

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 25th February 2017** at **10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Principal B.C. Josan
3. 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 Registrar ... (Secretary)

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the honourable members of the Syndicate that –
 - (1) The Associated Chambers of Commerce & Industry of India (ASSOCHAM) has awarded the Panjab University, Chandigarh, a 'National Excellence Award 2017' for 'Best International Collaboration of the Year' during the 10th Higher Education Summit held in New Delhi on February 23, 2017. The theme of the Summit was 'Building Entrepreneurial Ecosystems: Role and contribution of Universities'. On this occasion, P.U. Vice Chancellor gave a presentation entitled 'An update on attempt to promote Panjab University as a Hub for such an Ecosystem'. Hon'ble Union Minister for Human Resource Development, Shri Prakash Javadekar, delivered an address during the award ceremony and congratulated all the awardees. The award was presented by Shri Sandeep Jajodia, President, ASSOCHAM. It also makes available this presentation on the Panjab University Website.
 - (2) 11th Chandigarh Science Congress (CHASCON-2017) will be held on the PU Campus from March 9-11, 2017 on the theme 'Advancing Sustainable Development through Science, Technology and Innovation'. The Congress will be inaugurated

by Professor R. Ramaswamy, President, Indian Academy of Sciences, Bangalore.

- (3) Shri Ved Prakash, Chairman, University Grants Commission, has very kindly consented to deliver an Evening Lecture on March 21, 2017 as a part of deliberations on first day of the 7th Chandigarh Social Science Congress (CHASSCONG). His lecture will be webcast on National Knowledge Network (NKN) and the invitation for this lecture will be sent to all.
- (4) Hon'ble Mr. Justice J.S. Khehar, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of India, will not be able to come to receive the degree of Doctor of Law (Honoris Causa) during the 66th Annual Convocation of PU, scheduled to be held on March 25, 2017.
- (5) 123rd Birth Anniversary of Dr. Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar was celebrated by Dr. SSB University Instt. of Chemical Engineering. Two eminent scientists presented Orations on 21.02.2017. Prof. T. Pradeep from IIT, Madras (Recipient of Bhatnagar Award, 2008) delivered the Annual Dr. SSBUI CET Oration entitled 'Clean water using advanced materials science, incubation and industry' on this occasion. Eminent Academician and Physicist, Prof. Sushanta Dattagupta, former Vice President, INSA and founder Director, IISER, Kolkata) delivered Oration on the topic 'A view on what Bhatnagar would have envisaged about technical education'.
- (6) School of Mass Communication celebrated 6th Birth Anniversary of Radio Jyotirgamaya 91.2 MHz and 5th World Radio Day with a theme 'Sehat Ka Vardaan Nari Ka Sammaan' on February 13, 2017. During their programme, a 'Resource Book' for visually impaired students was released. This Resource Book' has been prepared by the students of B.A. (Hons.), Deptt. of Economics under the guidance of Prof. Archana Singh (Chairperson, School of Mass Communication).
- (7) To promote synergy between Industry and Academia, Pharmaceutical Export Council of India (Pharmexcil) under the aegis of Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India, Confederation of Indian Industry (CII)-Chandigarh and Chandigarh Region Innovation & Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) got together at the call of Centre for Policy Research (DST Project at PU to promote Industry-Academia Interface) for a two days Workshop on 'Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) and Regulatory Perspective for Pharma & Biotech Sectors' in the Panjab University on February 22 and 23, 2017. The workshop was attended by the Pharma industries operating from Baddi and other neighbouring states.
- (8) An Indo-UK Workshop on 'Development of Rural Bio-refineries in India: A Scoping Exercise' was held on February 22, 2017 in the Department of SAIF/CIL under the aegis of Chandigarh Region Innovation & Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), wherein distinguished scientists from CIAB, NABI, IMTECH and NIPER participated. Dr Avtar Matharu from University of York, U.K. delivered the inaugural address and represented the UK institutions. Dr. R.S. Sangwan, Chief Executive Officer, CIAB, Mohali, also addressed the audience.

- (9) Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology (CIC-B) a project under Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC) at Panjab University, organized a serial International Conference on Microbial Biotechnology (MICROCON-2017) from February 16-18, 2017. It was co-sponsored by Strategic Programme for International Research and Education (SPIRE), University of Bergen, Norway, UGC and DST-PURSE. A distinctive feature was organization of Punjab Start-up Fest 2017 on February 18, as an encouragement for showcasing entrepreneurial spirit of Punjab.
- (10) Two Panjab University affiliated Colleges viz. G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector-32, Chandigarh and Post Graduate Government College, Sector-11, Chandigarh have been placed in the 'A+' and 'A' Grade by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), respectively. G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector-32, has secured CGPA score of 3.53 in the third cycle and Postgraduate Government College, Sector-11, has secured CGPA of 3.4 in the second cycle respectively. So now we have a largest fraction of the Colleges in any urban area of India which have NAAC grading in 'A' category. We have five Colleges which are in 'A+' category. The University is doing well. We still can do better. We still do not have autonomous affiliated Colleges and we should encourage at least some Colleges to assume the status of autonomous Colleges. Let us implement new things and experiment with the new things and we can see how to adopt it for the rest of the Colleges.
- (11) Mr. Lovejot Singh, a former student of B.E. Information Technology (Batch 2012-2016) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, has been awarded with 'Young Entrepreneur of the Year 2016' by Software Technology Parks of India (STPI) at TieCon-2017 held at Chandigarh. These are held in the different parts of the Country. This was organized for the first time by the Panjab University.
- (12) Panjab University is continuing to perform well during the various sports events during the current academic year (2016-17). In this regard an update on the performance in 2016-17 has been made available by the Directorate of Sports for perusal of the Syndicate.
- (13) Panjab University has won 7 prizes including three first and four second in the 45th Rose Festival organized by Chandigarh Administration from February 17-19, 2017 at Zakir Hussain Rose Garden, Chandigarh.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as Justice J.S. Khehar is not coming, earlier also as they honoured Dr. Khushwant Singh, they could think of the same way, as he is going to retire in August.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would have to go to Delhi and would do it but they have to get time from him (Justice Khehar). He is an extremely busy man. He has already declared that he does not want to move out of Delhi and does not want to spend even a day anywhere else but whatever limited time he has at his disposal, he wants to clear as much of work as he could. He (Vice-Chancellor) has talked to his Secretary. So, after 25th March, they have to take some holiday from him and then go and do it. This is what at the moment.

He is very happy to tell them that Mr. Soli Sorabjee, in principle, has accepted to deliver the next Mehr Chand Mahajan oration at Panjab University. He would give them a date at his convenience after April. It would a Mehr Chand Mahajan oration-cum-Panjab University colloquium which he would deliver at the campus. Once he gets the date, he proposes to reach out to the Chief Justice of Punjab and Haryana High Court, who is also an ex-officio member of the Senate that he should come and preside over the lecture. The Chief Justice does not normally participate in the governance of the University. He would like to invite him and let him show his participation in the University by presiding over the Panjab University colloquium-cum-Mehr Chand Mahajan oration. He is excited about it. Hopefully, they would be able to webcast Mr. Soli Sorabjee's oration and all the law institutes should have the benefit of listening to him.

Professor Pam Rajput said that he (Mr. Soli Sorabjee) is a very good speaker.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Mr. Soli Sorabjee) has never come to the University. He is above 92 years of age and they were not sure whether he would accept it. But, in principle, he has accepted it. Now he has to work out the logistics of having him here as early as they could.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as said by Dr. Dalip Kumar, there was an issue of age factor and health of Dr. Khushwant Singh. But it is not in good taste that the whole University should reach someone's residence and honour that person. They could invite him for any other function and honour in a very good ceremonial way.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could call him next year.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not good and it does not send a good message in the society that they honour someone at his residence or in the court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not go to the court to honour him. As Dr. Narinder Singh Kapany, who was to come for this year's Convocation, is not able to come for various reasons. But he has written to him (Vice-Chancellor) that he is also of 91 years of age and has said that he would come next year and receive the degree. It is not the degree awarded in one year could not be accepted in the next year. Dr. Nuruddin Farah, who was given the *honoris causa* degree last year and could not come last year but said that he would come last year. If he did not come next year, then the next year he extending his stay in the University and he has honoured his word as he is staying in Chandigarh for full 18 days. They have good precedences. They could jolly well have Justice Khehar next year.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is better if he comes next year..

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it would look graceful.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, that is better. As Dr. Kapany would come next year, they could also honour Justice Khehar next year.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it has been announced and it could be given the next year.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that since the Chandigarh Science Congress and Chandigarh Social Congress are going to be held, a meeting of the Conveners was held on 13th, he requested that a letter from the Dean College Development Council should be sent to the Conveners and it should be also uploaded on the website.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the Dean College Development Council to send the communication through e-mail asking the people to join. The point is that if the Colleges have to be promoted as Research Centres and the College teachers have to be encouraged to have the students enrolled under them, they must get at least one chance in a year on behalf of the University to come and showcase this progress at least in the form of post presentation as to what they have done in last one year. The whole purpose of continuing and promoting both the Science Congresses on behalf of the University is to reflect on the work that is being done on behalf of the University. Let the abstract be put at some place, because collation of these abstracts year after year, five years down the line, somebody could have an assessment of what work has been done on behalf of the University. No other University is doing what they are doing and they should continue because now they are committed. They have now started to have even Professors in the Colleges. The aided Colleges of the University have still not got the Professors position. He would push for it. People have to get career advancement in the Colleges, to move to the higher rank and they must have the opportunity to showcase their work.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that in the information provided by the Director, Physical Education & Sports regarding positions secured in International Championship 2016-17, at Sr. No.3 the team is mentioned as weight lifting whereas the tournament is mentioned as Commonwealth Wrestling Championship. It needed to be corrected.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that either the tournament is of weightlifting or wrestling.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the Director, Physical Education & Sports and the students be congratulated on behalf of the Syndicate.

Professor Pam Rajput congratulated the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate, for creating an atmosphere of conducive research and getting the excellence award. A letter of appreciation, on behalf of the Syndicate, should also be sent to all the Departments and the faculty members who were involved in this collaborative research. Similarly, the letter of appreciation should also be sent to the Director, Physical Education & Sports and the teams.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the letter of appreciation should also be sent to the Principals of the Colleges which get A+ grade.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is already personally trying to contact the Principals and the letters of appreciation would be sent.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the power lifting championship is going on in Panjab University and he had a chance to go there and observed the championship is going on in the open space outside in spite of power lifting being an indoor game. Perhaps, the indoor facility is not available. The tournament was going on till 12 in the night. Since the weather now-a-days is not so cold otherwise it would have been difficult for the students to participate in the tournament as normally during these days the weather is chilly. Since most of the Colleges also participate in this event if some amount is collected from the Colleges an indoor facility can be provided. He had also requested the Director, Sports in this regard. If the facility is available, then it is okay. Otherwise they should create an indoor facility.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that they have good ideas.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he as well as Principal I.S. Sandhu had a talk with the Director, Sports. There is a budget requirement of about Rs.5-6 crores.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first of all he wanted to get the deliverance of the projects which are already going on. He looked up the files of the old projects. They raised money to have an Astroturf on behalf of the Colleges. They have messed around and not been able to have the Astroturf operational on the campus. So, first he wanted to complete the ongoing projects which they have commenced on behalf of the Colleges. He would keep the suggestions of the members in mind and whenever the Astroturf is ready, only then they could initiate a new project. He requested Shri Varinder Singh to take initiative on behalf of the University and give him feedback every 10 days as to what is the progress of the Astroturf and if there is any hindrance, he would intervene. He could not find so much time to individually follow. The responsibility on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor of this University must be shared by the members of the Syndicate of the time because the governing body of the University as per the construct is the Syndicate. The people say that the Syndicate is the government of the University. Syndicate would be the real cabinet of the University if the responsibility is assumed on behalf of the University for different aspects of the University. The members could be the real Cabinet Ministers if they amongst themselves would give him as to who would look after which aspect on behalf of the University. So, all the Syndicate members should have a formal meeting. As the duties are distributed in the Cabinet, the members should distribute these duties amongst themselves. He would be happy to pass on that responsibility to the members so that it seems to be a real cabinet. Presently, it is not working like a cabinet. It could perform the duty like a cabinet if the members assume the responsibility.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that such a culture has not developed so far.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no one is stopping the members.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the idea is very good but it has not been implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since nobody is stopping, the members should assume the responsibility. The members belonging

to the Colleges could look after the issues related with the Colleges. As a nominee of the Vice-Chancellor, the members should go to the Colleges. As one of the members had raised the issue of students belonging to economically weaker sections, he had sent the Secretary to visit the Colleges. If the Syndicate takes good decisions but the same are not disseminated. Unfortunate thing is that, again it is a construct of the University, majority of the Colleges are located on an average 120 kms. away from the University with the result that the Vice-Chancellor could not go to every College. They did not have a full time Dean College Development Council for decades now. They should evolve a system. Broadly speaking, they have three regions, namely, Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana and Muktsar. He requested the members to give the names of three members of the Syndicate who could accept responsibility on behalf of the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor for three different regions. Whenever they find time they should visit different Colleges and disseminate the information. Let the decision making that happens here, its benefits must accrue to all. Since he could not visit the Colleges, three of the members could volunteer and do that. He suggested that Professor Mukesh Arora could look after the Ludhiana Region, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma after Hoshiarpur and Principal I.S. Sandhu after Muktsar and Ferozepur region. They could visit the Colleges on Saturdays and make aware the Colleges about the decisions taken by the Syndicate. It would be announced in the Principals' Conference that the University has devised this mechanism. They could also take the help of colleagues.

Some of the members said that it is a good decision.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma could also look after Muktsar and Ferozepur.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could form the teams and disseminate this information. They are facing the problems on behalf of economically weaker students. One category is of students belonging to SC/ST category who are entitled for scholarship from the Government but the money has not been received. The other category is really economically weaker students belonging to general category. So, they should set aside a sum of Rs.5 crore on behalf of the University as a reserve fund. The scholarships of the SC/ST students are received after about two years. The students who are valid beneficiaries, to be evaluated by someone, should be given the money by taking the loan on behalf of the University at least for the first two years whether their scholarship is received or not. If some student has been enrolled for a three-year course, he/she should be given the money for two years and the money from the Government would reach by the third year. It is a kind of an advance and it has to be replenished. The advance could be about 90% of the entitlement. Since the money is received by the students directly on the basis of their Aadhaar No., the degree could be given to the students only when the loan is returned by the students. They should come out with an algorithm. Similarly, for the economically weaker students, they want to provide the money and the scheme is also announced that if a student asks for monetary help, he/she should be given.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the decisions are not conveyed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the information should be conveyed. He would have to work with the Finance and Development

Officer that they set aside at least Rs.2 crore every year and make sure that they are seen to be attending to the concern in some innovative way. He would work on it. At least, they should do something.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that the Director, Sports should organize the tournaments in the Colleges as lot of facilities for indoor games are available in the Colleges.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the schemes of the Government should also be informed to the Colleges. He cited an example that in the last year, DST FIST started giving grant to the Colleges. The Government College for Girls, Sector-42, Chandigarh got Rs.75 lacs. He had an interaction with the DAV College and Government College for Girls, Sector-11 (GCG-11). When he went to Bhubaneswar, he found out that theirs was the only College out of 192 Colleges for getting this grant. This year, DAV College, Chandigarh got a grant of Rs.1.5 crores and GCG-11 got Rs.85 lacs. Most of the Colleges in that list are from the southern India or Maharashtra. He suggested that this kind of information should be sent to the Colleges as to which of the schemes are available and this is the only scheme which is available to the un-aided institutions. The UGC never gives any grant to the un-aided institutions. Only the DST sponsors the un-aided institutions. He requested the members whose names have been suggested to provide such information to the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whenever one gets the grant and delivers the results, the grants would continue. One of the purposes of the Chandigarh Science Colleges to the College persons is to convey the message that they are serious about it. The President of the Science Academy is to inaugurate the Congress. They have invited Dr. Jitu Goswamy, who got Padma shri award this year, who retired as Director, Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad to give an evening lecture. They have invited Dr. Ajay Sood who took over as President of the Academy on 1st January, to deliver B.M. Anand Memorial Lecture. Since he is coming to Chandigarh, the Director, IISER, Mohali has also invited him. He would also deliver a lecture in Kurukshetra also. He is going to deliver three different lectures. The lecture in Kurukshetra is for the recipients of Goel Prize. Anyway, the University is doing well as Mr. Soli Sorabjee and Dr. Ajay Sood are coming. Dr. Nuruddin Farah is giving a colloquium on March 16. Professor Khush is coming to deliver Shiv Ram Kashyap Memorial lecture on 24th March, Hargobind Khurana Lecture on 27th for the students of Punjab who receive Hargobind Khurana scholarship. Dr. P.D. Gupta, who is to receive the Vigyan Rattan, is delivering the lecture in the Department of Physics on 24th March. The persons who are coming to receive the *honoris causa* degree are not just coming to receive the degrees but would also deliver the lectures and meet the community. The University has also invited Professor Murli Manohar Joshi and he would also, probably not now but later on, deliver a public lecture in Tagore Theatre. The Centre for Vivekanand Studies is getting in touch with him to get a date so that it could be done. Immediately, after the Convocation, Professor Murli Manohar Joshi would be at CRRID which is organizing a two-day meeting. The Panjab University Convocation ends up invigorating the academic atmosphere in the city. Some money is involved in it. But when they call a Vice President for the convocation, some expenditure is involved and the Government also incurs expenditure on such things.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma welcomed Dr. Subhash Sharma who came for the first time to attend the meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor and other members also welcomed Dr. Subhash Sharma.

