOTE:**
1. The posts of Assistant Registrars were advertised vide No. 2/2016 and the validity of the said Advertisement was upto 15.05.2017.
 2. The validity of the Advt. No. 2/2016 was extended up to 15.07.2017 by the Vice-Chancellor which was noted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 vide (Para 37-I (ix)) **(Appendix-XXVIII)**.

Further, the validity of the above said advertisement was again extended up to 31.08.2017 by the Vice-Chancellor, vide order dated 07.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**.)

RESOLVED: That the validity of Advertisement No.2/2016 for two posts of Assistant Registrar (1 for PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur and 1 for P.U.R.C. Ludhiana), be extended beyond 31.08.2017 up to Feb.28, 2018 so that the sufficient time may be available to the office to conduct the interview for the said posts.

Minutes of the Committee dated 16.08.2017 regarding roster for teachers

35. Considered if, minutes dated 16.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXIX**), along with annexure-I, II and III of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, as per decision of the Standing Committee dated 09.05.2017, regarding task of roster preparation for the post of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, be, approved, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 28) (**Appendix-XXIX**) has resolved that the minutes of the Committee dated 16.06.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor and as per decision of the Standing Committee dated 09.05.2017 with regard to the task of roster preparation for the post of Assistant Professors, be approved.

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

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 16.08.2017 along with annexure-I, II and III of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, as per decision of the Standing Committee dated 09.05.2017, regarding task of roster preparation for the post of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, **as per Appendix**, be uploaded on website.

Correction in Syndicate decision dated 30.04.2017 (Para 29)

36. Considered if, the following correction, be made in the decision of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 29) (**Appendix-XXX**), as proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal vide his letter dated 16.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXX**):

Present decision of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 29)	Correction as proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal
Resolved: That proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal dated 20.04.2017 that the pay of Dr. Ruchi Sharma nee Ruchi	That proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal dated 20.04.2017 that the pay of Dr. Ruchi Sharma nee Ruchi Vashisht,

Vashisht, Assistant Professor (on temporary basis), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, be fixed at a stage of Rs.21020 in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 plus D.A., HRA and NPA as applicable from time to time, as per appendix , be approved.	Assistant Professor (on temporary basis), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, be fixed at a stage of Rs.21020 in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.7000/- plus D.A., HRA and NPA as applicable from time to time, as per appendix , be approved.
--	--

RESOLVED: That the following correction, be made in the decision of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 29) (**Appendix-XXX**), as proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal vide his letter dated 16.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXX**):

Present decision of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 29)	Correction as proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal
Resolved: That proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal dated 20.04.2017 that the pay of Dr. Ruchi Sharma nee Ruchi Vashisht, Assistant Professor (on temporary basis), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, be fixed at a stage of Rs.21020 in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 plus D.A., HRA and NPA as applicable from time to time, as per appendix , be approved.	That proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal dated 20.04.2017 that the pay of Dr. Ruchi Sharma nee Ruchi Vashisht, Assistant Professor (on temporary basis), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, be fixed at a stage of Rs.21020 in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.7000/- plus D.A., HRA and NPA as applicable from time to time, as per appendix , be approved.

Deferred item

37. Considered minutes dated 04.08.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the complaint (**Appendix**) made by Shri Balwinder Singh, Flat No. 18, Lal Kothi, Naya Gaon, Distt. Mohali, regarding forgery of admission of Mr. Gaurav Rattan in Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical & Engineering & Technology in the year 2001.

NOTE: A copy of the report dated 06.04.2017 of the CVO is enclosed in this regard.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the Item be deferred.

Issue regarding Rajiv Gandhi Chair Professor in Contemporary Studies

38. To decide, future course of action on behalf of Panjab University, regarding progress/appointment for the Rajiv Gandhi Professor Chair In contemporary Studies, pursuant to e-mail dated 01.08.2017 of State Universities Bureau attach therewith letter dated August, 2017 of UGC (**Appendix-XXXI**).

NOTE: 1. As per page 83 of the Budget estimates (Part-II) 2017-18 of P.U. (**Appendix-XXXI**), the UGC vide letter No.F.1-8/99 (CPP-II) dated 28.10.2005, the Govt. of India has sanctioned a Chair to honour the contribution of former Prime Minister late Shri Rajiv Gandhi to be called a "Rajiv Gandhi Professor Chair in Contemporary Studies" be

established in P.U. Chandigarh (BOF dated 16.11.2005, Item No.39) extended up to XIIth plan vide letter No. F.39-12/2005 (SU-II), dated 04.07.2011.

The Syndicate dated 20.09.2015, Paragraph 25 approved that the budgetary provision of Rajiv Gandhi Chair be made out of the "Foundation for Higher Education in Research".

2. A sum of Rs.18,57,054/- was received by the Panjab University, which now stands at Rs.28,53,860/- (**Annexure-XXXI**).
3. The post of "Rajiv Gandhi Chair" has not been occupied since 2005, though the post was advertised (**Annexure-XXXI**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University was given a Rajiv Gandhi Chair for developmental studies long ago. Many Universities in India were awarded this Chair. About ten Chairs were given and the Chair given to Panjab University was one of them. Every Chair given to a University has some focused agenda. These Chairs were at the level which was as per the norms of 6th Pay Commission and this is in HAG-1. As there is a grade pay of Rs. 12000/- but the same is not operational in Panjab University. This was in 5th Pay Commission that salary grade attached to Rajiv Gandhi Chair was the salary grade of a Professor in the IITs and not as per the grade of a Professor in the University system. So it was higher level of grade not the rank. It started from 18400/- instead of 16400 and ends at the same level i.e. 22400/- with the age limit of 65 years for the incumbent and not the age of 60 years as in the case of other Professors. The University advertised the post once and only one applicant applied. It has a long history. The Chair could not be filled. Some court case was also there. Then instead of advertising it again and giving it to somebody on full time basis, the University thought to give it someone on honorarium basis on the pattern of Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair where a person is given Rs. 5000 per visit with some upper limit. This Chair has many things attached to it, such as, they could pay to a research scholar and can open an office also. They could not implement it, but they have got the money to the tune of Rs 18 lakhs from the UGC. Only 40-50 thousand could be spent. Someone was offered this Chair in honorary capacity, perhaps he came once only and Rs. 15-20 thousand were spent. Now the UGC has asked for its status. After getting the status, they may decide to continue it or not. But where some person is working on such Chairs, how they can discontinue it. So, this is the factual position as of today. On their behalf, there can be two proposals, one to express regret for not filling the Chair but they have the intent of filling it now. So if the scheme is being continued, let it be continued at Panjab University as well and that now they will make all efforts to find someone who will fulfil this agenda. The second proposal is that they have introduced the concept of Chair Professors and those Chair Professors will be given