Professor Pam Rajput informed that the Secretary General of United Nations has constituted a high-level Committee on economic empowerment of women and in that Committee, India was represented by Mrs. Renana Jhabvala. The report of the Committee has just been released and she has invited her to deliver a special lecture in the first week of April.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Pam Rajput to inform him about the date on which the lecture is to be delivered.

Professor Pam Rajput said that she would inform the date when she confirms it from Mrs. Renana Jhabvala. She knows Mrs. Renana Jhabvala since 1993, but when recently they were talking, she told that she is the wife of Mr. Harish Khare, Editor-in-Chief of The Tribune.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to do the agenda of naming Panjab University auditorium after Shri Dyal Singh Majithia. Panjab University is a modern University. The way it is, is simply because Shri Dyal Singh Majithia started The Tribune on 2nd February 1881 and got 27 articles written in The Tribune towards how should the University be conceived and what should the University do as and when it comes up. The Principal of Government College, Lahore wanted the University to be as if it is an Oriental University, but Shri Majithia said, no, the University has to be on modern lines. It could not be that only the graduates of the universities of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras are getting modern education and getting all the jobs. Mr. Majithia said that when a fourth University is to be created in the north-west of India, it has to do everything that the Calcutta, Bombay and Madras universities were supposed to do plus they would have to have oriental studies and stress upon culture, heritage and so on. This has to be a University which not only looks at the Indus Valley Civilization but also modern education like the education which is there in Europe. So, they could not have a campus of the kind that they have in Chandigarh, if University had not made the right beginning at Lahore. In fact, after the independence, Pakistanis have constructed a new campus which is a 3000 acre campus like the Jawaharlal Nehru University campus in New Delhi. They (Pakistani) assumed the responsibility as if that what is happening in Delhi should also happen in Lahore. So, they created huge campus for themselves. They also have a separate Oriental University today at Lahore. The Oriental College has now become an Oriental University. They do not have that counterpart and that job has to be done by them. They did try that by giving that responsibility to Punjabi University and doing a lot and the focus is different from Panjab University. They do not have a counterpart of Oriental University, Lahore because the whole agenda of Indus Valley Civilization is with it. There is a Mayo School of Art in Lahore and was attached to Lahore University. They have formed a new University which is National Art University which has subsumed everything. Lahore has a separate management University like the IIMs of India, Art University like the NSD, Delhi. Pakistan film industry is in Lahore. There is an employment possibility in the commercial art. Since there are

possibilities, they have created separate universities. Lahore has everything that India has as national institutes. Ultimately, that part of Punjab has everything. They should strive to have that for this part of Punjab and not Punjab as a Punjab State. Punjab should be treated as four States, Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, U.T. Chandigarh, parts of Uttrakhand, parts of western Uttar Pradesh, which are served by Mohali International Airport. So they should have and should aspire for that. U.T. Chandigarh, which is the capital of two States, must accept the responsibility that they have to promote all these things and they can do it.

Professor Pam Rajput said that a concept note should be prepared on all these matters.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Pam Rajput to do with the help of senior persons like Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that another University has been created by the name of Government College University, Lahore. He had visited there.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Pam Rajput and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to take up this responsibility of preparing a concept note.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) the Vice-Chancellor, the Departments and the faculty members for creating an atmosphere of conducive research and getting the National Excellence Award, 2017;
 - (ii) the Director, Physical Education & Sports and the students of the teams who have excelled in international and national championships/ tournaments;
 - (iii) the Principals of the Colleges which have been granted A+ grade by NAAC;
- (2) the Syndics Professor Mukesh Arora, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Principal I.S. Sandhu/ Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, with the help of other members, could visit the Colleges in the Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur and Muktsar/Ferozepur regions respectively and interact with the Colleges and disseminate the decisions being taken by the University;
- (3) Professor Pam Rajput and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to take up the responsibility of preparing the concept note on giving stress upon culture, heritage and modern education like the education which is there in Europe;
- (4) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's statement at Serial Nos.(2),

(3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (11) and (13) be noted; and

- (5) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 21.01.2017, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now they move on to the agenda items. As a part of the agenda, they have the essential items of the Board of Finance. He shared with the members that on 19th January, the Court had directed the UGC to provide an interim relief to the Panjab University in the form of release of Rs.30.5 crores. They have not yet received any formal communication from the UGC regarding this. He had raised this issue with the officials in UGC and Ministry of Human Resource Development. The Registrar had sent the utilization certificate of the amount of Rs.34 crores that the University had received a month earlier. They had requested for the release of Rs.30.5 crores. They had taken up with the representatives of the MHRD and UGC and he was told that whatever input they had desired from the University had been received and is under examination in MHRD. So, they have to wait up to 28th February and if nothing happens within the next two days, then they would be compelled to inform the Court that nothing has been received. He has kept the MHRD counsel Shri Satya Pal Jain informed of the current status. He has also informed Shri K.K. Sharma, the OSD in the MHRD who is going to take over as the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development from March 1. They still have two more working days and in the past when the deadline was 31st March, the money did arrive before 12 in the night of 31st March, so they should wait till then.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired whether the Court had made it time bound.

The Vice-Chancellor said that four weeks time was given for the release of the grant. The time has lapsed but he understands that the UGC met three days ago and does not know the deliberations of the meeting. The UGC Chairman has given his consent to come to the University roughly at the same time. So, he is taking up all these things as if the concerns of the University are being addressed to. Let them move on to agenda Item No.2.

Appointment of Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News on temporary/contract/deputation basis against leave vacancy

2. Considered minutes dated 15.02.2017 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee (Walk-in-Interview) (Advertisement No.01/2017) for appointment of Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News, to be filled against the leave vacancy, purely on temporary/contract/deputation basis, initially for the period of six months or until the person holding lien joins back the University, whichever is earlier.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are well aware that the DPR has been given six months leave. They had advertised the position and right now it is for six months only. At the end of six months, they would be able to know whether the DPR returns or not and if he decides to return, then well and good. If the DPR does not return, then they would have to take a call at that time as to what to do. As an interim arrangement, they have found a person. He also seeks the

approval of the members that the letter of appointment be issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate to which the members agreed.

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

- NOTE:**
1. A summary bio-data of the selected candidate is enclosed.
 2. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualification laid down for the post.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the appointment letter be issued in anticipation of approval of Senate.

Recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 13.02.2017

3. Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 13.02.2017 (Items 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7:

Item 1

That –

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

NOTE: The Maintenance Budget has been prepared as per the recommendations of the Estimate Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, keeping in view the projections already submitted to the MHRD/UGC vide letter No. 22/R/DS dated 13.01.2017 **(Appendix-IV) (Page 8 to 24).**

Item 2

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

Item 4

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

NOTE : The above honorarium has been recommended by the Director Internal Quality Assurance Cell stating that the Panjab University has been participating in the NIRF. Data for the same is collected from various departments and branches of the University. Most of the departments could provide data only at the last moment. At that stage the Vice-Chancellor advised that expert advice and help be obtained from Prof. S.K. Singla who had retired from the Dept. of Bio-Chemistry. Prof. S.K. Singla discharged their duties for 10 days of work from 1.11.2016 to 15.11.2016.

Item 6

The decision of Vice-Chancellor for award of contract of security services to PESCO be ratified in pursuance of the notification of Government of Punjab, Department of Defence Services Welfare dated 12.06.2014 (**Appendix-VIII**) (**Page 36**) regarding nomination of Punjab Ex-Serviceman Corporation (PESCO) as sole agency for availing security by all the Punjab Government Departments/ Corporations/ Boards/ Semi Government Undertakings with following conditions:

- i) that a clarification be sought from Punjab Government regarding the admissibility of allowances i.e., Tiffin, Uniform, Washing and Bonus to the outsourced security personnel and till then the amount of such allowances/bonus be withheld;
- ii) The term of present contract shall not be extended and before the expiry of present contract, a cost analysis shall be made to determine whether to outsource these services and if the services are to be outsourced, then University shall invite the open tender from all eligible agencies.

Item 7

Noted and ratified the decision of the Senate dated 9.10.2016 vide Paragraph XLVII (R-31) for sanctioning the payment of honorarium at double the rates (Appendix X-a)(Page 43a) in following cases:

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

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

The Vice-Chancellor said that he hoped that the members have spent some time on going through the first 7 pages of the minutes of the Board of Finance where he had given the background of the current financial situation. Right now, the budget is of tentative nature in the sense that they have not processed the proposal of enhancement in the income of the University for the next financial year. They have to enhance some income but in a concrete way how they have to do it through the tuition and examination fees. This is still to be processed. A proposal for the tuition fee was put and they had discussions. At the moment, the situation is that they enhanced the income last year in a substantial way in the hope that the matching enhancement would come from the Centre. So long as the matching enhancement is not assured, they could not go back to the students, whether studying at the campus or in the Colleges, to come forward to accept the increase. They have to, somehow, balance their books by 31st March. If they balance their books by 31st March and they should know how to balance the books by 15th of March because 15 March is the next date of hearing in the Court. The MHRD and the Punjab Government representatives have to give a response as to how they would meet their obligations to the University. If the Government wished to withdraw from their obligations as the time would go by, it would also be told to the Court. Punjab has already reached a stage that it is hardly meeting the needs of the University. An amount of Rs.20 crore out of the total salary of Rs.400 crores is just 5%. At the moment, Punjab is already on the verge of reaching a stage that their contribution is very notional. It is so notional that it almost amounts to no contribution. The Centre, at one time, had 60% share in the University deficit. If the total budget of the University on salary and maintenance is already at the level of Rs.515 crores and the income is only of the order of Rs.250 crores, and the Punjab's contribution is less than 5%. The rest of the deficit is Rs.250 crores. The Centre has frozen their grant at Rs.176 crores. The University has a very serious shortfall and the University is back to a stage as the University was commenced in 1881. The University was commenced when the people of Punjab agreed to put on the table certain amount of money. After they put certain amount of money, the Government gave minimal support to the evolution of Panjab University. All the money on behalf of the Panjab University was collected through the stakeholders of

Panjab University. The stakeholders of Panjab University means the public at large or the examination fee collected on behalf of providing service to the society. The Indian University Act, 1904 which applied to the than 5 universities of India, did not envisage any Central grant to the 5 universities. The then 5 universities were not given any money by the then Central Government. Today, when the universities, after independence, are being created by Act of Parliament and are called Central Universities, the Central Government is committed to give them the money. Bathinda Central University has come up, the land might have been given by the Punjab Government but everything else is coming from the Centre and it is not the Punjab Government which is giving the grants. So, Panjab University, which means the campus part of Panjab University, started to come into being from 1904 onwards, that was being progressed only from the surplus from the examination fee of Panjab University. The fee paid by the students at the Panjab University campus has never been a big source of income of Panjab University. There is a reason for it, why it always came from the examination fee. Who came to get education at Panjab University? It is the students graduating out of the Colleges of Punjab, the students who are doing well that means who gain admission in the postgraduate classes which was always by merit and there was no quota, the students who came to study at Chandigarh were the best students of the Colleges of Punjab. The Panjab University campus teaching departments were created out of the resources which came in the form of the surplus of the examination fee and the examination conducted on behalf of Colleges of Punjab University as a centralized agency. Whatever they are seeing in the University, that is the collective property of the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University. As just now has been said that an indoor stadium be built up by collecting fee from every student. It is in that spirit that it is a collective responsibility. That is why the Panjab University Sports Council is a separate entity and not a teaching department of the University. In the like manner, as the Syndicate is the governing body on behalf of the entire University, in the same way, all the things are there. It is a collective resource, or by whatever name you may wish to call it. It is in that whole spirit. He said perhaps the governments do not want to give grants to the University, they shall have to go back to the drawing board. They have to treat it , as a public sector undertaking in which the governments are not involved but public per se, they are involved. Under such a circumstance, how it will have to be done, they shall have to have a collective meeting to decide how to have the system run in a self sustainable way. He said that when the University was started, it was not envisaged that they shall have a large number of professional courses in the University. They had a land given to them in the neighbouring sector. The Sector 14 was a traditional University and the sector 25 was lying empty. They started to develop the Sector 25 in the hope that they will have a surplus income from the conduct of operations in sector 25, and they could cross subsidize. They shall have to go back to that model and re-examine all the fundamentals. The fundamental when the University had been extended in the Sector 25 and how they cannot let this institution to collapse. He said that as a community, they had ten million refugees who crossed over to Indian Post of Punjab people across. So this is a resource of all those people who cross over and started to develop this part of the north-west India. This is a resource of the north-west and they have to find some way. It is a collective Capital of Punjab and Haryana. For some reasons, the people who are living in and around Chandigarh, they do not have a stake in the University. There is lesser number of middle class people who are

living in (Central) Chandigarh city today, and there are more number of people who are connected with this city, who are living around Chandigarh. The Colleges are also there, but they are not affiliated with this University. So the people of these satellite towns of Chandigarh do not feel attached to this University. The school students of Mohali will not get seat in a Professional Colleges of Chandigarh. In the emerging scenario that there would be a metropolitan city, there is so much of money which is there around Chandigarh. What is the shortage of University every year, it is of the order of Rs. 100 crores a year. He questioned as to whether three million people in and around Chandigarh are asked that the University needs Rs. 100 crores, can they not evolve some way of generating 100 crores from all these stakeholders in the form of some Cess. He said that after all when the school education was commenced by the Britishers, they said that one percent of the land tax would go towards funding the opening of the new schools. He further said that if they were the resource for this region. He pondered that of the children, who were coming to the P.U. Campus, how many of them live in Chandigarh city *per se*. They are a small fraction, and from where do the rest of them come. Some come from Zirakpur and Panchkula, some from Amaravati Enclave, someone is coming from Mohali and someone from Kharar. He said that they shall have to go to a larger platform and see that they generate some money. If they cannot get additional Rs. 100 crores from the Union government budget, can they have some ways to generate this 100 crore rupees from all those people who are living in this region. So some new thinking has to be there. They cannot just let this institution collapse. He said that it was in that backdrop that there was a Public Interest Litigation and that was why the judiciary had all this to say that the heritage institution cannot be allowed to collapse. He said that the amount of Rs. 100 crores was not a big thing. He said that in the big Sectors, even the multi-storey flats are sold for tens of crores and in a given year, there get constructed so many buildings in the area. He said that Rs. 100 crore looks a very large figure, but actually it is not a very large amount. If they have to sustain an institution, the figure of 100 crores was nothing.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that along with the surroundings, they should tackle the alumni abroad, it may be more useful.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to look at all the possibilities.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the college affiliation fee is very less, it is Rs. 2000 only. He further said that the Managements have enough money. They can even give Rs. 1 lac as affiliation fee.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that as they were talking about the infrastructure, the College Bhawan has been constructed with the help of the students. He said that to an estimate, there might be three lakh students and if one time Rs. 100 is charged from them, it becomes Rs. three crores and it was the question of the survival of the institution.

The Vice Chancellor said that they shall have to have some inclusive way. The students who cannot pay, they should not be left out or some less money be charged from them.