this Chair on honorarium basis. They will request the UGC not to take back the amount of thirty lakhs available with them and that they will use the interest of this money for running this Chair. They will make appointments in the same way as that of other Chairs and continue this. The Vice Chancellor also informed that the Chair was granted in the year 2005. The Vice Chancellor further said that he is not asking them to take a decision right now, but these are the two proposals that he can make on their behalf. They can think over it and give their decision by the next meeting. He can ask the UGC that the Syndicate is deliberating on it and give some more time. The Vice Chancellor requested the members to discuss the issue among themselves and give their decision instead of doing it in a hurry.

Dr. Dalip Kumar informed that the UGC has issued two circulars in the month of June and July regarding the issues pertaining to development plan and any other issue pertaining to any other plan. They have extended the period to 30th September to use the money. So they have to take all decision by end of September.

The Vice Chancellor said that since the time is upto 30th September, so they will take some decision in the next Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested not to wait upto next Syndicate and urged to take the view point of the members through circulation. He further requested that it is better if a decision is taken today itself.

The Vice Chancellor again requested the members to send their opinion and he will take a decision after receiving the same.

However, later on the members requested the Vice Chancellor to take a decision in this regard as deemed fit.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Chair should continue so that someone gets the opportunity to work on this Chair.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members if he would have to first advertise the Chair, but the members said that the Vice Chancellor may do whatever deems fit. The Vice Chancellor asked, could they appoint a person upto 30th September.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that let the Finance & Development Officer go to Delhi and formally talk to the UGC and then they will take a decision to which all the members agreed.

The members also requested that all the other Chairs should also be filled.

RESOLVED: That the Finance & Development Officer would visit UGC office and informally talk on the issue with them and the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate, be authorised to take a decision accordingly.

**Minutes of the
Committee dated
16.08.2017 on the
issue of grant of special
chance to two students
of Dept. of Laws**

39. Considered minutes dated 16.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXXII**) of the committee constituted by the Dean, Faculty of Law to look into the representations (**Appendix-XXXII**) of Mr. Ankur Kansal, Roll No. 377/16 and Divyank Mishra, Roll No. 237/15, students of Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh regarding grant of special chance to complete their degree.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the minutes dated 16.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXXII**) of the committee constituted by the Dean, Faculty of Law to look into the representations (**Appendix-XXXII**) of Mr. Ankur Kansal, Roll No. 377/16 and Divyank Mishra, Roll No. 237/15, students of Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh regarding grant of special chance to complete their degree, be not accepted; and
- (ii) Mr. Ankur Kansal, Roll No. 377/16 and Divyank Mishra, Roll No. 237/15, students of Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh be granted a special chance to complete their degree.

Routine and formal matters

40. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xviii)** on the agenda was read out, i.e.,–

- (i) In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Professor M. Syamala Devi, Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University on contract basis upto 21.07.2022 (i.e. the date of her attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:**
1. Academically active report should be submitted by her after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.
 2. The Senate decision dated 29.03.2015, item-8 (C-20) circulated vide No. 3947-4027/Estt.I dated 11.05.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.
 3. Rule 3.1 appearing at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 reads as under: “The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the

stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed transition of payment of salary to Dr. Samer Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Microbial Biotechnology from Ramalingaswami fellowship to Panjab University w.e.f. 02.07.2017 onwards, as the term of his fellowship has concluded on 01.07.2017.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 17.08.2014 (Para 24) (**Appendix-XXXIII**) had resolved that:-

- (1) Dr. Samer Singh, Assistant Professor, Centre for Microbial Biotechnology be allowed to continue to work in Ramalingaswami Fellowship (under the scheme of DBT) as 'Ramalingaswami Fellow' and also be allowed to draw his Salary + HRA and P.F. benefits for the period 19th May, 2014 to 1st July, 2014 from the earlier host institution, i.e. Jawaharlal Nehru University; and
 - (2) he be allowed to continue with 'Ramalingaswami Fellowship' and retain the fellowship amount as per norms of DBT. As far as other benefits, including contribution towards the Provident Fund and other consequential benefits, are concerned, all the benefits be granted to him on his notional salary fixed as Assistant Professor in the University as per rules, for which he is entitled in accordance with the service conditions of Panjab University w.e.f. 2nd July, 2014 to 1st July 2017, the tenure for which the 'Ramalingaswami Fellowship Scheme' has been assigned to Dr. Samer Singh.
2. Request dated 20.07.2017 of Dr. Samer Singh, duly forwarded by the Chairperson, Department of Microbial Biotechnology is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).
 3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Mr. Saumyadeep Bhattacharya, Assistant Professor, P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date he will start work for the academic session 2017-18, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39600 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which he was working earlier.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following as Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date they start/started work, for the session 2017-18 upto the start of summer vacations 2018, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 appearing at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name of Person	Branch
1.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Assistant Professor in Commerce
3.	Mrs. Navdeep Kaur	Assistant Professor in English
4.	Dr. Inderjit Singh	Assistant Professor in Political Science
5.	Dr. Sukhjeet Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
6.	Dr. Sumit Mohan	Assistant Professor in Hindi
7.	Dr. Ram Singh	Assistant Professor in Commerce
8.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Assistant Professor in Economics
9.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	Assistant Professor in History
10.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Assistant Professor in Physical Education

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Dr. Vishal Agrawal, Assistant Professor (Temporary), Department of Biochemistry, P.U. up to 30.06.2017, with one day break on 01.05.2017, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper

selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

- (ii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor (temporary), Department of Biochemistry, P.U., for next academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. the date he start/started work, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which he was working during the session 2016-17.

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Imrose Tiwana as Part-Time Assistant Professor in Law in the Department of Laws, P.U. and name of Ms. Naseem Yadlapati as Part-Time Assistant Professor, in the waiting list, on an honorarium of Rs.22,800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week) for the Academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. the date he/she start work.

NOTE: 1. A copy of office order No.4985-86 Estt.I dated 21.07.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

2. The waiting shall be operative only after main list is fully exhausted.

- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has, extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Class 'A' and 'B' employees upto 31.08.2017, on the previous terms & conditions:-

Sr. No.	Name of employees/ Designation	Department
1.	Shri Pritam Chand, Senior Technician (G-II)	Bio-Technology
2.	Shri Birender Singh, Driver	D.U.I.'s Office
3.	Shri Surmukh Singh, Work-Inspector	Construction Office
4.	Shri Bikram Singh, Driver	Vice-Chancellor's Office

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following recommendations of the Academic Council dated 21.6.2017 (Para XXI) (**Appendix-XXXV**) that:

1. the following courses be introduced from the academic session 2017-18:

- (i) Masters in Governance and Leadership
(ii) Certificate Courses in Governance and Leadership (3 months duration)
1. Certificate Course in Citizenship

	3. Ms. Neha 4. Ms. Shaan Arora 5. Mr. Arshbir	
--	---	--

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has, approved the minutes dated 28.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) of the Standing Committee, to frame guidelines for admission to post graduate courses for students who have reappear/s/passed graduation under semester system.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has sanctioned Extra Ordinary leave without pay to Dr. B.S. Ghuman, Professor, Department of Public Administration, P.U. Chandigarh, for one year with immediate effect i.e. 14.08.2017 (A.N.), under Regulation 11 (G) at page 139-143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to enable him to join as Vice-Chancellor, Punjabi University, Patiala.

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor (temporary), in the Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering, Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U., w.e.f. the date he starts/started work, purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, for the next academic session 2017-18, or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which he has worked during the session 2016-17.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Richa Rastogi Thakur, as Assistant Professor (Temporary) in Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, University Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U. w.e.f. the date she starts/started work, purely on temporary basis, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, for the academic session 2017-18, or till the posts are filled in, on through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which she has worked during the session 2016-17.

NOTE: An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIX**).

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following as Assistant Professors, purely on temporary basis at P.U. Constituent College Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur, w.e.f. the date they will start/started work for the session 2017-18 upto the start of summer vacations 2018, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible, as per University

Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Dr. Resham Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
3.	Dr. Harnam Singh	Assistant Professor in Physical Education
4.	Ms. Simarjeet Kaur	Assistant Professor in Mathematics
5.	Ms. Nishi	Assistant Professor in Commerce
6.	Mr. Mohammad Sazid	Assistant Professor in Commerce
7.	Mr. Harjinder Singh Bhardwaj	Assistant Professor in Political Science

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate has:

- (i) re-appointed afresh the following faculty member at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U. purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 16.8.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 15.7.2018 with break on 14.8.2017 (Break Day) and 15.8.2017 (Holiday) or till the posts are filled up, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Monika Nagpal	Assistant Professor
2.	Dr. Amrita Rawla	Assistant Professor
3.	Dr. Rajeev Rattan	Assistant Professor
4.	Dr. Prabhjot Kaur	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Manjot Kaur	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Amandeep Kaur	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Vandana Gupta	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Rajni Jain	Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. M.K. Chhabra	Associate Professor

- (ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U. purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 15.9.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 14.8.2018 with break on 14.9.2017 (Break day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Prabhleen Brar	Sr. Assistant Professor
2.	Dr. Rosy Arora	Sr. Assistant Professor
3.	Dr. Vivek Kapoor	Sr. Assistant Professor
4..	Dr. Ruchi Singla	Sr. Assistant Professor

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate has approved the academic Calendar (tentative) **(Appendix-XL)(Annexure-A)** of the Department of Physical Education, P.U. for B.P.Ed. and M.P.Ed. courses for the session 2017-18.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed the following as Assistant Professors, purely on temporary basis, Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt. S.B.S. Nagar, w.e.f. the date they will start/started work for the session 2017-18 upto the start of summer vacations 2018, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/-, plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 111-112, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. (Ms.) Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi
2.	Ms. Sukhjot Nahar	Sociology
3.	Mr. Hari Krishan	History
4.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi
5.	Dr. (Ms.) Poonam Dwivedi	English
6.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics
7.	Mr. Inder Bhagat	Computer Science
8.	Dr. Hari Nath	Hindi
9.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Commerce
10.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce
11.	Mr. Deepak	Commerce Science

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(viii) and R-(x) to (xviii)**, be ratified; and
- (ii) the information contained in **Item R-(ix)**, be ratified and the Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to effect changes in the nomenclature of the course, etc., if any.

Routine and formal matters

41. The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(iii)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

- (i) In supersession of order dated 4766-73/Estt-I dated 10.07.2017 (**Appendix-XLI**), the Vice-Chancellor, has allowed Dr. Kuldip Singh, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Distt. Moga, to look after the affairs of P.U. Constituent College at Dharamkot, in addition to his own duties, with immediate effect, till further orders.