Dr. Sandhu said that as has been stated by the Vice-Chancellor that if the society considers its responsibility, the amount of Rs. 100 crores is not such huge.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that shall they abandon the hope that government would not give any money as they are running after the Punjab government to give Rs. 20 crores and they are not giving it. The government could give the grant but it seems that they have no such intention.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that they had started the Dental College with a view that it would benefit the University but ultimately it has become a liability.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Dental College was a responsibility that the Chandigarh Administration should accept. The Dental College is like an extension to Sector 32 Hospital. So the Dental College should be considered as a resource of the city and he (the Vice Chancellor) was appealing to the Dental College people that they should enhance the outreach of the University and make it sure that the Dental College assumes the responsibility to look after the dental health of the children studying in all the government schools in Chandigarh region.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there was a wide gap between the income and the expenditure of the Dental College. It is a big liability on the University. The purpose for which it was established, has not been fulfilled.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was why he is appealing and he wants to go back to the UT administration and ask them to take some responsibility of the Dental College.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it was said that committees would be formed promptly for vacant seats in Dental College and UIET, but the committees have not been constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has been working on constitution of these committees. He further said that he would give this responsibility to him (Dr. Arora).

The members suggested that Migration Committee should be formed and it was resolved that the Migration Committee would be formed.

Discussing about the budget, the Vice Chancellor said that he would give them the background about the budget figures that were with them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one thing in the budget figures was that actually the meeting of the Finance Board was held on 13th of February, 2017 whereas the court case was on 14th of February, 2017 and even in that meeting they discussed that provision has been made for retirement benefits. So obviously, now those people are not going to retire during this financial year, so that provision shall have to be reduced substantially and increased for the next financial year.

The Vice Chancellor said that the court case was for 14th February, 2017, so the liability is to be re-worked out.

It was explained that liability of Rs. 10 crore was incorporated in the budget of 2016-17 and there is no need to record this in the minutes. A note or foot note could be inserted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that obviously these are all estimates and the note shall have to be made because ultimately if equal retirements happen next year, that part also will increase.

It was explained that that would be taken care of while making revised estimates but this year's estimates cannot be changed.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should make a note of it because the minutes of this meeting shall have to be presented to the Senate meeting scheduled for 26th of March, 2017. They shall have to have notional passing of the budget to respect the Calendar by 31st of March, 2017.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that all feel that enhancing income is something difficult but they could resort to saving and he had two proposals. First, they have lot of infrastructure and space which could be utilized for solar panels. They could give their space to private people who can utilize it and their expenditure on electricity will ultimately be saved. Secondly, we should not go now for construction of hostels of our own. That land can be given to private players so that some workout can be there.

The Vice Chancellor said that some bid and tendering could be done. Further he said that right now they have thousands of PU students living in unsecured PG accommodation in Sector 15 and sector 38. They can carry out a survey how many people need accommodation. The international Hostel was got constructed and they have already used this model and the rent charges are Rs. 9000/- per month and that is too without any food facility. He cited an example that how threesome girls reside in one tiny room in Sector 16.

Principal Gurdip Sharma continued stating that they should enhance the number of seats and a plan should be chalked out in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that number of seats could be enhanced but not in every course because in order to adhere to the UGC norms, student teacher ratio has to be maintained and wherever it is possible, the seats have been enhanced.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that as has been suggested by Principal Gurdip Sharma that let they allow the private players to construct the hostels and if they can earn profit, why the University cannot earn profit by building as has been done in the case of International Hostel.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are lacking money.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said there are two things and first of all is that to construct the hostel, they would require money and second problem is that whenever such things are done by the University, there would be more pressure of the students and the

students shall pressurize to make it same. Ultimately rather than being profit making, the hostels shall become a liability.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that what to talk of charging Rs. 9000/- per month from the students for hostel facility, they cannot make them to pay even Rs.5000/-.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he was talking this in the context that there is a huge waiting list of hostel seekers and there has been a waiting in international hostel that has been constructed by the University itself.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if they give the hostel construction work to the private players, even then, they cannot make any disparity. He questioned as to how the students could be asked to give more money for the Hostel of the same institution.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that we cannot make it at our own. He further said that already private player concept was going on in Hoshiarpur. He said that although the land has not been provided by the University, but still they have an MoU with them where some charges have been fixed for them and ultimately when they go for private players does not mean that they would have total autonomy for fixing the charges. For charges, we have to go for tender and who will charge minimum from the students, that would be allotted the work with the kind of specified facilities and facilities would definitely be much better. He said that the whole process would be through tendering.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can have a Small Sub-Committee of this Syndicate which would supervise this process when it is commenced.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that by the way, this is a new thing that perhaps whatever the pressure of Government of India is upon us or the Punjab Government is not meeting its responsibility, all these things have been coming out of this. He said that in his view, we somewhat make a thinking to overcome these things. He cautioned that the end would be very bad if they start giving entry to private players in the University and it would bring a lot of negative features. He said that they might be aware of the proposal which came in the past and was opposed by them (Rabindner Nath) regarding privatizing the whole of the heritage at Shimla Holiday Home and Dalhousie and half be kept by the University itself and the half be given to the private player. He said that the determining factor of the private player would be profit making, nothing else and the manner in which he will handle the sites, shall create a new culture. He said that it is his view that whatever they observe, and the rest is subject to details that whatever is being done by the Vice Chancellor to awaken the governments is a good job on the basis of which the High Court has taken a stand and all the things has been happening at this time. The Vice Chancellor has very rightly projected and highlighted it that it is the responsibility of the governments whether it is the matter of 60:40 or is of the Punjab government. He said that if they would try to carry all the loads at our own and further transfer it on the students, they would apprehend that things are alright and there is no need of government sharing. He said that the talks of saving and economy are alright, all the things should be there but it should not be such to think running the University with the fees of the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that that is why he has been thinking to go to the drawing board. The University had been commenced only without any government aid.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that, those were the different times. The Vice Chancellor has talked about the period of 1904 and that was the entirely different context. The situation has changed today.

The Vice Chancellor said that how the things are different. When the governments have to give nothing. He asked Dr. Sharma to tell him about any State in India which is paying for the Education.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma continued saying that things will remain where they are if they do not generate any public opinion and highlight the things. He said that in this way, even the figure of 176 crores would go down.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have already warned us and what was the warning from the Centre is that if we do not do 1:1.1, teaching to non teaching, the Centre would not consider to increase even a penny in the proposal of enhancing from Rs, 176 crores. In case they consider, in future, whatever number would come this year, that will remain frozen for subsequent years. He said that so he sees no light at all at the end of any tunnel. The Centre has already put their hands up. Not even a single paisa beyond 176 crores . If even the deficit of this fiscal is met by them beyond 176 crores and the deficit amount is given by them, there would be no increase on it in the next year finance. He said that this is what the MHRD had stated and this is what on which the Court has to give its opinion on March of 15. He said that right now, they are at this situation. But they are the governing body of this institution, governing body though chosen for a limited time, but this a first year of the new governing body, so they have to think at least what is to be done for the next year. He said that he is here up to July 2018 but they shall have to represent continuously to whatever has been happening this year and in the previous years. The situation is very grim, they have already stated, though not publicly announced but news reports are there that the Seventh Pay Commission would only be applicable to the Central institutions. The recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission for the University teachers are not binding on the States of India. If they are not binding on the States of India and we are an Inter-State Body Corporate, not enacted by an act of Parliament. It would not be applicable on us and we will not be able to implement 7th Pay Commission at all. Even if we are the aided institution and we have been put into the body of aided institutions, the aided institutions are Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Dayalbagh University, Intra University centres are the few institutions and the Seventh Pay Commission would be implemented to them if whatever is the quantum of enhancement needed for implementing 7th Pay Commission, the 30% of that is generated by themselves. If we are very lucky, then it is whatever the enhancement is needed to implement 7th Pay Commission, the 70% of which will be given by the Centre and 30% shall have to be generated by us from our own income. That means burden of implementing Seventh Pay Commission in the University is 30% of the enhancement. What is the enhancement, about 2.57 multiplier factor and the 30% of the total enhanced budget would be, if it is of Rs. 400 crores, the total amount would be of Rs. 120 crores and the 30% of 120 crores would be

Rs.36 crores. To implement the 7th Pay Commission, we have to generate hefty amount of order of Rs. 30crore additionally and we have to implement the 7th Pay Commission from 1st January, 2016, the date of implementation of 7th Pay Commission, then we have already in deficit by Rs. 45 crores at the moment. The very thought of implementing 7th Pay Commission in Panjab University from 1st of January, 2016 means we shall start with a deficit of the order of Rs. 40 crores.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that earlier also, after five years the States were given the 80% of the total enhancement. On this the Vice Chancellor said that all this has been stopped now.

The Vice Chancellor said that this has been decided in the UGC meeting which has taken place three days before and its report have not yet come, only in a newspaper of Kolkata, The Daily Telegraph, some extracts have been published and somebody have sent him it on the University link and he had read out it.

Principal N.R.Sharma said that suppose, despite of all that, they release the money, even then some future strategy shall have to be in place. He said that as has been stated by Principal Gurdip Sharma that if the private players be approached and the burden will not be increased but they would evolve a system. Secondly, there is no harm in making new experiment.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that the land requirement shall have to be made very cautiously.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that loan could be taken for the purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the loan would cost us more because the big infrastructure companies are able to get loan from outside India where the rate of interest is 3 to 4 percent and they cannot do that and if do that it would cost more to us.

Principal N.R.Sharma said that the Vicky was rightly saying that the affiliation charges are of Rs. 2000/- whereas the examination fee is Rs. 3000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was just waiting to see that as to whether the 31st of March would be crossed or not and he did not want to start all these things until we have crossed 31st of March, 2017. He said that let the March 31 cross, they will discuss all these things. The members agreed. He urged the member to see the items of Budget.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the budget, in the Income side, at No. 13, miscellaneous receipts, it has been falling extraordinarily in the estimates of 2017-18 and as has already been discussed once in the Finance Board that our revenue from Estate has nowhere been mentioned. There is one item and I have come to know while reading this item that we have two plots in Panipat and that is the most posh area of Panipat. It has been given in estimates that the market value of this site is of Rs. 5 crores. They are lying vacant. Like this, we have a lot of chunks in Shimla also and if we go from the Holiday Home till down, for sustenance, revenue from Estate is so necessary for us. The another point is that the publication part, he is surprised to see that

on 5 and 6, AC Joshi Library, Chandigarh and Extension Library Ludhiana. From Chandigarh it is 3.4 lacs and from Ludhiana it is 5.7 lacs. The numbers at Chandigarh are more and the students at Ludhiana are less and their income is more than the Chandigarh. He suggested that this should be worked out.

It was explained that the estate income is reflected in the Estate Fund i.e. on page 75, it is a part of budget and the reason for this decrease is that there are certain securities which get lapsed. So that lapsed amount becomes the income of the University in the year when these securities have been declared as lapsed. It comes once in a three years because after three years securities get lapsed and then we take the amount in the income of the University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the income that comes from the overhead charges such as in 2016-17, 35 projects have been sanctioned from different funding agencies and 10% is recurring income from the each project as overhead charges.

It was explained that actually not all funding agencies allow 10%. Some funding agencies allow and that 10% is being utilized for the concerned department and that, we cannot take as Income and cannot utilize it for the purpose of salary because against that 10% we used to allow the amount to the concerned researcher to upgrade the laboratory etc. and other general development of the Department. If we start including this 10% as the Income of the University then, ultimately we will use it for the payment of operating expenditure and those departments would, then be crying for these facilities. This provision has been approved by the Syndicate, the utilization of those funds. 35% at the disposal of concerned PI or researcher. He can use those overheads for the augmentation or for the development of his space of the laboratory and the balance 65% for the department as a whole. The utilization guidelines have been approved by the Syndicate and accordingly we are utilizing those overheads.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as some construction items have been given in it, there are many items, the constructions have been started in the year 2013. He said that as the cost increases by the passage of time, whether any time line has been fixed or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is why the XEN office has been asked to give status report on every construction and construction report is somewhere in today's agenda and in any case if it is not there in today's agenda, I will make you available. He (Vice Chancellor) has personally gone and enlisted all the ongoing projects which have not been completed. One of the projects which has not been completed as yet that had caused him concern was the auditorium. I (the Vice Chancellor) have visited the auditorium and worked out strategy that some part of the partially constructed auditorium could be put to use in few months from now in the form of two auditoria of 250 capacity and have some more area for exhibition. He said that if they have time after lunch break, they could all visit the auditorium to see what was proposed to be constructed and where it is. It will give them a feel that as to how much money they have spent on it and what is needed more. He said the whatever has been spent on it, at least that could be put to use. He said that it is not as horrible-incomplete as it appears from a distance. When you walk in there, then it looks that to a partial completion and utilization stage, we can take a look very quickly. He urged the members to visit and

see and take the responsibility that the project be got completed. He said that he is expecting that by the 1st of August, the things are in place. He further said that the auditorium is not as such incomplete. It was opined that the XEN be informed to arrange for the visit after the lunch. He said that the information as sought by Dr. Dalip Kumar is available on page (xiv).

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as has been stated by Principal Jarnail Singh that there has been a mention at two places about calling of tenders of construction of two Student Holiday Homes, at Shimla and Dalhousie and renovation of Teacher's Holiday Home.

The Vice Chancellor said that one portion at Dalhousie has been completed.

It was informed that one portion of Student Holiday Home, near bus stand at Dalhousie has been completed and at Shimla, the tender for portion other than the Dingle has been invited and the work will be started and the improvement for odd- even toilets is under process.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that two things are very necessary at Shimla. He said that he is the regular visitor of Shimla, twice thrice a year. About the land preservation, he said that if the University cannot make a boundary wall, at least the fencing should be made there. The people can encroach upon the University land. It happens to be the habit of the neighbour to encompass the land lying nearby his habitat.

The Vice Chancellor said that after the Convocation, they would visit the Teachers Holiday Home, Shimla.

It was informed that the renovation work is going on at Holiday Home, Shimla. The Inverters has been installed on all floor. There were no power sockets for heaters, they have been provided. Kettle in each room has been provided. All the toilets have been renovated. Mirrors have been fixed in all the rooms. The mattresses of all the beds have been changed.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that the staff deputed at Teachers Holiday Home, Shimla run towards them with great zeal whenever they visit the Holiday Home, Shimla. He said that he has been informed salary to the staff is being paid on the basis of the DC rates prevalent at Shimla. He said that the living conditions of the staff are not good. They live in unsafe old buildings. There live there in odd seasons. They are all human beings. Their salary and their living and working conditions should be streamlined.

The Vice Chancellor said that after Convocation, he himself alongwith Principal Jarnail Singh would visit the site at Shimla.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that actually the Teachers Holiday Home gives the appearance of hostel and it needs revamping. He suggested that some crockery items should be made available in the Kitchen.

On members' suggestions that attention should be made towards the Dalhousie site, it was informed that it was in a very dilapidated condition and it would require a lot of money to renovate.

Construction could be made only after demolition. There is a spacious chunk of land in the front, but it will require a heavy investment.

The Vice Chancellor said that the possibility of public private partnership could also be explored to develop the land at Dalhousie.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that one page 69, the income and expenditure of Constituent Colleges have been shown. In it on page 69, the first head is 15-16, Rs. 1,13,74,840 as total of the salary. There are three members of non teaching staff. They are working there and the salary is charged from his College. The Superintendent is Shri Jagdish Kumar and one is clerical staff. He had no problem but he did want to bring an issue before the Vice Chancellor. He said that when he asked Shri Jagdish when they get the salary, it was replied that every 3rd day of month, they get salary. He said that it is the responsibility of the official that at least to execute the work of the Constituent Colleges in time. He said that there is a case of extension of 4th class staff and whose livelihood is dependent on the salary of Rs. 8,000/- or 10,000/-. The extension lapsed on 24.11.2016 and the next extension was sent the very next day. Till date, they have not been given extension after 24.11.2016. He said that the matter should be looked into for expediting in giving the extension. About another issue, he said that they had made appointments after getting the approval from the Vice Chancellor. He had not got joined in his College, until the approval was given by the Vice Chancellor. To his knowledge the Vice Chancellor had given the approval on 5.10.2016 and it was conveyed through a message that joining be made and the approval will follow. There are two candidates of non teaching staff who had joined on 18.10.2016. The third employee has been allowed to join on 23.1.2017 as there was no need earlier. We had thought of putting no burden on the college and tried to run the affairs to the extent till it was possible. Now the objection has been raised on the joining of 18.10.2016 that they have joined the duty before the date of approval. The employee has not been given the salary for the last five months and he has paid Rs. 36,000/- out of his own pocket. The child of the employee has been admitted in hospital. The incumbent was mali and had been working as a pruner of gardens, before joining. Before joining the college, he happened to earn Rs. 250/- , 300/- as labourer.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to why the situation was so.