NOTE: 1. Earlier, the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 (Para 28) (**Appendix-XLI**), while considering the recommendations dated 17.11.2016 has further resolved that Principal I.S. Sandhu be assigned the duty to look after the affairs of the Constituent College at Ferozepur and Principal N.R. Sharma for the constituent College at Dharmakot in addition to their own duties.

- 2. A copy of request dated 21.07.2017 of Dr. N.R. Sharma enclosed (**Appendix-XLI**).

- (ii) 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. (Mrs.) M. Syamala Devi Professor Department of Computer Science and Applications	12.07.1995	31.07.2017	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 (ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due

				to him/her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.
--	--	--	--	--

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

(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.	Ms. Tripta Devi Assistant Registrar USOL	04.03.1976	31.07.2017	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Dolly Superintendent Computer Unit	27.09.1982	31.07.2017	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.

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

While referring to Sub-Item I-(i), Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma brought it to the information of the House that Principal Kuldeep Singh has got stay by being connected with the Panjab University court cases. The University teachers who have got stay have not been given any administrative or financial powers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Principal is not a part of the University and should not have been granted the stay by the Court.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Principal has been granted the stay by connecting his case with the case of Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia. The Principal was on probation. He is teaching in a College and has been given the charge of another College. Everyone knows about the nature of the appointment and working. According to him, it would be better if the matter is examined and legal opinion should be sought on this issue whether giving the additional charge would be right or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not take a decision on this. If left to himself, he would have retired the Principal. But the Court has granted the stay.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that one thing that the Vice-Chancellor could do is that the charge of the other College should not be given. It could be done by the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a minor thing.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that earlier the charge of the College had been given to Principal N.R. Sharma.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that the number of students in his College is large. Secondly, the College is in an interior area. Therefore, he had requested the Vice-Chancellor to relinquish him of the charge.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the charge could be handed over to the Dean College Development Council.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Coordinator has also been appointed from the same College. The bigger issue is whether Principal Kuldeep Singh is to continue or not. Since he is continuing, that is why the charge has been given to him.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is right as there is no other alternative.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not done any favour to Principal Kuldeep Singh.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as suggested by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, the charge could be given to the Dean College Development Council.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a lot of difference.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is no coordination between the Coordinator and the Principal. He suggested that the charge could be handed over to Principal I.S. Sandhu.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the charge could be handed over to a person from the Government College.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the person from the Government College could not be handed over the charge.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in that case, the charge could be given to Principal N.R. Sharma.

The Vice-Chancellor said that earlier the charge was given to Principal N.R. Sharma but he has shown his inability.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that due to burden of his College, he could not handle the charge properly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is just a minor thing.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that if no other option is available, then it is okay.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Items I-(i) to (iii)** be noted

General Discussion

1. Professor Pam Rajput said that there was a Committee regarding Neelam Paul constituted by the Syndicate. The Committee was of 4 members. Prof. Rajput informed that the Committee met in her room and she was authorised by the Committee to talk to Prof. Neelam Paul. Initially, she had requested Dr. Neelam Paul to come to her office. Since it could not be made possible, telephonic link was established with her and she (Prof. Rajput) went to the Music Department and had a sitting with Dr. Paul. Dr. Paul said she has not seen the papers and after checking the papers, she would come to see me. Afterwards a time (10.30 a.m.) was fixed for meeting and telephonic calls were made to her. I kept on waiting but she did not come, later Dr. Paul replied that actually her husband was not there and she could not share the matter with him and she would be meeting her (Prof. Rajput) only after consultation with her husband. Prof. Rajput further said that Dr. Paul was again contacted and was requested that because the Syndicate was meeting on 20.8.2017, and after the Syndicate, the matter would go to the Senate, it was necessary to give the required papers and informed that she could not consult her husband. Prof. Pam Rajput said that she received a letter from Dr. Neelam Paul on 23rd July, 2017 that I will get the reply within 7 days. Prof. Rajput said that again in the early morning of 20.8.2017 she again went to her home before coming for the meeting of Syndicate and informed her about the para of the Syndicate/Senate which was requiring regret from the authority to whom the inconvenience had been caused due to her communications to the Chancellor's office. Dr. Paul was asked that she has apologised to the office of the Chancellor but the regret to the University authorities have not been made. Prof. Rajput informed the house that Dr. Paul has said that she has sent the letter to the Chancellor's office and she has not received any communication from there that you have done half of the work and rest half is due. She said that if such a communication would have been received from the Chancellor's office, then she would have thought of what was to be done in the matter. Then, she had a talk with Professor Navdeep Goyal and thought that talks with Dr. Neelam Paul be held on behalf of the Committee. They would again work on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever input would be given by Professor Pam Rajput, the same would go straight to the Senate.

Professor Pam Rajput said that, that is why she has raised this issue since it has to go to the Senate

This was agreed to.

2. Principal B.C. Josan said that about 52 cases of 3rd and 4th stage promotions of all the Colleges teachers under CAS are lying pending for want of DPI signatures. Currently the file is with the Education Secretary. He said that this matter be taken up with the Education Secretary.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will talk to the Education Secretary.

3. Shri Jarnail Singh said that his concern is more to the Semester System. He said that they have started the semester system and whatever their results have come, it is a very serious matter because it has caused damage to the students and he said that a Committee should be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is worth to have some assessment of the Semester system as it had been decided at the time of introduction of the Semester System that it would later be assessed at some stage. Let him say that on behalf of our University and Punjabi University was another University which had introduced the Semester System in undergraduate courses alike Panjab University. Let him have an assessment after meeting with Professor Ghuman.

Shri Jarnail Singh said the semester system has caused a great loss to the students and if it were to incur loss to the students, there is no logic in continuing the semester system.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him have an assessment with Professor B.S. Ghuman on behalf of both the Universities.