It was explained that the case came to the Registrar the day before yesterday. The Registrar enquired and the audit had raised an objection that they had probably approved on 13.10.2016. The orders which have been issued by the Branch is somewhere around on 23rd and had been delayed from 13 to 23rd and the people who had joined on 6 or 7th retrospectively, the audit had raised an objection how it was possible retrospectively.

The Vice Chancellor said that the case be got approved in anticipation from the Syndicate today.

It was clarified by FDO that actually the problem of delaying of payment of salary of daily wagers will persist unless we dispense with the system of 89 days appointments. He further said that he had already written to the Establishment Branch that they approved an appointment for 89 days. Once the 89 days period is over, then process of further extension get started and it will take another 2-3

months for Establishment Branch to issue fresh orders. Unless those orders are issued, the salary of those people already gets delayed by one or two months because the audit will not accept unless there is a clear cut extension of tenure of the appointment

The Vice Chancellor said that it is alright but one has to have a solution to this problem. He said that one thousand employees in this University are of the kind of 89 days system. A Separate Cell should be created in the Establishment and the Accounts Section whose job is only to look after the 89 days appointments. He said that a large fraction of the work force of the University is on 89 days business.

It was clarified by FDO that it was his submission that the problem will persist.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to why the problem will persist. He said that the problem has been persisting because they were starting the things at 89th day. He said that they will not start the things at 89th day. They will start the things at 59th day so that they have one full month at their disposal.

It was explained that they have been spending so many of man hours just to deal with daily wagers business.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to whether 89 days was any legal thing.

It was clarified by the FDO that there was no legality and he has given in writing that there was no legal sanctity either you appoint a person for 89 days or you appoint a person for one year, both those employees are standing on the same ground. The things are not so that the 89 days persons, it is not that he is not going to be protected by law or one year person will be protected by law.

The Vice Chancellor said that ever since he had come here, it is 89 days.

It was submitted that he had given in writing in this respect to the Vice Chancellor so may times.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to where from the concept of 89 days came in.

It was clarified by the FDO that concept of 89 days was there days back when there was a provision that once an employee completes 240 days in a year, so his services would be termed as regular. But that position of law has already been struck down by the Supreme Court. Now there is no such concept of 240 days. Once a person has been appointed either on the basis of contract or temporarily, he cannot be replaced by another temporary or contract arrangement. That means either they shall have to dispense with the services of those either that person has been appointed on 89 days or one year on the basis of non conduct of duties or by way of replacement by a regular employee. So by appointing a person on 89 days and then every three months giving extension so many times, gives only this type of file work and we are gaining nothing.

The Vice Chancellor asked the FDO where was the note and he had not seen that note.

It was informed that he had talked to the Registrar also.

The Vice Chancellor said that there has to be a formal note and if the formal note was put up, then the formal note must have been brought to the monthly Syndicate meeting.

It was explained that there is a difference in the salaries. The rates are different, one year contract rates are different from the others.

It was explained that this problem will not be addressed until and unless they streamline the system of appointments.

The Vice Chancellor said that 0000the things cannot be done in the House right now. They could form a Sub-Committee which has to get me an answer before the next Syndicate.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the things could be done in the time bound period of one month. He said that he had the question on which he has been questioning is that it might be known to the FDO that the salary of the teachers of the college is not paid before 18th of every month. Even the salary is not paid for two-two months. He said that his objection is that the person who is getting salary from his head on 3rd and the colleges staff itself, is getting salary on 18th. He said that until and unless his college staff gets the salary, those three employees of the University should not be disbursed their salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would resolve it, after the today's discussions, before the end of today's meeting.

It was informed that it was observed that certain employees drawing their salary, against the vacancies at Sikhwala, Kouni, Muktsar, etc., while working here in Chandigarh. The Registrar stopped that. One or two might have escaped his notice, but otherwise he has given written instructions that nobody should be allowed to draw salary against our vacant posts outside Chandigarh while being posted in Chandigarh.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, they do not have all the facts with them at the moment but they have to resolve it and they will try to resolve it as much as they can after the end of the meeting before the February 28th so that the salaries are in place for the end of February because in any case the financial year is ending. All the pending salaries and arrears must be paid within this financial year and it must not go under any circumstances, beyond 15th of March, the day of hearing of court case.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that there is a fundamental rule that the wages of the workers should be paid before his sweat goes dry.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that he just want to add something. The decision they have taken. There are two cases of transfer. One is from Nihalsinghwala to Dharmkot, and another one is from Ferozepur to Dharmkot. Both of them have not been paid salary for the last six

months. Both of them keep on telephoning him and I have assured them that their issue would be raised.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that this has also been complicated by the facts that the Punjab Government has not given approval to the MoU as yet for these two colleges. It is not as yet known as to whether the full money of these colleges would be received or not. Everything was being complicated by the political classes of India. They dictate that do this or that. The DPI of Punjab too has visited the University only once, that is too to get his own work done. He had requested him (the DPI) to come for just one hour for the meeting of 25.2.2017 and he agreed but no one has turned up. The DPI of Chandigarh also did not come. The resolutions were passed by the Senate. So that governance structure of this University actually needs serious reforms. People who hold the first place and the people whose opinion matters when it comes to providing finances to the University, they do not participate in the governance of this University. They only come and they have a big red ink pen and leave after marking a round circle. He said that they keep suffering. So governance reforms are needed. Those who are supposed to be the ex-officio members of the Syndicate on behalf of the governments, which have fifty percent stake in meeting the deficit of this University, either they have to be present in the Syndicate or the Calendar of the University have to be appropriately amended. They shall come themselves or any of their representative(s) would come and would participate in the meetings of the Syndicate because they cannot have this thing. We have archaic structure that the only the DPI can come himself for the Syndicate/Senate meetings and DPI would never come because our meetings lasts from morning to evening. There are no government meetings which last from morning to evening. But we have a system. We take decision by participation, by discussion, debates whatsoever and so on, so that because they should be seen respecting those decisions at the end of it. So there are pluses in our system but there are negatives that the people do not come. Those who feel uncomfortable, they do not come. You come because you have chosen to be here and they have not chosen to be here. They have been just appointed to that office, they are deputed to attend but there is no punishment if they do not come. It is their fancy if they do not want to come, they do not come. So we have to have governance reforms. We have to amend that DPI or representative of DPI can attend the meeting. He or she may not be allowed to vote, when there is a contentious decision. But just as a COE is sitting here, just as FDO is sitting here and just so many others officials of the University are sitting here to aid the process of governance of this University, some representatives should come, sit as a observer(s). We have given them the right to send observers, in the Board of Finance, they should also be compelled to sit here as an observer to this meeting so that we know how to process the things through the governments. But that is a governance reforms issue and that also is a matter at the court. PIL is also on the governance reforms. So at some stage, we would be asked to give our input to the court also on the governance reforms and we should remain mentally prepared that we shall have to give those inputs. Moving on, he said that he is very seriously concerned that the salary to the lowest category employees should remain to be paid regularly. That is the reason that even if we cannot pay the salary to the senior officers of this University for the month of February, and they have already started to work out that if pensioners and the C class and the daily wagers should be paid money somehow or the

other from whatever or wherever, we have the money available in the University budget for the month of February.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu again raised the issue of salary of his college staff. He said that concerned Superintendent should be transferred to his college so that he may come to know the agony of mind in case of non-payment of the salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that his concern is well taken and they should attend to it.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he has to say a little on Item No. 1 and Item No. 2. He said that on Item No 1, the rates of teachers, coding or decoding are fixed by the Syndicate but the rates of other persons, such as waterman should also be fixed by the Vice Chancellor himself. He said that there is a belief among the people that the Syndicate increases the remunerative rates of teachers only and others are ignored. That they are biased.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this part has been got resolved from the Board of Finance although it was not the part of BOF and for the rest, the meeting of the Committee is to be held on 1st of March for the purpose.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there is problem of payment of practical examination. Sometimes the payment does not reach to the claimants and if reaches, it is a very minimal. He suggested that practical examination rates should also be revised.

It was clarified that the payment is credited through online. He said that sometimes it happens that IFSC code is filled wrongly and in such a situation the entries do not get through.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that time and again, they should not be asked to supply account No. and IFSC code. Some permanent database should be made and because of this problem, most of the teachers hesitate to fill the TA forms.

It was explained that the codification of teachers is being done and it will make an end to such problems.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that atleast the Account Nos. and IFSC codes of Senator should be taken because they are asked for every time to supply the same.

It was informed that the data is already fed in his computer system but to tag them with a number and they are working on a scheme of codification. Once that codification comes, the system will become automated.

The Vice Chancellor said that before they forget; there was a long discussion in it if they see in the minutes of the Board of Finance regarding the C class employees. Now the C class employees is an issue because the MHRD has been asking that non teaching employees should be reduced. It is in that background that when the extensions beyond 60 years started to come to him for the C class employees, he passed the matter and put it in the Board of Finance. Now in the Board of Finance, the opinion of the Punjab Government's representative was that the C class is a diminishing cadre in Punjab

Government, the extensions have been stopped. She was of the opinion that the extensions should not be given. But the University has an autonomy and it is written in the Calendar of the University that extension to C class employees may be given. So any categories which has this kind of benefit permitted to them as a part of the Calendar, it is natural for them, he is aggrieved of that. So he is not saying that their concern for the agitation is unjustified but their dilemma is that if the Central government makes it as an issue that because of this we are not doing adequately, they will not consider enhancement in our allocations for this year and if we cannot even make balance of the books by March 31st, in that case the University would be in problem. So he took a plea that let the matter stand and the extensions, new extensions be granted upto March 31st. Let they see as to whether they can balance the books by March 31st. If they can manage balance the books by March 31st, then whatever they have done upto March 31st and will make it till April 30th, between March 31st and April 30th, we will convene a special meeting of the Board of Finance to take a call whether to continue with C class upto the end of next March, by that time, we would know from the Centre as to what the situation is. Things are not minuted to this extent, it is only said. So this is the actual situation that we discussed. Whatever we are talking today, it is going to that Committee. Escape from minuting this, this is what we did, we cannot hide the situation from the Centre. The Punjab Government have given us a directive already. He asked from the University officials, as to whether the Punjab Government has sent any directive that we cannot give extension to the C Class. He asked the officials to submit that paper. He continued saying that this is the situation at the moment that the 'C' class employees who have got the extension up to the age of 65 years, which is 2+2+1 years, in the case of 1 year, it would be over by the end of the year 2017 because he came under pressure from January this year and he had not given the extension to anyone beyond 31st March, 2017. Those who got the extension in 2016, that would end in December 2017. Those who have been given the extension, i.e., 60+2 or 62+2, in the year 2016, all those would come to an end in the year 2018. He did not know what the Central Government would decide, what directive it would give for which they would have to wait and see. If the Central Government says that no extension should be given, it would mean that no extension would be given after the year 2018. In the case of those who have already got the extension, they could not curtail it down. They would have to fix a deadline of the end of 2018 if both the Central Government and Punjab Government put a pressure on the University not to extend. The argument of the 'C' class employees is that if this is the kind of directive from the Central Government that the University is under compulsion, then why is it that the teachers are being given re-employment up to the age of 65 years.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the University should not listen to the directive of the Punjab Government very much for the reason that the Punjab Government also does not care for the University and is not giving much grants due to which the employees also have a resentment. As per the regulations of the Panjab University Calendar, they could grant the extension up to 65 years and the same should be continued until the Centre refuses it. They could cite the reference of the Panjab University Calendar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Mr. Shastri, the representative of the Central Government had said in the meeting of the Board of

Finance that the University should do nothing up to 31st March which could affect a decision by the MHRD or an unfavourable decision is taken.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they could also delay the actions as the Punjab Government also delays the release of the grants.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as is the sentiments of the members, the state of mind of the 'C' class staff is that the teacher is getting the extension up to the age of 65 years for which the University is defending the matter in the Court and if they deprive the 'C' class staff on the asking of the Government whether it is Punjab Government or Central Government. This staff becomes the victim and this is the lowest paid class. The Syndicate should take a decision that the extension of 'C' class staff should be continued and it should be submitted to the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the teachers enter into service after the age of 35 years. The "drivers" of the University are not the non-teaching employees. The "drivers" of the University are the teachers and researchers and they need best of the teachers and the researchers and the service conditions should be equivalent to the best. When the academic evaluation of the University is done, it is vis-à-vis other peer institutions. If they did not have service conditions for the teachers which are comparable to the best, they would not get best teachers. So it is in that background. If the University employees say that if something is not given to them, they would close the University and would do the same as has happened in Punjabi University. These are not the right things, one should not invite harm on their own.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the concern of the 'C' class is that they should be given the extension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the institution survives, only then it could be given. The institution would get the money from the Centre only if its academic standing is high. If the academic standing is high, that is ensured by the good students and the good teachers. If there are no good students and teachers, the University as an institution has no deliverable. Something which is essential for the University in deliverable, that cannot be attacked by anybody. There is no governing body of the University if there are no deliverables on behalf of the University. They should understand the whole thing holistically. The members have to join him in conveying this to all these people, please do it. There is no governing body of this University if there is no University. He is doing everything that he could as a Vice-Chancellor. Still when he enters the University, there is a protest, saying Vice-Chancellor *murdabad*.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it should not be done. They are just giving the opinion that the extension should be given up to the age of 65 years. It is not that the Vice-Chancellor is not giving extension, he is only under the pressure from the Government

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that their view is to consider sympathetically. The reality has to be seen. If there is a pressure, then they have to bow before that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is the Central Government for whose employees, the retirement age is 60 years but for the teachers the retirement age is 65 years. It is the Centre which retires the doctors in the dispensaries at the age of 60 years but allows the doctors in All India Institute of Medical Sciences and PGIMER to go up to 65 years because a doctor who becomes a part of the regular faculty of the PGIMER or AIIMS that is above the age of 35 years. One could not be a faculty member in PGIMER or AIIMS, if one has not MD, DM plus several years of post doctoral experience. They could look at the age of the faculty, there is no person below the age of 35 years who becomes a doctor as he has seen while attending the meeting of the Selection Committees. When the nation after doing everything has decided that the IAS officer would retire after the age of 60 years, but a doctor at AIIMS would retire at the age of 65 years, a Professor in IIT and IIM would retire at the age of 65 years, why it is so. It is so one could not become an IAS officer after the age of 30 years whereas the doctors or teachers could not come before the age of 35 years because the minimum requirements are such. So, they know the writing on the wall. After that on flimsiest of the grounds, they want to collapse the whole system, let the system collapse and none of them would have a job. They have no work to do. There is no University, there is no governing body of this University. Let them hope that the Court would give something favourable by 15th March, they would have balanced the books by 31st March. He would extend it from 31st March to 30th April and could convene a special meeting of the Board of Finance as early as they could and take a call on 'C' class and move on accordingly.