4. Principal B.C. Josan, the file is withheld with the Education Secretary.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already talked to the New DPI.

Dr. Josan said that the DPI has done it by putting his signatures on 52 cases.

Dr. Dalip Kumar Said that no case of associate professor is pending. Only 6-8 cases are pending. The education Secretary has joined recently. If any file is going to him, he is getting feedback on the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that I will talk to him, this is no issue at all.

5. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has received a representation from the Ambedkar students Association. It is regarding the cut of marks for SC/ST students for M.Phil/Ph.D entrance test. The SC/ST students want that the marks must be reduced to a reasonable limit.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see it.

6. Shri Jarnail Singh said that his request is to the Controller of Examinations. He further said that he wants to request the

Controller of Examination that left out cases of the students, even due to change of date sheet, there-examination could not be held. The re-examination of such should be conducted.

The Vice Chancellor said that branding of the University depends on the its servicing. The half of the income of the University comes from the Examinations.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if any one does not follow the orders of the authority, he should be punished. He should be punished in such a way that he does not repeat it. He should be blacklisted.

The Vice Chancellor said that the concerns of Shri Jarnail Singh are well taken.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said as has been stated by Shri Jarnail Singh, the Coordination Committee was constituted in the year 2013-14 in which all the three Vice Chancellors and three of the Deans and it was decided that semester system and five day week would be implemented simultaneously. The minutes of that Coordination Committee are recorded and he could not bring it with him.

The Vice Chancellor said that on the version of Dr. Tarlochan Singh, he had taken the initiative to start this.

7. Dr. Dalip Kumar said that regarding the PG courses of the Colleges, the Vice Chancellor might have received enormous mails from the Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana districts in which there was a condition of OCET. Now there are left ten day in the admission, and this is a fact that the candidates who have cleared the entrance test out of which 80 percents candidates are from the Chandigarh. They would not like to take admission at Ludhiana, Gurusar Sadhar or at Dasuya. There is left a period of 10 days and in view of the practice for the last 4-5 years, on the basis of merit, they should be allowed admission at Chandigarh on the vacant seats.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is okay, it would be allowed so that seats do not remain vacant.

8. Dr. Dalip Kumar further said that there has been issued a circular from the office of the FDO of July 24th to the Chairpersons that the Ph.D examiners which come for taking Viva Examination stipulates that if they have to come by air , the journey should be through Air India flight.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that this issue should not be raised. He is very much liberal in granting in Air India. He has not refused to anyone provided the reason is reasonable.

The Finance & Development Officer said that CAG para was generated.

He further said that what the government of India says is that the reason should be reasonable from travelling by non-Air India flights. He said that the claimants be asked to give the reasonable reason. He said that at the time when the

invitation goes to the examiner, he must state the reason as to why he cannot come by Air India. He further said that there is only one flight of Air India from Delhi to Chandigarh. To travel by that flight, one shall have to connect to it from other locations. If no connectively would be made, there would be a waste of two days. No person would give us so much of the time. So you have to give a reasonable answer. After that it would be written to the aviation authorities that because of this or that, I am permitting.

9. On raising the issue of one of the student of Law by Dr. Dalip Kumar, who is one mark short to clear his paper, the Vice Chancellor said that the syndicate platform should not be used for such petty issues. Rather such issues could be brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor and he would have done it. It is not a matter of Syndicate.

10. Principal N.R. Sharma said that actually the college in which he has gone, there has passed the period of one year, the name of that college is not known till date. He said that when a student goes for bus pass, there is applied a different seal, that is of Shaheed Udham Singh government College. When I correspond here with the Panjab University, it is used as PU Constituent College. He further said that as the colleges in Balachaur and Nihal Singh Wala were named, in the same way, a midway should be found out so that the Kamboj community is also pleased and it could be named as Shaheed Udham Singh Constituent College.

The Vice Chancellor said that let a proposal comes to him and he will do it. He further said that bring it as formal agenda item and not as a table agenda. In the next meeting of the Syndicate, it would be cleared.

11. Principal N.R. Sharma said that whatever proposals of his colleges are sent to the UGC, that are sent through the Registrar. He said that he had communicated with the UGC and they said that our college has not been not converted which is to be specified in the communication to the UGC to received projects.

12. Principal N.R. Sharma said that the College is in a very dilapidated condition. The number of students have reached to 1500 and now he has to put ban on the more numbers. The situation is such that if one is stopped, then the Principal is accused of the blames that the admission has been stopped because of SC reasons. There is no space for the sitting of the students. The boundary wall is also not there and even telephone facility is not available. There is a village and basti adjoining the College and the people come and go through the College, straightway. He said that the Vice Chancellor has sanctioned the money, but no action on the part of the XEN and the FDO is there.

13. Principal N.R. Sharma said that it is his last year in the College and he asked as to whether his salary will be protected or not. He said that when the appointment was made, it was made with the increment.

The FDO explained that because of the burning of the Service Book, the case has been delayed and now the new service book has been prepared on priority basis and orders has been issued including the protection of salary etc. and due to some minor mistake in the orders, they have been amended, the case would be processed shortly.

14. Principal N.R. Sharma said that there should be devised some mechanism to control false Schedule caste and sexual harassment fabrications.

15. Principal N.R. Sharma said that in the Guru Nanak College, the Principal is not at any fault. There is a clear cut instructions of the Central govt. and MHRD that if you have taken the fee, then you have to give in writing. Even the SDM is on the side of the students who are sitting on dharna. The principal is being pressurised by the management that she shall have to take the fee. He said that problem is growing gradually and it would have to be tackled necessarily. Mechanism should be devised to settle such issues within 10 or fifteen days.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had met the Chairperson of the SC/ST Commission in New Delhi where the people generally do not like to go. He said that he got the SSP to accompany him. I keep the hot line with the SC/ST commission at Chandigarh. Whenever any complaint comes, I make a call to them. He further stated that he had kept the SC/ST Commissioner convinced that the University was not doing anything which is to discriminated the SC. That is why that till date, they have not given any adverse judgement against the University and this is also on record. The letter is formally written but when I reach their office, they take it leniently.