This was agreed to by the members.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should have sympathy with the employees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would have to do it step by step and should not take any wrong step. They have to send a message that the autonomy of the University as envisaged in the Universities Act, 1904 is being handled by one of the oldest institutions of India properly. No other University, which has been established by the Universities Act, 1904, has such a governing body as Panjab University has. They are the only University which till date has the Constituency of the Graduates, College Principals, Technical College Principals, College Teachers, Technical College Teachers, University Teachers, Faculties. This governance structure has not been made by themselves but by the Central Government of 1904. They just brought out an Ordinance from Shimla and only made small tiny-mini changes. The number of nomination of 58 members which was being done during the British period has been reduced to 36 and those 22 were in the form of College Principals, Technical College Principals, College representatives. The number of Registered Graduates (15) is going on since 1904 and they have not touched it. The number of Faculties which elected representatives for the Senate which used to be 5, they have done it to 6 by forming a Combined Faculty and nothing else. If they see the meetings of other Universities, there is no such participation.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in other Universities, the Vice-Chancellor is all-in-all.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Vice-Chancellor goes after completing the term of five years. He has worked in the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research. It seems that it is a private institution but it is not a private institution. It was created by Dr. Homi Bhaba, a Parsi, the nephew of Dorabji Tata. The Institute was started with the help of Dorabji Tata Trust. But when the laws and byelaws of the Institute were framed in the year 1961 it was got written that everything would be decided by the monthly meeting of the faculty and at that time the faculty was only the Professors of the faculty. Today, the Professors have been done away with the every regular member of the faculty is entitled to participate in the monthly meeting of the faculty. Anybody could contribute for the monthly meeting of the faculty. The agenda items are looked at by the Committee of Chairpersons of various departments. Whatever items are worthy of consideration are listed separately and those which are not worthy of consideration are also listed separately that these items were received so that when the meeting of the faculty happens, first of all, the things which are of consensus nature are considered and during zero hour those items which have been listed could be considered which the Chairpersons did not think that this should be discussed in the monthly meeting. All these things are then minuted. The minutes have to be vetted by the body of Chairpersons and then minutes are circulated. One month's time is given to people to opine on that. The minutes are finalized and then sent to the Directors and become the depository for the quarterly meeting of the Governing Council just like the Panjab University Senate. The system that they have is a robust system and this is what the academic institutions of world class are also practicing. In all this cacophony, they should not lose the autonomy. If the autonomy is lost, the University would be worse off than what it is presently.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the cause of concern which seems in this is that basically it could be to try to hijack the autonomy of the institution. In future, they would have to remain prepared as some other big decisions could also be taken and more pressure could be put on.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they are outsourcing the security services. Is it not possible that they could themselves employ the security staff on contractual basis on lesser amount than outsourcing in which their involvement would be more, they would be more accountable and answerable. He remembers that in the past also they had outsourced the security services and the agency had taken the responsibility of the PGIMER and the University also and the result was that it was a flop. Then they started what the present system of contractual is going on. If they could make the appointments on contractual basis and pay the same amount that is to be paid to the agency, according to him, the employees would be more suitable, accountable and committed because the security is a sensitive area especially related with the girl students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Centre's viewpoint is that the number of regular employees be reduced. It is for two reasons, one is to reduce the overall budget on salaries and the second is that the ratio of teaching versus non-teaching. The number of non-teaching staff has to be reduced because there is some statutory requirement that it could not exceed beyond a certain number. Right now, the number that the Government is asking from the University is 1:1.1 for which the University is saying that it is impossible. Then the

Government says 1:1.4 and the University says that it is also impossible. Then the Government asks the University to provide the number for which the University says that it should be the same as prevalent in Aligarh Muslim University and Banaras Hindu University which roughly at the moment is around 2. The number in the University is far beyond 3. So, they have no option but to reduce the number because this number also somewhere has become touchy that they are not seen to be doing something on their own. If they have it on their rolls and this number becomes unfavourable, they have to optimize the strategy that the grant from the Centre is also released. Whenever they ask grant from the Centre, it says that the number of the employees has not been reduced. So as a part of this strategy to reduce the number, all this was done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired whether the budget to be allocated for the outsourcing has been accounted for in the budget or not as the number of employees through outsourcing (100 or 200) is also in the University account.

It was informed that there is a budget provision for 258 posts and other than that they have got provision for outsourcing and only for that the outsourcing is being done. They are not outsourcing the posts which are available in the budget.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he was talking about the outsourcing given to the agency, those employees should be in the hands of the University itself by employing them on contractual basis.

It was informed that the outsourcing is given for outsourcing of services and for that a budget is given that they have to outsource the services. For that particular job, the agency might employ 10 or 15 employees, but the University might have to employ 100 odd persons. At the end of the day, the agency is accountable for all those things in that area and for security he is responsible and they could fix him up.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that previously, this experiment failed during the term of Professor R.C. Sobti as Vice-Chancellor. They employed persons on security through outsourcing and it was a flop. According to him, they should think over it.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether it is true that they did it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma replied that they had done it for one year only.

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

Shri Varinder Singh said that they are paying around Rs.11,800/- to the security staff whereas they are paying Rs.17,000/- to company per person which means a difference of Rs.6,000/- per person.

It was informed that the University security staff is getting the overtime also which is much higher.

Professor Pam Rajput said that it should be examined.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the other benefits are also given.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be examined.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the matter is approved only for one year and then it has to be examined after year.

It was informed that the approval is given only for one year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be examined after one year.

It was informed that at the moment it is till the month of August.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since it is up to the month of August, it could be examined before that time.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as the Vice-Chancellor has said that the Government is saying to reduce the employees, it is only for the teachers whereas whichever is the Government, is increasing all the posts like ETO, PCS, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the MHRD is not asking the University to reduce the teachers and is saying that whatever grant is given, only that would be given. If the University wanted to employ teachers from some other source, the MHRD is not against the University. If there are 700 teachers in the University as on date and if the University wanted to employ more teachers, the Government would not pay for more than the present teachers.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he is talking about the Government Colleges. When he came into service there were 2000 teachers the number of which has now shrunk to 800 only.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is also a fall out of the pay revision.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 13.02.2017 (Items 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7), be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

Assignment of Fellow to Faculties

4. Considered that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name:

Shri V.K. Sibal H.No.29 Sector-5 Chandigarh	1. Laws 2. Languages 3. Design & Fine Arts 4. Business Management & Commerce
--	---

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Fellow be assigned to the faculties mentioned against his name:

Shri V.K. Sibal H.No.29 Sector-5 Chandigarh	1. Laws 2. Languages 3. Design & Fine Arts 4. Business Management & Commerce
--	---

Conferment of designation of Honorary Professor on Dr. O.N. Bhargava

5. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. O.N. Bhargava, FNA, at Centre of Advanced Study in Geology, Department of Geology, Panjab University.

NOTE: 1. The Joint meeting of Academic and Administrative Committee of the Department of Geology in its meeting dated 17.01.2017 (**Appendix-III**) has recommended that Dr. O.N. Bhargava, FNA, be appointed as Honorary Professor in Department of Geology under section 18 of P.U. Act appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

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 Dr. O.N. Bhargava enclosed (**Appendix-III**).

RESOLVED: That, it be recommended to the Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. O.N. Bhargava, at Centre of Advanced Study in Geology, Department of Geology, Panjab University.

Extension in appointment of Dean of Alumni Relations

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

NOTE: 1. The Regulation 1 at page 109 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007:

“The Senate on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate may appoint a Dean of Alumni Relations. Such appointment may be renewed from year to year but the maximum period for which a person may hold this office shall not exceed five (consecutive) years.”

2. Professor Anil Monga, Centre for Police Administration was appointed as Dean Alumni Relations for one year w.e.f. 01.03.2014 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.03.2014 vide Para 9 and Senate in its meeting dated 28.09.2014 vide Para IX under above quoted regulation.

He was further given extension from time to time and the same was approved by the Syndicate/Senate. His present term as Dean of Alumni Relations is going to expire on 28.02.2017.

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

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

Issue regarding to look into the leave cases of teaching staff

7. Considered the minutes (Item Nos. I to III) dated 27.01.2017 (**Appendix-V**) of Committee, 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 the recommendations of the leave cases Committee as per appendix, be approved.

Writing off Books

8. Considered, the recommendations dated 17.01.2017 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.11.2016 (Para 13) (**Appendix-VI**) that only those books which are multiple in copies, be written off and none of the books with sole editions being written off.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are 72 books which are gifted ones. Were there any conditions when the books were gifted? If there are multiple copies, these could be sent to the Regional Centres as Law course is being run there. Law is also run even in the Colleges. These books could be sent there, as by writing off, nothing would come.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the case of multiple copies, one copy could be sent.

Professor Pam Rajput and Principal B.C. Josan said that it is a good suggestion.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that these could be offered to the Colleges also and the physical verification should also be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the physical verification has been done by the Committee. It is written in the minutes that the members of the Committee physically examined all the books. The books be written off and the offer could be given to the Colleges. First, these books have to be written off. As suggested by Dr. Dalip Kumar, the books could be offered to the Regional Centres/Colleges.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that earlier once they had given the books to the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the Dean College Development Council to send a notice to all the Colleges and the Regional Centres in this regard.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that before auctioning, the offer could be made.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that if there are book lovers, they could also get the books free of cost instead of selling the books as waste paper.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could open a small window in the library and all such books could be placed there. Make it a policy that those who visit there, could get the books. A physical space could be created there for all such books and it would be periodically put on the website.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that an exhibition of the books could be held and all the books could be sold.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it is a good idea to put the list of the books on the website.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 17.01.2017 that only those books which are multiple in copies, be written off and none of the books with sole editions be written off.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a letter along with the list of written off books be sent to the Regional Centres and affiliated Colleges as also be put on the PU website so that if the books are useful for them they could take the books free of cost within a month.

Representation of Non-teaching staff of affiliated Colleges for Concession in fees in Self-finance courses

10 Considered letter dated 25.01.2017 (**Appendix-VII**) of Dr. B.C. Josan, Principal, D.A.V. College, Chandigarh, with regard to the representation of the non-teaching staff of the College employees (**Appendix-VII**) seeking concession of 25% in Self-finance courses to the wards of Non-teaching staff of affiliated Colleges studying in the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 15/25.04.2013 (Para 27) (**Appendix-VII**) has resolved that 25% tuition fee concession be extended to the wards of the retired teachers of affiliated Colleges at par with the in-service teachers of such affiliated Colleges in respect of self-financing courses in the University and its Regional Centres.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he agreed with the proposal given by Principal B.C. Josan but does not agree with the fund from which the concession is being given. He has always been opposing this item. This is for the teachers, non-teaching staff and is also given to employees in the State of Punjab. All the students of the Colleges contribute amount of Rs.40-50 for the College Development Fund. Out of that fund, an amount of Rs.10 or 15 lacs goes for this purpose. He had also opposed it in the Senate when this was started. He suggested that the concession could be given only to the students on merit basis whether that student is a ward of the teacher or non-teaching staff. Otherwise a lot of amount from this fund would go towards this concession. The money is collected from the students. If a poor student is contributing an amount of Rs.10/- towards this fund, why the teachers should take the benefit from that fund. His suggestion is that it should be given only on merit. Whenever such an item comes, he has always been saying that it could be given from any other fund other than the College Development Fund. It is for the members whatever they take a decision. This fund is being misused. If a teacher is getting a salary of Rs.1.75 lacs why his/her ward should get the benefit from that fund.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the fund is also not meant for this purpose.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it had been approved that the concession be not given from that fund. He has always been opposing it as also opposing now. Supposing there are 5000 students in a College and contributing an amount of Rs.40/- each and if the teachers take the benefit from that fund which is contributed by the poor students, it is not a good practice.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the students also contribute to the fund of PTA and the salary of the non-teaching staff is also paid out of this fund.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he opposes that also.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the Government Colleges pay the salary from the PTA.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this benefit was given after due consideration and lot of debate and lot of deliberation had taken at that time and only then it was approved. The money is coming from the students.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that in the Senate also he had opposed it. The funds of PTA are also being misused and the students question them as to why the teachers are taking the benefit from this fund. He had said whatever he wanted and it is for the Syndicate to take a decision.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that during a meeting of the College Development Council last year, he had talked about this item that the non-teaching members of the Colleges should also get this 25% concession. When the process for grant of 25% concession in the case of teachers was started, it was already prevailing in the University as there were some funds. As said by Professor Mukesh Arora that the concession should be given on the basis of merit, the students take admission on the basis of merit and it is not that the students just pay the fee and get the admission. He suggested that it should be sent to the College Development Council and be reviewed. After getting reviewed, they could consider it again.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the concession being given to the wards of teachers should be withdrawn. However, the concession could be given to the wards of non-teaching staff.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma also suggested that the concession being given to the teachers should be withdrawn.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as teacher he has never taken such a benefit. Since the teachers are getting a good amount of salary, they should not ask for such benefits.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is unethical.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they could think of granting the benefit to the non-teaching staff.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the non-teaching staff is also getting the salary and the students of labour class are also studying in the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said whether the College Development Council decides the financial things and how it would decide as to how to accommodate it in the fund.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the concession is being given to the deserving students including the handicapped and having some diseases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they would have to see whether surplus money is available or not.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it needs to be reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have also to see as to how many children of the non-teaching staff are studying in the self-financing courses. The financial implications of the same could be done only after data collection.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be reviewed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in the self-financing courses the fee was on the higher side. At that time, the concession was given only in the case of teachers of Panjab University in the first instance. Thereafter, it was extended for the teachers of the Colleges. If they talk about the merit, the merit is at India level but the contributors to the fund are only the Colleges. The teachers and the non-teaching staff of the Colleges also contribute towards the working of the University. If the concession is being given to them, there is no harm in that otherwise they would have to withdraw the concession which is already available to the College teachers as well as University teachers. There is no harm if they extend this benefit to non-teachers of the University also since salary-wise they are in the low class. Since the concession is available to the University teachers.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the concession is available in the case of the University employees.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that since the concession is available to the University teachers, College teachers, there is no harm to extend it to the College non-teaching employees also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to look at the numbers who are entitled to it. Right now, the University teachers and the employees' wards pay lesser amount of fee. So that means that it amounts to lesser amount of income. So, if it is extended to more number of people that means that it would amount to further lesser amount of income. So, it is better that they just have a look at the date as to how many such people are in this. If that number is miniscule over the last five years, it is not going to change. If they also pay lesser amount and if it is not going to make a great deal of difference in the income of the University.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that this facility is available only for the regular teachers and employees.

It was informed that if they talk about giving this benefit to the wards of the non-teaching staff of the Colleges, then this burden is to be borne by the College Development Funds. There is a specific provision in that.

It was informed that there a reserved fund of Rs.10 lacs for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they have to look whether this Rs.10 lacs is going to be neutralized or not and look at the statistics. If the number of people coming under this purview is so small that the expenditure is about Rs.11-12 lacs, then the whole damn thing is only Rs.1-2 lacs.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the number of regular employees is very less.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a fund of Rs.10 lacs stand allocated for this purpose and at the moment, the utilization is of the order of about Rs.3-4 lacs. They should check up as to how many people are there at the moment and find out what would that amount to. If that amount goes from Rs.3-4 lacs to Rs.5-6 lacs, let it be go and leave it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they are giving the grants from different budget heads like poor students, seminar etc.

It was informed that there is a separate fund of Rs.50 lacs for that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there is a cushion and that is adequate to meet the requirement for the existing students, then it is okay.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that maximum of the teachers are not availing this concession.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in principle, it is okay subject to availability of funds.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in the next meeting of the Syndicate, a complete data should be made available.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be brought as an agenda.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that now a question is raised that most of the College teachers do not avail it. He pointed out that some of the Principals and the Deans have availed this concession. As Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he has not availed the concession, similar is the case with him. Why the teachers should utilize the funds collected from the poor students. There is a separate merit for which it is being said that the students take admission on merit. In that merit only the wards of the teachers could compete and not any other student. This needs to be thought of. He is not opposing any teacher or non-teaching.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it should be reviewed.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as said by Dr. Dalip Kumar, it should be sent back.

Principal B.C. Josan said that there are 60000 employees working under the DAV College Management Committee and all the teaching and non-teaching employees are given the concession.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that then the wards of the DAV Colleges non-teaching employees could not take the benefit from Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that then the wards could take from the DAV Management.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they collect the date and if it is very small expense, then it is okay. The item could be deferred in the sense that they have debated and they would look and come back

with the proposal. It is not deferred. Whatever discussion was to take place on the matter, that has taken place. They would look at the data and come with a proactive proposal.

RESOLVED: That the detailed data in this regard be collected and if the concession comes to a very small amount, then it would be looked into by the College Development Council and a proactive proposal be prepared and put before the Syndicate.

**Appointment on
compassionate ground**

11. Considered if, Shri Sanjay Sharma H/o Late Smt. Pushpa Rani, Senior Assistant, Department of Centre for Public Health, be appointed as clerk, on compassionate grounds, by giving him relaxation in age.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.10.2016/27.11.2016 (Para 17) (**Appendix-VIII**) while approving the recommendations of the Committee of compassionate grounds dated 11.08.2016, has also resolved that Mr. Sanjay Sharma H/o Late Smt. Pushpa Rani, Senior Assistant, Centre for Public Health, be also appointed on compassionate grounds.
2. As per application form/record he is Graduate. He was born on 18.12.1969 and his age is 47 years, whereas the age requirement to join Panjab University for the post of Clerk is 18 to 37 years.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-VIII**).

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is right that this item is approved. He had earlier also made a request that an employee namely Shri Rakesh Chander had expired whose son had got the job. He had requested that the dependent had to apply for the house within a year but he could not apply due to some reasons. He had requested for the condonation of delay as the dependent had applied for the house after one year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not understand it. Is there any rule that when one gets a job in Panjab University, he/she has to apply for a house within one year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not so. The employee could apply anytime.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he had requested for the condonation of delay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no issue of condonation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when an employee applies, his/her name is including the list and as per seniority could get the house.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to was that dependent of the employee entitled for house on compassionate grounds.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not allowed.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he is not saying to go against the rules.

RESOLVED: That Shri Sanjay Sharma H/o Late Smt. Pushpa Rani, Senior Assistant, Department of Centre for Public Health, be appointed as clerk, on compassionate grounds, by giving him relaxation in age.

**Formation of
Committee to look into
the quality of
construction**

12. Pursuant to the decision of the Senate dated 17.12.2016 (Para XIV) (**Appendix-IX**), a Committee, be constituted to enquire into the quality of construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University.

NOTE: Lists prepared by the Executive Engineer-I in respect of the building works carried out during the last 16 years by the Division No.I & II and data received from the F.D.O. are enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to have a Committee. The information has already come a Committee could be formed.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it would have been better if the area per sq.ft. had been mentioned and the Committee could look into that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the data which they had asked for has been provided. May he suggest a Committee, let the Dean of University Instruction head the Committee, Professor A.K. Bhandari, under whose term all these things have happened, should act as Co-Chairperson, then Dr. Ajay Ranga as he was vociferous about it, there was a suggestion of having Dr. Suveera Gill as she was a member of one Committee and is well versed with the procedure, could he request Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma as he has a long experience, one of the persons from the buildings constructed in Sector-25, namely Dr. Sanjeev Sharma, UIAMS and the Registrar to be the convener of the Committee.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that two technical members be also put on the Committee and the name of Dr. Amrinder Singh, UIET was suggested by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had thought of requesting Dr. Vats, the retired Principal of Government College of Architecture. He was also thinking of Advisor, Civil Engg. as now they are having a new Advisor to which a few of the members said that the Advisor should not be associated as he is a part and parcel of the working of the XEN office.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that some outside person from the U.T. Administration be taken on the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was also thinking of asking the Director, PEC University of Technology to nominate a Professor of Civil Engineering.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that Dr. Amrinder Singh from UIET be also made part of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was also thinking of having a person from the Senate Dr. Manoj Sharma.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that why the details of the last 16 years have been asked for.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is because they started the construction from the year 2000 when the UIET came into being. The first institution to come up in Sector-25 was University Institute of Engineering & Technology, then UIAMS, then Dental College and then Basic Medical Sciences. If they think proper, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi could also be associated with the Committee. Let the Committee have a look on the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that let this Committee be formed and it could form a Sub-Committee, if needed.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that it should be made time-bound.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that 6 months be given to the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee be given 6 months time from today.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the Committee needed any kind of help, they could have some special invitee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in case the Dean of University Instruction could not find time to chair the Committee, Professor A.K. Bhandari could chair the meeting. It was the reason that he had thought of Professor A.K. Bhandari as Co-Chairperson.

RESOLVED: That the following Committee, be constituted to enquire into the quality of construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University and submit its report within a period of six months:

1. Dean University Instruction (Chairperson)
2. Professor A.K. Bhandari (Co-Chairperson)
3. Dr. Ajay Ranga, UILS
4. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Fellow
5. Dr. Manoj Sharma, Fellow
6. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Fellow
7. Dr. Suveera Gill, UBS
8. Dr. Sanjeev Sharma, UIAMS
9. Dr. Amarinder Singh, UIET
10. Dr. Vats, Principal (Retd.), Chandigarh College of Architecture

11. A nominee of Director, PEC University of Technology preferably a faculty with Civil Engg./Construction background
12. Registrar
Secretary to Vice-Chancellor Convener

Condonation of Delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis

13. Considered, if delay of 5 years and 5 days as on 24.01.2017 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 Mr. Chakarverti, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Sciences, Department of Anthropology be condoned w.e.f. 20.01.2012 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the following reasons:

- (i) Disturbed law and order situation in Jammu and Kashmir state (his study area) coupled with accessibility problems to visit remotely located settlements in hill districts of the state delayed his fieldwork beyond his imagination. It took him nearly two years to complete.
- (ii) Thereafter, in 2011, he joined the Department of Anthropology and Tribal Development, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur, Chhatisgarh. He served the institution until 2012.
- (iii) In 2013, he joined the Department of Anthropology, University of Delhi as an Assistant Professor. These three factors collectively delayed his work.

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 28.11.2016 of Mr. Chakerverti is enclosed (**Appendix-X**).
 2. Mr. Chakerverti was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Science on 20.01.2006. He was granted first extension for one year i.e. up to 19.01.2010 after normal period of 3 years. He was further granted 2nd and 3rd extension (one year each) w.e.f. 20.01.2010 to 19.01.2011 and 20.01.2011 to 19.01.2012.
 3. 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”.

4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that on the one hand, they are going as per the UGC guidelines, which is 8 years and on the other they are allowing it. Its relevance should be examined at least from 2-3 persons whether it is relevant or not.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the reason is that the candidate could not get the related material.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is based on research.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is being done on the recommendations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything is explained in the item.

RESOLVED: That the delay of 5 years and 5 days as on 24.01.2017 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Chakarverti, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Sciences, Department of Anthropology be condoned w.e.f. 20.01.2012 on the basis of grounds cited in his request and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision.

Request of Shri Kuldeep Singh to appear in LL.M examination as a private candidate

14. Considered request dated 21.01.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) of Shri Kuldeep Singh S/o Shri Dharam Singh R/o 1410, Ground Floor, Audit Colony, Sector- 41-B, Chandigarh for allowing him to appear in Master of Laws (LL.M.) examination as a private candidate, treating as a special and deserving case on account of disable person with disability with 100 % deafness:

- NOTE:**
1. Shri Kuldeep Singh was informed vide No.856ERI dated 22.06.2006 (**Appendix-XI**) that his representation for appearing in LL.M. Examination cannot be acceded to, under the existing regulation 3.1 at page 2 of P.U. Calendar Volume-II, 2005.
 2. Regulation 3.1 appearing at page 396 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 reproduced as under (related to Master of Laws):

“The examination in Part I/II as the case may be, shall be open to a student who has submitted his name to the Controller of Examinations by the Head of the University

Department of Laws and produces the following certificates signed by the Head of the University Department:-

- (i) Of good character;
- (ii) Of having remained on the rolls of the University Department for the academic year preceding the examination.
- (iii) Of having attended not less than 66 per cent of the lectures delivered to his class in each of the subjects;
- (iv) Of having satisfactorily done his class assignments.

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could allow it as per the Regulations as it is related with LL.M. He suggested that it should be sent back to the Department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the department has considered and the request is not acceded to as per the existing Regulations.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that a similar case of Mukerian, if possible, be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the candidate had attended the classes of LL.M. in 1993 and did not appear in the examination. The candidate met with an accident in 2002 and became completely deaf and says that if some relaxation is given, he could clear the examination. So, this is what he is saying.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired as to what the Bar Council of India says whether a person could do LL.M. privately. Would the degree be recognized?

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the candidate do appear under the golden chance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the problem is that for allowing LL.M. examination privately, there is a technical hitch. He would put it back to the Dean, Faculty of Law and the Chairpersons of both the Departments, i.e., UILS and Laws and let their recommendations come.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a note, as the Vice-Chancellor had said, should also be given whether the candidate could appear as a private candidate or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the concern of the candidate is genuine but it is to be seen whether they could do it. Let the Controller of Examinations be also associated with it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the rules of Bar Council of India should also be looked into.

RESOLVED: That a Committee of the Dean, Faculty of Laws, Chairperson, Department of Law, Director, UILS and the Controller of Examinations be constituted to examine the matter and submit the report.

Status of two industrial plots at Panipat

15. Considered minutes of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, visited at Panipat on 10.11.2016 (**Appendix-XII**) to have an on spot assessment of status/conditions of the two industrial plots E-68 & E-69 belonging to Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the Registrar had visited the site, he could give the details.

It was informed that the land is at a prime location. It was found that the land could be used on commercial basis. In front of the land, there are textile and other factories. One commercial proposal could be that the land be utilized for the purpose of warehousing for these factories. The building is in dilapidated condition and it is also being misused by the people around. The University is also wasting money on the security guard as the security guard was also not available on the date of visit. Regarding the price of the land at that point of time, because of the demonetization effect, market price has dropped thus it was not the right time to dispose off the land. Earlier, the Syndicate had taken a decision to dispose off the land. As of now, they could not make an assessment as to how much could be the cost of sale. It might be about around Rs.5 crores or so as per the current market rate.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it might be about Rs.10 crores. They could wait for some time.

It was informed that as an alternative, they could consider have a build-operate system for a warehouse.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the land is situated in the industrial area and nearby Model Town which is also a posh area.

It was informed that the another option was of leasing it for a banquet hall.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should not go for the banquet hall.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said they could think of having a warehouse there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to see that if the land is sold for Rs.5 crore and they get an interest of 8%, they could get an annual income of Rs.40 lacs. Could they earn such a income from a warehouse. It could not be so. So, it is better to sell of that and use

the money for some hostels. Whoever had donated the land, must have given the same for the purpose of education and the purpose could be solved or this amount could be used for providing the scholarship to the SC/ST fund.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the terms and conditions of the donation should be seen.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that a trust in the name of the donor could be formed.

It was informed that the discussion had taken place in the earlier meeting of the Syndicate and after lot of deliberation, it was approved that they must sell off the land.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the meantime, a board be put up there and the security guard be appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should use the land so that the purpose of providing education to the students is served.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that a trust be formed in the name of the donor or a building could be named after him as the amount of Rs.5 or 10 crores is a big amount.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the terms and conditions of the donation must be seen.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could also construct a student centre in Sector-25.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if some other persons also wanted to make donations, that could also be explored.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that normally when the land is donated to the universities, some conditions are put that the land could not be sold.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that from the educational point of view, they could not establish anything there on behalf of the University as it is not their jurisdiction.

A few of the members suggested that they should wait at least for a year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they assumed the responsibility that the matter has been discussed in this Syndicate and before the term of this Syndicate ends, they would dispose off the land. It was agreed to by the members. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma would look into all the matters related with it. Shri Jarnail Singh would also assist in the matter.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it would be better to sell off the plots separately as it would be easier and if some purchaser could buy both the plots, the same could also be sold off to a single purchaser.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Shri Jarnail Singh and Dr. Subhash Sharma to assume the

responsibility to look into the purpose for which the land could be utilized.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the photographs of the area should also have been provided.

It was informed that the photographs would be provided to the members.

RESOLVED: That the following Committee be constituted to examine the purpose for utilization of the funds so to be generated through the sale of the plots in accordance with the terms and conditions of the donor, if any, and submit the report:

1. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
2. Shri Jarnail Singh
3. Dr. Subhash Sharma

**Minutes of the
Committee regarding
changes in existing Ph.D.
Guidelines, 2014**

16. Considered minutes dated 27.12.2016 and 17.01.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine and recommend the changes, if any, in the existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines, 2014 in accordance with the U.G.C. minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil/Ph.D degree Regulations 2016 published on 05.07.2016 (**Appendix-XIII**).

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the year 2014, the University prepared the guidelines in view of the UGC Guidelines. The Committee has incorporated its suggestions to the UGC Guidelines of July 2016. He suggested that the guidelines which had been circulated by the University, that has not been given the weightage here and many of the things were done for the Colleges and the College teachers also got the promotions in terms of their enhancement in the knowledge. All those factors have not been suggested by the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that he (Dr. Dalip Kumar) is making very sweeping statement. He wished he had come out with some written document so that they could take a decision. They could come back to it in the next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that we would give them in writing what is to be done, because otherwise it will not make any difference.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a Sub-Committee should be formed that would see it the next time because he has been sensing two three things in it.

The members felt that there were some questions which needs further clarifications.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee comprising of Dr. Dalip Kumar, Professor Pam Rajput, Dr Shaminder Singh Sandhu and Professor Navdeep Goyal would give input to him. He said that do it as the agenda is to be circulated a week in advance. He said that they could give them till the next fortnight and the next meeting of the Senate is on 26th of March, 2017. He asked the members should they have a meeting of the Syndicate in March or they hold the meeting of

March Syndicate on April 1st, 2017 because the Court decision would come by 15th March, 2017.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the meeting of Syndicate could be convened one or two days after 15th of March.

The Vice Chancellor said that on 17th, 18th and 19th of March, he would not be here. He informed that on 17th, he would be in Mumbai and he would be coming back on 19th of March in the afternoon. He further stated that they could have the meeting after 4 p.m.

The members agreed that the convening of the meeting afternoon shall have no problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that the meeting of the Syndicate would be on Monday, the 20th March, 2017 at 4.00 p.m. and by that time, the Court decision would come.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he had to make one more request to the Vice Chancellor that he had made so much efforts that for the Ph.D. the colleges, the guides have been decided by the UBS of the faculty of Commerce, but the seats have not been allocated despite of the requests made so many times. He said that particularly the seats are allotted by the UBS. He requested that as the guides have been approved by the UBS and further said that the UBS be requested to allow allocation of seats. It is only then the benefit of doing Ph.D would be there.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Centre of Commerce should also be created.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the best way to deal with the suggestion as given by Dr. Arora is that the problem is that only the University faculty should decide in the matter. He said that whenever the meeting in this regard takes place, one representative from the Colleges should be there.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that one representative from the college has already been included in the Committee.

The members suggested that atleast two members from the colleges should be there in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that DAV and SD College have strong hold in commerce, one representative from each would there be in the Committee.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it is good that the issue has been raised by Dr. Dalip Kumar but it is requirement of the college teacher and the Vice Chancellor was doing a lot for them. He said that it is seen by subject-wise in the University, however, it could be mistaken on his part, the University has been having 16 research students whereas, as per his view, the number cannot be more than 8. He said that he could name the person who is having more than the prescribed numbers of Ph.D. students and they could check it. He said that Punjabi department could be checked. He said that there are 3 Professors in Punjabi department and research scholars are 16. He said that 6 students of one guide has cleared the test. It

is objected if there comes only one student from the college side. He said that these committees would be of no use if the nodal agencies shall create hindrances. He said that atleast two members from the colleges should be there in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said it is the old practice which is in place.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that to his view basically it should be proportional. If there are nine members, there would be 3 members from the colleges and in case of 6 members, there would be 2 members from the college side. It should not be such that from the colleges there are 2 members and from the University the number is 11.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would make no difference. The Only thing is that let it be known what is happening and only then they could discuss further.

RESOLVED: That the following Committee be constituted to correct the guidelines proposed by the Committee:

1. Professor Pam Rajput
2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
3. Dr. Dalip Kumar
4. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu

Waiving off Market Rent to be charged from Ms. Alka Tuli W/o Late Shri Naresh Tuli

18. Considered if, ten time revised market rent to be charged from Ms. Alka Tuli W/o Late Shri Naresh Tuli on account of unauthorized occupant of H.No. T-1/10, Sector-25 allotted to her husband and retained by her from 02.12.2016 to 30.12.2016, be waived off and normal rent be charged from her for the said period.

RESOLVED: That ten times revised market rent to be charged from Ms. Alka Tuli W/o Late Shri Naresh Tuli on account of unauthorized staying in H.No. T-1/10, Sector-25 allotted to her husband and retained by her from 02.12.2016 to 30.12.2016, be waived off and normal rent be charged from her for the said period.

Issue regarding adoption of UGC notification dated 20.07.2016

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they shall have to see one thing it could be adopted in principle, but how to implement that. He further suggested that a Committee should be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor A.K. Bhandari was requested in the matter. He said the whole idea is the following that Government of India wants a very large number of courses for which all this should be done and it should be done by experienced teachers and there is a competition also because many people are offering. So

when UGC Chairman came to Chandigarh last time and it was discussed at that level. After that it has also been discussed during a workshop organized by the USOL where Professor Bhandari made a presentation. He said that the PPT of Professor Bhandari is with him and he would forward each one of them what the Professor Bhandari has proposed to be done on behalf of the University, by the University teachers as well as the teachers from affiliated colleges. In particular, he would try to involve retired teachers of the colleges although this is not in the agenda. As per agenda it has only to be done by serving teachers. He said that in fact the retired teachers, emeritus teachers, retired teachers of the colleges, they have more time and experience at this disposal. But it is not free, some honorarium is also paid for this. But it has to be a quality job. If it is done, it is a quality job done on behalf of the University that is also ultimately incorporated as the part of the USOL agenda of the University. It will eventually amount to more number of people enrolling at Panjab University USOL. If more number of people enroll at Panjab University USOL, income of the USOL would go on. If the Income of the USOL goes up, suppose it is doubled, then I have proposal to be made to the MHRD that if the income of the USOL doubles up, all that additional income should be used only to recruit teachers for the University to fill up those positions which are lying unfulfilled. He said that the Centre shall not give money to recruit more teachers, but if via this agenda, the income of the University could be enhanced, all that additional quantum should go towards recruiting more teachers for the University so that the student-teacher ratio and teaching and non teaching employees ratio could be improved. So this is a very good item and he would send them what Professor A.K.Bhandari presented.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that let them know in brief what the proposal was.