The Vice Chancellor further said that share it with him whatever is there and he will do everything what is possible and beyond that he is unable to do anything.

16. The members collectively wanted to know as to if the donated money to the Voluntary Fund Account was rebatable under Income Tax Act.

17. Professor Mukesh Arora said that there was a provision of dissertation in M.A./M.Com. classes in the colleges which is now not there. It was there in the 1997, 1998. In the Second Semester of M.Com., it is written without dissertation or with dissertation, fee is thus. The fee is Rs. 1740/- without and with thesis, the amount is etc. etc. He said that actually the thesis prevails nowhere. What is the internal training report, that is sent to the University as a kind of thesis. When the notice is put on, the students send it with Rs. 1740/-. When the report is sent along with the amount of Rs. 1740/- to the University, the late fee is imposed stating that send the extra money. He said that Rs. 1740/- is charged which should not have been charged. The students have been asked to pay Rs. 2 lac which should not have been there. He said that by this time, the amount has been paid. He urged the Vice Chancellor to look into it.

18. Professor Mukesh Arora continued raising another issue stating that the students who are doing B.Sc. final year and have got admission in M.Sc., one of the student who have cleared hundred percent papers and in theory he has got 27 and 29 marks out of 35 marks, but by giving 4 or 5 marks in practical he has been failed.

On the point of order, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he would like to tell the detail of the college of Dr. Mukesh Arora. He said that the COE is very much aware of the case and for the last 2-3 months, the Controller of Examination has been requested but he could not take any decision, he might have his own limitations. He said that the candidate is a girl student and her father expired and she could not attend the college for a period of 20 days or say, a month. He said that they do not want that the student be given relaxation on medical ground etc. , but if she has got roll number, then no teacher should interfere in the matter. The concerned student requested the Principal and she has been issued roll number and she has got 29 marks out of 35 marks in theory paper, there is a teacher who is known to my colleagues, he said that he does not want to disclose his name but they do not want that the neither the student nor the teacher be put to any loss.

Professor Mukesh Arora cited another example of his own College that he has got a telephonic call from a candidate from Ludhiana who made him known that what is happening is that a lady teacher has been telling her that if she (the student) has got the roll number, even then, she will have move to her (teacher) and consequently the student was failed in two papers. The other students have been given good numbers. He said that the sufferer student be given marks in practical proportionately to his performance in theory papers. He said that the power to pass the student rests with the Controller of Examination in such cases, but he did not know the limitations of the COE, as to why the case remained unsettled. He said that he had told the COE that if the issue is not resolved then the issue would be raised in the Syndicate and name of the concerned teacher would also be disclosed.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is Okay and asked for re-order of the examination.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the concerned teacher should not be assigned to take the practical examination of the candidate.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that so far as he knows about the teacher, the teacher is of very good credential. But he is surprised as to how it happened. He said that if any loss has been made to the student, she must be given marks on average basis.

On this the Vice Chancellor said that the Average would set up a wrong precedent.

The Vice Chancellor said the practical examination of the candidate be re-organized in the same city.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma stated that if any candidate could not appear for the practical examination because of death of mother or father, that case should also be looked into.

19. Professor Mukesh Arora said that after 4th amendment, it has been specified as to how much marks would be of Seminars, Books etc. for the interviews but rules for the pre-amendment has not been notified. He urged the Vice Chancellor to look into the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that to bring clarity in the matter, issuance would be made.

20. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that after the OCET test, Postgraduate seats have been filled. If any seat remained vacant, that should be filled without test.

21. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that as has already been discussed with the Vice Chancellor, there had come an amendment of NCQ that without NET no teacher would be appointed, which has been stayed in the Court, he urged to Vice Chancellor to get the stay vacated. The case is of B.Ed. Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to do the needful.

22. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the compartment students get one chance after a year to clear the paper. Earlier there were two such chances. He suggested that why the two chances be not given to compartment candidates.

23. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal continued that this time, the paper of B.Ed. has been misspelled. He said that if the concerned Press is repeating the mistakes time and again, why that Press be not changed and give the work to some another Press. There is no necessity that the same Press it to be kept.

24. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in the year 2009, when he had broken the bricks in the meeting on the issue of a building, and the XEN Rai is much aware of this, a Committee was constituted and the meeting of that Committee has not been held as of today. He said that after constituting the Committee properly, if a meeting is made to be held, so that it comes to fore what irregularities has been committed.

It was explained that the meetings of the said Committee could not be held due to quorum problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that the update on the issue be given to him and the members who do not come, be replaced.

25. Professor Pam Rajput also raised the issue of Printing Press. She said that there were four papers in which printing errors have taken place.

26. Shri Varinder Singh raised the issue of the Campus Sports. He said that the Directorate of Sports on Campus was created so as to ensure improvement in the Sports and achievement of

the Sports. Now the problem which has been surfaced is that the grants which were to be received in advance, for trials of the sportspersons, has not been received neither by the DSW nor the Deputy Director Sports due to which the expenditure for trial fee has been borne by the students itself. The another issue that the system of Campus Sports is not running well. The trials for recent admissions have been taken and the videography of the trials have also been made. He said that he can claim it strongly that 40 to 50% of the students do not deserve to qualify the trials. But because this will create harm to the students and they would not be able to get admission anywhere and the process will take a long time, he said that there have occurred a large scale irregularity which can be checked from the videography. The videography has not been made properly. The games have not been videographed. Only the videography only of 50 meter race, or jump has been got done. The trials of the games have not been conducted. He said that he is raising the issue not to cause any harm to the students or the persons concerned, but to caution that in future such things should not happen.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not clear to whom Shri Varinder was accusing. He said that he must be told as to who is at fault, is it Deputy Director Sports at fault, or the Deputy Director Campus Sports on fault. He said that the proceedings are being video-recorded and being the Chairperson of the meeting, he has to take action as he has no other option.