The Vice Chancellor said that the number of students enrolling in the colleges are desiring to enroll in the colleges is going to enhance by the factor of enhancing the seats but the colleges have not so much capacity. Neither the colleges have financial resources. So the massification of the higher education could only be done by the distance learning. He said that what the distant learning mode of today is that to send the lessons. But if they have a high quality lessons, prepared on behalf of the given open learning school and those lessons are then used by that school of open learning, and the people who prepared these lessons and if they are available to monitor it, then those teachers are available to distant learning people.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that somewhere it has been written that it will be free of cost. He questioned as to what was that.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not free of cost. If you can read by downloading itself, then you will be given the degree from somewhere. If the lessons have been prepared by the more contribution of our University teachers, you could enroll at Delhi, you could enroll at Kurukshetra, you can enroll at anywhere but if more number of University teachers have participated in this experiment, and if we advertise that from our USOL that such and such persons have made these lessons, in our USOL those persons would be involved which belong to our University. More people will enroll knowing that our teachers have participated more.

Principal Gurdip Sharma enquired as to what would be the role of the Colleges as the letter has been sent to the colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that the College teachers could participate in it. They can prepare lessons, because this is for Undergraduate students. The University teachers cannot typically prepare lessons for undergraduate students. He further said that the college teachers are more suitable. Larger number is of B.A. and B.Sc. level.

Principal Gurdip Sharma again enquired as to how it was different from the USOL, is it different for only e-learning content. He further said that earlier they were sending the lessons, now they would send the lecture.

The Vice Chancellor said that these lectures are available on on-line and their teachers shall have to prepare it accordingly.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the relevant material prepared by Professor Bhandari in Power Point would be sent to them through email.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that they should be informed somewhat about Swayam.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Bhandari has prepared the good presentation he has also presented at ICSSR.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that even in the fourth amendment, there has been given more weightage to the e-learning.

The Vice Chancellor said that the license can also be used as a part of University teaching. They can use it here also. Actually fast forward is that if the University is not allowed to take teachers, then to sustain the responsibilities on behalf of the University, one model which is being practiced in few Universities of Andhra Pradesh, some teachers of a subject and some mentors would be there. Teacher would deliver the lecture, mentor learns this lesson which are uploaded. So if a given department part of the teaching is the deliverance of lectures by whatever faculty it is done, part of the learning is exposing you to this e-learning but assisted e-learning. Assisted e-learning is that there is a e-classroom in the department, the students come, the mentor has already learnt that lesson. So now the Mentor is there, students are there, class learns not for the fifty minutes but the class learns for one hours and thirty minutes. The lesson is being progressed as the lecture is being delivered. He said that they can have their Ph.D. students as the Mentors. The Ph.D. students could be enrolled in the department as Mentor. These Mentors learns those lessons. They see the lessons once or twice. There happens to be a class and the students happen to come, then the lecture is being given, just a Mentor is sitting there. The lesson goes on. It is run for 10 minutes. Mentor is there. Somebody has a doubt. If the lesson is of 50 minutes, the class runs for one hour and thirty minutes. The class is of forty minutes, in that forty minutes whatever has been done in those fifty minutes, that would be discussed and would be clarified, who will clarify, that will be done by the Mentor. But the every department has to have that server on the table of every student , computer is there, lessons are downloaded. The lesson is going on the screen and on the server also.

Principal Gurdip Sharma enquired as to what about the examination.

The Vice Chancellor said that the examination would be as per the syllabi. He further said that with that result that you need not those many teachers. Suppose in an equilibrium state, there remains that many teachers which are very much there. We decide to recruit forty percent teachers as Mentors, they are not being paid full salary. They are being paid salary of a Mentor. Mentor means somewhat low salary. In today's state, whatever is being paid to the research scholar, thirty thousand will be paid to them. He said that rupees 30,000/- is given to the Mentor, he is doing the Ph.D. as well and he is mastering the lesson also. He said that there is a Professor and there are two Mentors attached to him, then there is a class. So part of the class is the class room teacher by a Professor. Some part of the syllabi is covered via this, that is by the Mentors. So total number of teaching requirement would come down. This has been practiced in the few technical Universities in Andhra Pradesh.

Principal Gurdip Sharma again said that as has been stated by the NAAC about the slow and good learners that those are the good learners should teach the slow learners.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had visited the Andhra Pradesh and what they do, is that everyone has a server and the lesson. The lesson has been downloaded and after the class, the lesson is very much with you. If you want to get clear the doubt of that lesson, you can do so in that class of forty minutes. Once there is a designated lesson, you can go to the Mentor again. He said that every department has to have a classroom in which on every desk, the lesson is loaded. Actually the full course gets loaded. You can do with your own speed. There is a Mentor available to you to answer all the questions. If that course has been devised by the teacher which is very much from here, but if we are playing the lesson prepared by our own teacher or a teacher of the college from the city, that would be run where that teacher would be available.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the system has become totally like foreign.

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

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

Amendment in eligibility criteria for admission to M.A. Women's Studies & M.A. in Public Administration

20. Considered if,

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

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join:</p> <p>(a) Bachelor's degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(b) B.A. (Pass) with at least 45% marks in Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology, or Psychology or Gandhian Studies or Geography or Philosophy. The candidates with these subjects be given preference in admission.</p>	<p>A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join:</p> <p>(a) Bachelor's degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(b) B.A. (Pass) with at least 45% marks in Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology, or Psychology or Gandhian Studies or Geography or Philosophy or Human Rights & Duties.</p> <p>b(i) Subject weightage will be given to those candidates who have studies any one of the Subjects as mentioned in para (b) above at Undergraduate level for Three years or Six Semesters consecutively (except as provided in Rule 7.3 (b) of Handbook of Information 2016 page no. 245 which reads as "Some Universities award B.A./B.Sc. degree on the basis of aggregate marks of B.A./ B.Sc. 2nd and 3rd years. In that case the aggregate marks and the marks of the relevant subject in which the applicant is seeking admission, will be considered on the basis of marks obtained in B.A./B.Sc. 2nd and 3rd years only for calculation of the basic merit marks and in the relevant subject.)"</p> <p>b(ii) Weightage for Honours would be given to those candidates</p>

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
	who have got B.A. with Honours degree in any one of the following subjects only: Women's/ Gender Studies, Public Administration, Political Science, History, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Gandhian Studies, Geography, Philosophy and Human Rights & Duties.

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

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>11.1. A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:-</p> <p>(i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.</p> <p>(iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(1) (a) For the Public Administration course, a person who has passed one of the following examinations shall also be eligible:-</p> <p>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology or History.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(1)(a) For the Public Administration course, a person who has passed one of the following examinations shall also be eligible:-</p> <p>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology.</p>

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council & Regulations Committee has approved the

recommendation (No.11&15) of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016 (**Appendix-XV**).

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

RESOLVED: That

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

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join:</p> <p>(c) Bachelor's degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(d) B.A. (Pass) with at least 45% marks in Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology, or Psychology or Gandhian Studies or Geography or Philosophy. The candidates with these subjects be given preference in admission.</p>	<p>A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join:</p> <p>(c) Bachelor's degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(d) B.A. (Pass) with at least 45% marks in Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology, or Psychology or Gandhian Studies or Geography or Philosophy or Human Rights & Duties.</p> <p>b(i) Subject weightage will be given to those candidates who have studies any one of the Subjects as mentioned in para (b) above at Undergraduate level for Three years or Six Semesters consecutively (except as provided in Rule 7.3 (b) of Handbook of Information 2016 page no. 245 which reads as "Some Universities award B.A./B.Sc. degree on the basis of aggregate marks of B.A./ B.Sc. 2nd and 3rd years. In that case the aggregate marks and the marks of the relevant subject in which the applicant is seeking admission, will be considered on the basis of marks obtained in B.A./B.Sc. 2nd and 3rd years only for calculation of the basic merit marks and in the relevant</p>

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
	<p>subject.)”</p> <p>b(ii) Weightage for Honours would be given to those candidates who have got B.A. with Honours degree in any one of the following subjects only: Women’s/ Gender Studies, Public Administration, Political Science, History, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Gandhian Studies, Geography, Philosophy and Human Rights & Duties.</p>

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

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>11.1. A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:-</p> <p>(i) A Bachelor’s degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.</p> <p>(iii) Master’s degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(2) (a) For the Public Administration course, a person who has passed one of the following examinations shall also be eligible:-</p> <p>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology or History.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(2) (a) For the Public Administration course, a person who has passed one of the following examinations shall also be eligible:-</p> <p>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology.</p>

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council & Regulations Committee has approved the recommendation (No.11&15) of the Faculty of Arts dated 19.12.2016 (**Appendix-XV**).

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

**Recommendations of
Empanelment Committee
dated 09.02.2017
regarding health package
rates**

21. Considered if:

- (i) new package rates as approved by the Empanelment Committee dated 09.02.2017 (**Appendix-XVI**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor be approved in order to engage reputed hospitals on empanelment, so that reasonably affordable and quality treatment be obtained by the P.U. beneficiaries.
- (ii) permission, be granted to invite expression of interest and initiate other procedural formalities, so that MOU may be entered with reputed hospitals willing to provide treatment as per approved rates.

NOTE: 1. The decision of the Syndicate dated 16.03.2013 (Para 27) with regard to empanelment of reputed hospitals enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).

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

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that recently the Government has made capping of artery stents under pharmaceutical norms, the maximum limit of Rs. 20,000/- has been fixed and minimum limit is of Rs. 8500/-. In the agenda, it has been given 85,000/- the maximum and Rs.,15,000/- as the minimum. We shall have to keep it the same. These are the vaccines of government and of NPPA, in that background they have to see another medicines also if such a fall down has come. These are the directions of the government issued on February 13.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what they will do to this item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could approve it subject to the condition that if there are any directions from the Government, that will be followed.

The Finance & Development Officer said that it can be approved and the Vice Chancellor could be authorized to implement it on the basis of the revised rates.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the regulations of NPPA should be incorporated with it.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be done so.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized, on behalf of the Syndicate, for modification in the approved rates as per NPPA.

**Recommendation of the
Committee dated
30.01.2017**

22. Considered minutes dated 30.01.2017 (Appendix-XVII) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the grounds of extreme hardship cases for condonation of shortage of attendance.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 30.1.2017, as per appendix, be approved.

**Condonation of Delay in
the submission of Ph.D.
thesis**

23. Considered if, delay of 2 years 9 months and 18 days as on 15.02.2017 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Tina Singh enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Economics, be condoned w.e.f. 28.04.2014 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to the following reasons:

“The title of her thesis is ‘A Comparative Study of Structural Change in an agriculturally and an Industrially Developed State of India’ which deals with the structural changes in workforce in one of its chapters. One major reason for delay has been the non-availability of sectoral data on workforce for Punjab, Gujarat and India for the latest Census report (2011). During the initial phase of the research work, it was decided to procure the data on workers classified by industrial category from the Office of Registrar General and Census Commissioner for the years 1981, 1991, 2001, and 2011. But, unfortunately this office has till date not published the latest data for 2011 which is why after prolonged wait, the data source of one entire chapter was changed. The new data source was shifted to NSSO. The data from NSSO (unlike Census) involves cumbersome procedure of data extraction, which is why it took her longer to compile it, thereby repeating the entire exercise of compilation and analysis of the chapter on workforce all over again.

Apart from this, she had started working at the Directorate of Education (SGPC), Chandigarh in 2011. Her Job obligations did not allow her to devote full time on her research work.

On the personal front, her mother is suffering from Parkinson’s disease. She also suffered a stroke in 2015. Her health issues have played a role in my inability to devote full focus on her Ph.D. work.”

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 03.02.2017 of Ms. Tina Singh enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).
 2. Ms. Tina Singh was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts on 28.04.2008. She was granted three year extension up to 27.04.2014.
 3. 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”.**

4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

RESOLVED: That the delay of 2 years 9 months and 18 days as on 15.02.2017 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Tina Singh enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Economics, be condoned, w.e.f. 28.04.2014 on the basis of grounds cited in his request and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision.

Promotion Policy for Faculty of Dental Institute

24. Considered minutes dated 14.02.2017 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to look into the issue of Policy for promotion of teaching faculty working in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. A Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal was constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 1/15/28/29.05.2016 (Para 70) (**Appendix-XIX**) to go through the promotion policy recommended by the Committee and suggest the required changes, if any.
 2. Since no recommendations of the above committee were arrived at, a new Committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for the purpose

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that actually then had started meeting at 5 p.m. and it continued and it was discussed upto 8 p.m. after that we gave responsibility that this is to be done. Some mistakes have been committed and something has been left out.

The Vice Chancellor said that Okay, then they would come back next time, and in the next meeting things would be set right.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is going to suggest one thing that the matter should not be given to the large Committee. Two three members could be taken from here. The basic data was brought by Professor Karamjit Singh. He said that Karamjit Singh could be included and one or two members could be included from here. The three members Committee shall set it right.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that someone from Dean medical should be included.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he himself, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Professor Karamjit Singh and Dean medical could be taken.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is requiring this because he has to put it into the Board of Finance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the Syndicate authorizes, the Committee itself be authorized that in principal, it is approved and it be resubmitted after making corrections.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Navdeep Goyal would become busy.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said most of the work has been done, only a little work is to be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that you (Professor Navdeep Goyal) would get it done.

RESOLVED: That the following Committee be constituted to suggest the changes, if any, in the proposed promotion policy:

1. Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences
2. Dr. Dalip Kumar
3. Professor Navdeep Goyal
4. Shri Varinder Singh
5. Professor Karamjeet Singh

D.R. (Estt.)

Convener

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Committee be authorized, on behalf of the Syndicate, to take the decision.

Fee Structure of Hostels and Guidelines for Working Women Hostel

25. Considered:

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

RESOLVED: That

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

Issue regarding deputation/lien

26. Considered minutes dated 21.02.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to prepare a proposal pursuant to MHRD circular F.No.8-9/2008-TS.1 dated 13.10.2014 (**Appendix-XXI**), regarding deputation/lien, to take up academic assignments at the newly established Central Education Institutions.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.07.2015 (Para 3) (**Appendix-XXI**) has considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 09.07.2015 (**Appendix-XXI**) for adoption of circular F.No.8-9/2008-TS.1 dated 13.10.2014 issued by MHRD and resolved that a Committee, comprising Syndicate members, 1-2 teachers representatives, be constituted under the Chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction, to look into the issue in its entirety, and make a proposal for consideration by the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 21.02.2017 regarding adoption of MHRD circular F.No.8-9/2008-TS.1 dated 13.10.2014 related with deputation/lien, to take up academic assignments at the newly established Central Education Institutions, as per appendix, be approved.

Request of Law students to attend the classes in Chandigarh

27. Considered:

- (i) request 05.07.2016 (**Appendix-XXII**) of Mr. Shubham Bhumla, student of B.A. LL.B 3rd Semester, PURC, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur that he be allowed to attend classes at UILS P.U. Chandigarh instead of PURC, Bajwara.

NOTE : Medical Certificate of Mr. Shubham Bhumla duly recommended and verified by the Chief Medical Officer, Institute of Health, P.U., is enclosed **(Appendix-XXII)**.

The Committee in its meeting dated 02.02.2017 **(Appendix-XXII)** constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to evaluate the applications of the students from law courses for transfer from one institution to the other within the Panjab University system of Institutions has recommended that the case of Mr. Shubham Bhumla be placed before the Syndicate as the same has been recommended by the CMO.

- (ii) requests **(Appendix-XXII)** of Ms. Mehr Singh, SSGRC Hoshiarpur and Shri Edward Augustine George, Rayat College of Law Rail Majra that they be allowed to attend classes at UILS, P.U. Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee in its meeting dated 21.02.2017 **(Appendix-XXII)** constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to evaluate the applications of the students from law courses for transfer from one institution to the other within the Panjab University system of Institutions has recommended that the case of above two candidates be placed before the Syndicate.
 2. The decision of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) with regard to evaluate the applications of the students of law courses for transfer from one institution to the other with the Panjab University System of Institution is enclosed **(Appendix-XXII)**.
 3. Office note containing the observations of the Registrar enclosed **(Appendix-XXII)**.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that actually two issues have been raised in the item. Two cases have come as agenda item but when we look at the proceedings of the Committee, a lot of things which had been said by the Syndicate, are not there. For example on page 189 and 190, one item has been recommended. Then about one Amandeep Singh, it has been said that it is to be recommended only if the seats are available. He said that this needs to be seen.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that he wants to say something on the issue. He said that from this Committee it appears that the case of hardship comes once in a while, after every 3-4 years. He further

said that it is only in one year duration, there are coming 5-7 cases of Law Department only.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are not 5-7 but these are 50-60.

Principal Jarnail Singh continued saying that whether the cases of hardship are actually there or this practice prevails only in Law Department. He said that there are other courses also. The admission by students is taken at some other place and after making some grounds they try to be shifted here. He said that if the genuine hardship case is there, that could be accommodated. Otherwise this practice should be discouraged, this was his opinion.

The Vice Chancellor said that that is why whatever the cases he had permitted in the past, he had a query whether these were for one semester or so.

The members said that it is for one semester only and its fee is of Rs. 20,000/- .

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that 20,000/- are for the students of Regional Centres and fee for affiliated colleges is Rs. 100000/- for one semester.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the meaning of the statement of Principal Jarnail Singh is that there are courses other than the Law courses where such hardship cases could be there.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that it looks like this and in other course no one is applying for shifting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for the migration , system has been devised that the procedure is not so simple. That is ultimately being checked by CMO and the PGI and many a cases have been denied.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that let they do the decision whatever they want, but he wanted to ask one question that he is astonished to note that in Economics, Political Science or any other department such cases come. Why the curiosity only is in the Law.

The Vice Chancellor said that no student of Chandigarh would like to take admission in M.A. Economics, or Punjabi at Muktsar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the student have to pay Rs. 2 lacs for migration, nobody would like to come here. He further said that there is item 7 and he is not saying as to this is to be done or not. Now they have fixed the fee of Rs. 1 lac and student says that he cannot pay. Because one we have approved the policy, what do we have to do with this. The fee concession was to be given or not, that item had to come to Syndicate, but that did not come.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that as has been rightly said by Professor Navdeep Goyal that if one wants to come to 3rd or 4th Semester, there should be no objection.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the NRI seats could be converted and the sufficient money would come.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for one time, migration fee could be charged to any limit. If they allow migration and supposedly the migration fee is Rs. 1 , that no one could stop.

The members suggested that migration fee for different courses should be fixed differently.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that by forming a Committee, the migration be allowed in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology and the Dental College as there are so many seats lying vacant and the Vice-Chancellor had said that he would form a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he as well as the Committee could not violate the law of the land. The financial problems of the University could not be solved with the income of Rs.1 or 2 lacs. They should not invite criticism that they have become a soft State that by having approached the Syndicate members and forming of a Committee, the admission is made. It should not be done.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it could be done only if the law permits.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, okay, he would form a Committee and they have to be careful.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they have to keep the interest of the University in view.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that what Shri Jarnail Singh has said, it is right. A Pandora box might not open with it. It is not difficult to justify a genuine case.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the migration has been disallowed by the Supreme Court.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should not favor anybody.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that during the 1980s, some students through pressure had migrated to the PEC University of Technology, but it was disallowed by the Supreme Court.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he meant to say that the migration of such a student could be made who was above the last admitted candidate in the merit list.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as per MCI regulations, there is no migration facility.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whichever is not allowed as per rules, that could not be done.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether the fee concession is not to be allowed in the Item No.27.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that fee concession be not allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now they are left with three jobs. His suggestion is that after the lunch they go to the auditorium in Sector-25 and then come back.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that during the lunch time, the issue related with the salary of the employees appointed on 89 days could also be discussed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to resolve this issue.

RESOLVED: That on the recommendations of the committee, Mr. Shubham Bhumla , Ms. Mehr Singh, and Shri Edward Augustine George be allowed to attend classes at UILS for one semester as per approved policy and no concession in fee be allowed.

When the meeting resumed after the lunch, Shri Jarnail Singh said that they appreciate the efforts being made for the construction of the auditorium.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that the regular update should be given after every month.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to help in having an appointment with the HRD Minister.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Minister could be invited on the teachers' day.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the HRD Minister could visit the Panjab University anytime during the week of Teachers' Day.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor to send a formal request to the Minister, a copy of the same be given to him and he would pursue it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the tentative dates of the visit could be fixed on 9th or 10th September.

Routine and formal matters

28. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xiv)** on the agenda was read out and ratified, viz. –

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following recommendations (No. I, III & IV) of the meeting dated 23.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXIII**), pursuant to issue raised in the meeting of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016:
- (I) **Grading System for Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) for B.Sc (Hons.) Courses under the framework of Hons. School System at Panjab University.**

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

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

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

Once the Letter grades and Numerical grade points are assigned to all subjects, the SGPA (Semester Grade Point Average) and the CGPA (Cumulative Grade point Average) can be subsequently calculated according to the UGC guidelines mentioned on page numbers 5 & 6 of the UGC document, *9555132_Guidelines.pdf*. It should be included in this form in the final declared result along with the grade conversion table 1. Minimum criterion in terms of Credits has to be defined for promotion to next year as well as obtaining a degree. In principle, the calculation for SGPA should be performed for all the students at the end of every semester. In case some students fail in certain examination(s), the SGPA calculations have to be recalculated after their reappear examination. For a student failing in a subject, the numerical grade point earned in the subject will be counted as zero for the calculation of SGPA and CGPA in the numerator of the assigned formulae. However, the minimum credits required for all the subjects should be considered in the denominator of the formulae.

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

Suppose a student acquires the numerical grade points of u, v, w, x and y in various subjects with the pre-assigned credit points of U, V, W, X and Y, respectively, in a semester. The SGPA_i of the ith semester will be estimated as,

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

The total credit points CP_i of the ith semester will include the credit points of all the subjects in a semester irrespective of whether the student fails in any subject.

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

$$\frac{(SGPA_1 \times CP_1) + (SGPA_2 \times CP_2) + (SGPA_3 \times CP_3) + (SGPA_4 \times CP_4) + (SGPA_5 \times CP_5) + (SGPA_6 \times CP_6)}{CP_1 + CP_2 + CP_3 + CP_4 + CP_5 + CP_6}$$

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Board of Control in Library & Information Science dated 23.01.2017 (**Appendix-XXIV**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has enhanced the number of seats in the Department of Library & Information Science for the following courses from the academic session 2017-18:

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

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

NOTE: 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.”

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Joint Academic and Administrative Committees of the Pharmaceutical Sciences dated 20.01.2017 (Item No.1) (**Appendix-XXV**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has changed the nomenclature of the following existing courses run at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, P.U. from the session 2017-18 with the ones from the list of the courses as approved by the Pharmacy Council of India (**Appendix-XXV**) as two of the six M.Pharma courses run by the Institute are not in the approved list and the eligibility, admission norms, course structure, fee and number of seats in the proposed courses shall be the same as in the existing courses:

Existing	Proposed
Master of Pharmacy in Pharmaceutical Analysis & Quality Assurance	Master of Pharmacy in Pharmaceutical Analysis
Master of Pharmacy in Drug Discovery and Drug Development	Master of Pharmacy in Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has executed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXVI**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh, India and Institute for Protein Research, Osaka University, Japan.
- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has granted Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) to Dr. Ajay Guleria, System Administrator, Computer Centre, P.U., for a period of one-year i.e. w.e.f. 07.03.2017 to 06.03.2018 to enable him to join as Sr. System Programmer/Manager in Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Guleria has joined University service on 15.07.2005 and he is confirmed Class ‘A’ employee. A copy of his appointment letter for the post of Senior System Programmer issued by the IIT, Delhi is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).

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

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

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

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the names of the candidates who have passed examinations for the various degrees of the University and have become qualified under the regulation for admission to such degrees for the award of degrees at the 66th Convocation to be held on 25th March 2017, under Regulation 1 at page 27 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, as under:

Sr. No.	Name of Examinations	Degrees to be conferred on Annual Convocation to be held on 25.03.2017
	Part-A	
1. 2. 3.	D.Sc. D. Litt. Ph.D.	To all the candidates whose viva-voce are conducted and cases submitted to the Vice-Chancellor from 12.3.2016 to 24.03.2017, on behalf of the Syndicate.
	Part-B	
	M. Phil.	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 06.03.2016 to 18.03.2017 (7 days before the Convocation).
	Part-C	
1. 2.	M.D. M.S.	To all the candidates whose results stand declared from 06.03.2016 to 18.03.2017 (7 days before the Convocation).
	Part-D	
1. 2. 3. 4.	LL.M. M.Tech. M.E. (Chem. Engg.) Masters Degree of Engg. (All Branches)	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 06.03.2016 to 18.03.2017 (7 days before the Convocation).
	Part-E	

Sr. No.	Name of Examinations	Degrees to be conferred on Annual Convocation to be held on 25.03.2017
1.	Master's degree (M.A./M.Sc./M.Ed. Annual & Semester System) Examinations in various Faculties.	First three first divisioners, whose results of April/May 2016 examinations stand declared from 06.03.2016 to 18.03.2017 (7 days before the Convocation).
2.	Following Bachelor's degree examinations, B.E. in: (a) Chemical Food Technology Telecom. & Inf. Tech. Electro. & Comm. Engg. Bio-Tech. Comp. Sci. & Engg. Electrical & Electronics Mechanical Civil Electronics & Electrical Comm. Engg. (b) B. Pharmacy (c) B.Sc. (Hons. School) (d) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Year Integrated course (e) Bachelor of Arts (Hons. School Economics) (f) Bachelor of Dental Sciences (g) Any other newly instituted Examination.	

NOTE:

All the candidates who have been placed in the first division and secured first three positions in the final Merit list, after taking into account the process of Re-evaluation, where-ever applicable, may be allowed to be invited to the Convocation. This will, however, be subject to the condition that they have not earned Comptt./re-appear/P.R.E. in any subject/paper/Semester/yearly exam. Candidates who have applied for degree in Absentia and have collected or not collected the same from the University may be allowed to be invited to the convocation.

(ix)

The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has condoned the shortage of lectures of the students of the following students of various teaching departments/Regional Centre: **(Appendix/Annexures-XXVIII)**:

Sr. No.	Department	Name of the Student	Appendix/ Annexure
1.	PUSS Giri Regional Centre , Hoshiarpur	Mr. Partap Singh Gill Mr. Raghuraj Guleria Mr. Gautam Gupta Mr. Gurpreet Singh	'A' (152-155)

Sr. No.	Department	Name of the Student	Appendix/ Annexure
		Sandhu Ms. Iltza Khatoon Ms. Sneha Bajaj Ms. Tanvee Mr. Kanwar Pal Singh	
2.	University Institute of Applied Management Sciences	Ms. Priyanka Sharma	'B' (156-157)
3.	University Institute of Legal Studies	Mr. Fateh Jang Singh Ms. Rimsha Anwar Mr. Kanav Goyal Mr. Yogesh Kumar Mittal Mr. Madhav Singla Mr. Arshbir Mr. Inderbir Singh Mr. Manavdeep Singh Mr. Yash Vardhan Mr. Aayushi Arora Mr. Karan Mr. Raman Dhiman Mr. Parag singh Parmar Mr. Raghav Kalra Mr. Rahul Aggarwal Mr. Yadwinder Singh Mahla Ms. Mannat Mr. S. Partha Swami Ms. Gurreet Ms. Akangsha Dogra Ms. Saloni Bindal Mr. Navjot	'C' (158-166)
4.	PURC, Ludhiana	Mr. Vishal Kaushik Mr. Fateh Zorawar Singh Ms. Khushboo Seth Ms. Taincy Ms. Japnoor Kaur Ms. Shavy Mr. Tanveer Singh Mr. Vishavpreet Singh	'D' (167-171)

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Academic Committee dated 06.02.2017 (**Appendix-XXIX**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following changes in eligibility and admission criteria for B.A. B.Ed. course from the session 2017-18 onwards, and the same be incorporated in Handbook of Information 2017:

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

4. Weightage for merit in 10+2 will be 50%.

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

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

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has reduced the intake of seats for LL.B course as 300 in the Department of Laws from the session 2017-18.

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

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

Course	Seats	Duration
LL.B.	166+14 NRI	3 years
(Morning)* +	166+14	(6 semester)
	(Evening)*	
	*Subject to the approval of the competent authority	

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

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

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

OR

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

Provided that in case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate, through Modern Indian Languages (Hindi or Urdu or Punjabi/Gurmukhi script) and /or in a Classical Languages (Sanskrit or Persian or Arabic), the aggregate of 45% marks (40% for SC/ST/BC candidates) shall be calculated by taking into account the percentage of aggregate marks that he/she had secured at the language examination, excluding the marks for the additional optional paper English and the elective subject taken together.

OR

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

OR

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

NOTE: Letter No.471/D/Law dated 13.02.2017 of Chairperson, Department of Laws is enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIII)**.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i) In pursuance of orders dated 17.12.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 26187 of 2016 (Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop Vs Panjab University and Ors.) which is fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 14.02.2017.

- (i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Science be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.01.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 31.12.2016 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking.
 - (ii) all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.
- (ii) In pursuance of orders dated 15.12.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 22992 of 2016 (Dr. Rakesh Datta Vs Panjab University and Ors.) which is fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 14.02.2017.
- (i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Rakesh Datta, Professor, Defence and National Security Studies be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.01.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 31.12.2016 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking.
 - (ii) all those teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.
- (iii) As per authorization given by the Syndicate/Senate at its meeting held on 31.05.2015 (Para 6) & 29.09.2015 (Para XXXIX), the Vice-Chancellor has re-fixed the Basic Pay of

Rs.19740/- + AGP of Rs.6000/- of Dr. Samarjit Sihotra, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics, as per revised LPC, issued by Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar (**Appendix-XXXIV**), submitted by him in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining i.e. 29.09.2010, with next date of increment as usual.

- (iv)** The Vice-Chancellor, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Cheshta Arora, Programmer, Computer Unit, P.U. w.e.f. 17.08.2016 (without any notice, as in the case of work charged staff), under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2009 and her monetary benefits viz. Provident Fund etc. be released to her accordingly.

NOTE: 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.”

Provided that no notice of resignation or termination of service shall be necessary in case of:

- (i) Work charged staff;
- (ii) Appointment of temporary nature without any specified period or till further orders.

- (v)** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Geeta W/o Late Shri Gautam, Cleaner, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, who expired on 25.08.2016 while in service:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
- (iii) Earned Leave Encashment up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Sudershna Devi W/o Late Shri Ashok Kumar, Security Guard, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, who expired on 07.10.2015 while in service:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
- (iii) Earned Leave Encashment up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(vii) 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. Vijay Nagpal Professor & Chairperson Department of Laws P.U	01.02.1989	31.01.2017	(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.
2.	Dr. Rana Nayar Professor Department of English and Cultural Studies	01.06.1990	28.02.2017	
3.	Dr. P.S. Jaswal Professor Department of Laws	08.09.1988	28.02.2017	

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

(viii) 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. Grace Dean Deputy Registrar RTI Cell	09.08.1976	31.01.2017	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Rajinder Agnihotri Deputy Registrar Dr. H.S.J. I. S & Hospital	09.05.1974	31.01.2017	
3.	Shri Chatter Singh Rahi Assistant Registrar Establishment Br.-I	10.10.1974	31.01.2017	
4.	Shri Balwinder Singh Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	07.05.1980	28.02.2017	
5.	Shri Parmatma Ram Yadav Sr. Tech. Assistant (G-I) UICET, P.U.	24.07.1981	28.02.2017	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
6.	Shri Thakur Dass Senior Tech. G-II CIL, PU	15.11.1984	28.02.2017	
7.	Shri Deep Chand Gestetner Operator USOL	03.07.1973	31.01.2017	
8.	Ms. Shyama Devi Peon Examination-IV	10.04.1991	31.01.2017	
9.	Shri Jasmer Singh Security Guard Security Staff P.U.	11.06.