Shri Varinder Singh continued stating that it might be that the DSW did not want to receive the advance amount as he might be fearful that the staff of his office would delay the adjustment of the amount and he himself would be involved in outstanding advance in his name. He suggested that to overcome this problem, the charge of Campus Sports be taken from the DSW and it should be given to the Director Sports so that the grant is received or both the departments be merged as earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that few years ago, we separated them because the matter was raised in the Syndicate, alright, Syndicate changes every year, we can reverse the things but we should have some cognizance as to where we have failed. Is that failure avoidable, is that failure because of the processes, or the failure because of individuals not performing. So if it is an individual reason that has made it failure, we have to attend that individual. If it is process, then we can do anything.

Shri Varinder Singh continuing saying that after the separation of the departments, there is no doubt that the performance has improved considerably and we are very much close to MAKATROPHY trophy. But in the campus sports and the Sports Department, there have emerged an immense politics in between the duo that there have come to fore the two offices dealing with the common thing, and the third one is the DSW. Due to the three number of the offices, the student are made to face harassment. By the way, the knowledge of sports solely remains with the Director Sports and the DSW is already over

busy in such a way that he cannot find time to attend the sports matters. He suggested that by taking the charge from the DSW, the Director sports should be made the In-charge of the Sports tasks.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now the DUI sees the Sports matters and we are going to find out the firstly, the Deputy Director Sports and if the Deputy Director Sports is not taking the advance on this or that, then he or she is not performing the duty assigned to a person, then it is our duty to take disciplinary action against him/her. He further stated that as the DUI is already seeing the work and he is working with the DUI. Because it is Campus Sports and the DUI have taken cognizance of it, and we are doing something about it and he has this information to share with them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the DSW takes the advance in his name and that has to be given to Director Sports and if the adjustment does not come and it has been observed in the last cases that problem in advance adjustment had come. So far as the system is concerned, the problems are very much coming in the system, the problem is coming because when we talk about the infrastructure, as has been decided that majority of the infrastructure remains with Directorate of Sports and nevertheless the things are to be shared, and in sharing if both are coordinating with each other, then there would be no problem. That is why it looks as that ultimately the overall charge must go to the single hand of all the facilities like grounds. It is a common happening that workforce i.e. malis, groundmen etc. are deputed at one place by one authority and the other shifts it to another location on the same day. This is creating lot of problem as a system also. So he said that he feels that whole of the system shall have to be encompassed under one authority.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Director Physical Education and Sports be made the faculty member in the Department of Physical Education as adjunct member and Director Physical Education and Sports be given charge of Campus Sports Department.

The members again raised the voices for the merger of the two, the Vice Chancellor said that rather it was an effective merger.

The Vice Chancellor further added that the Director Physical Education and Sports has been made the adjunct member of the faculty of the Department of Physical Education so that it is not a complete disconnect with the Director's efforts and the responsibility should remain there to deliver to the campus sports as well.

27. Shri Varinder Singh said that there is a garbage dump along the Gurudwara Sahib, Sector 14. The residual is accumulated, at once there, and is lifted later on. And when the lifting is made, the dust spreads in the nearby houses. The diseases of sinus, asthma are feared to disseminate. He said that he is requesting the Vice Chancellor that there are

available a trolley-like-boxes which could be used to accommodate the garbage.

The Vice Chancellor said that he must be given in written and it would be made a part of the Swatchhta agenda.

28. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there happens to be CAS promotions in the colleges. The teachers with 14-15 years experience are not being promoted as Associate Professors. The college cannot promote at its own. If it is done so, these are not approved by the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that this matter has to be discussed at the level of the DPI Colleges, Punjab.

Principal Sandhu continued saying that in self finance college, there is a lot of problem. They shall have to take a penal action. He said that a Committee has been formed and he has come to know and he has no hesitation to say that Prof. Ghuman is the chairperson of the Committee. He said that it is the issue of the colleges and not even a single person is from the colleges. He suggested that atleast Dr. Dalip Kumar be included as a member in the Committee as he is familiar with the issues of the colleges. He further said that it is not the CAS promotions of the University, these are the CAS promotions of the colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has no hesitation to do. He further said that he is being accused that he is partial to the colleges. There is a propaganda ongoing that he (the Vice Chancellor) is disregarding the Professors of the colleges.

The members said that they condemn such accusations and further referred to the news in the newspapers that the college teachers should not be part of the Committees.

The Vice Chancellor said that as far as he is concerned, a person who is a professor, whether in the College or in the University and if satisfies the same norms that the UGC has prescribed, nobody has been promoted either in the college or in the University beyond these norms. It is quite possible that for promotion one has to score upto 50 out of 100. There are people scoring low marks in the colleges as well as in the University, but everybody has to cross the threshold and once a threshold is crossed, why it is a Professor. He said that if he has included the college Professor in a Selection Committee, it should not be taken as biasing or favouring.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he did mean to say that Professor Ghuman has been made the Chairperson of the Committee and again 3-4 months would be destroyed in the process. He suggested that senior most teachers of the colleges should be included in the committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will make it immediately and he will also make it balanced.

29. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there are 2nd 3rd and 4th amendments. In 2nd and 3rd amendment, the Ph.D

holders after 2009, who have done Ph.D. after course work, they are eligible for Ph.D. in both the 2nd and 3rd amendments. Now the new and last amendment has come in which the old Ph.D. holders have also been made eligible in which five conditions have been imposed, that there should be two examiners, open viva was there. With the imposition of such conditions, there is a confusion in the DPI office too. They say that either the Vice Chancellor or the DUI should certify that the relevant scholar has undergone the course under the laid down conditions. He said their students are facing problem. He said that if any such candidates come to the University, he/she should be given the required certification.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the DCDC recommend it, I will sign it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the DCDC be empowered to do this.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the issue would not be resolved by giving powers to the DCDC. He further said as per the instruction of the UGC, only the certification on the part of the DUI or the Vice Chancellor would serve the purpose.

The Vice Chancellor said that after the recommendations of the DCDC, he would certify the document.

30. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu raised the issue of the candidates of 2006, 2008 of annual examinations who could not pass their examinations. He said that most of his colleague would agree to his request that a golden chance should be given to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members all the time keep on demanding the golden chance, let him examine about it.

The members voiced that instead of naming it as a golden chance, it could be called as Diamond chance or Special chance.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him think over it. He said that this was not correct that in every meeting, there is a demand to have a golden chance in zero hour. He further said that this is not a good advertisement of the members themselves, and it is not his own. He said that some statistics should be given, so that if there are some statistics, these are kept in the file that these were the circumstances in which this relief was given. He further said that in the absence of any data, without anything supporting, it does not set the precedents of the kind that they will regret themselves, later on. He said that even if it is to be done every year, then new statistics shall have to be given. Atleast some statistics should exist there. There are ways of making a case, and they are all intelligent how to make a case. He said that they should make a case and he is not against it but the paper record should be justifiable.

31. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said a complaint has come to his notice that the candidates who have done M.Phil. from other Universities, the course work is not accepted by the University. Earlier it was accepted. The cases have been lying pending because of this. He urged the Vice Chancellor to clear the cases.

The Vice Chancellor said that this will not be stopped.

32. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the list of publishers has to be given by the University Departments. The issue has been raised in the Senate time and again. So far as his knowledge is concerned that till date only two departments have uploaded the publishers list. It was decided that there would be two college teachers in the Committee. The two departments which has uploaded the list, is without the college teachers. No other departments have uploaded this list. He said that he is saying time and again that they should give a date so that the list is ready by that time.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue would be kept in the next Chairpersons meeting. He asked Professor Parvinder Singh to arrange for placement of the issue in the next meeting of the Chairpersons.

33. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the issue of gratuity was discussed in detail lastly and the spirit of that was that we did want to give a strong message to the colleges that misappropriation of that fund is not there.

The Vice Chancellor said that the letter has already been issue to the colleges. He said that a report in the next Syndicate should be presented as to, to how many the letter was issued and how many have responded. The Data should be presented.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that as per the letter, the information has been sought for the period of three years. He said that the information should be demanded from the time, the students had starting giving the funds. Instead of demanding the reply 'at the earliest', some deadline should be fixed. The total amount so collected and the statement showing the account details should be sought.

The Vice Chancellor said that it might be that the minutes of the meeting are not recorded and they will not wait for the minutes for this thing. So the matter should be given to him (by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu) in writing so that update on the issue could be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate. He further said that the 30th September would be the last date for providing this data.

34. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that Earned leaves have been increased from 8 to that of 12. Although the earned leaves have been enhanced, but yet the Earned leave one is entitled, have been shown as 180, the earlier number. He said that UGC should be written in the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that so many reminders have been sent to the UGC and he himself has visited the UGC in person. He offered Dr. Sandhu to visit on behalf of the Syndicate.

35. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu raised the another issue of practical examination. He said that earlier there was a provision of one external and one internal examiner for practical examination. Now a days, it has become so, that both the examiners are from within. On account of this, our system has been diluted greatly. There was used to be a pressure on the student as well as on the teacher to perform better before the external examiner.

The Vice Chancellor said that those college from which most of the complaints are received regarding discrimination with the students in practical examinations, be instructed that they shall have to appoint one External Examiner for practical examination.

The members said that the complaint would come after the mistake has been committed and it will not be possible because already the teachers are not available.

36. Professor Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has raised the issue earlier too that the health of Panjab University Health Centre was not good.

The Vice Chancellor said that that there are no doctors and that is why it was planned that the doctors be allowed to be recruited.

37. Professor Rabinder Nath Sharma said that some employees of para medial medical field have been taking classes in the University departments. He wanted to know whether the job which has been assigned to them, it is based on that or they are paid for teaching.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to who goes from the para-medical staff for teaching.

Professor Sharma said as the information has been provided to him that, the gentlemen goes to teach the law classes and he is going regularly.

The Vice Chancellor said that it might be an isolated case. He might be a lonesome.

Professor Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it must be enquired if this is allowed with payment.

38. Professor Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has received an application which has simultaneously been received by other members too, from someone Kulbir Kaur. She had written that despite of her having higher qualifications, she has not been appointed as Punjabi teacher.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to the issue relates to which college.

Professor Sharma informed that the issue is one of the Panjab University constituent college and requested the Vice Chancellor to look into it. He said that the candidate has given him the copy of the selection and perhaps, it has also been sent to the Vice Chancellor also.

39. Professor Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as has been told by the members that the Joint Entrance test which has been conducted recently for B.Ed. admissions, it could be said that the problem of printing or conduct is not so vast, there is a problem in the setting of the paper. The translation has been made in such a way that a fundamental gap appears to be there.

The Vice Chancellor said that let them have a Confidential Internal Report, if necessary he will share it with all of them. He further said that we will make a report and it will not be made public. It would be brought in this body only.

40. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the UBS departments has not been allowing the Research Centre and the M.Phil candidates are also being said for fresh course work. He suggested that a circular should be issued in this regard.

41. Principal Gurdip Sharma further said that his query is for the Registrar. The 30-40 cases of confirmation of non teaching staff, including that of clerical staff from the Hoshiarpur have been held up with the office of the Registrar.

The Registrar said that in his office no case of confirmation is with his office and all the files have been put up to the office of Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor said that in his office, about 100 of the files are lying.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR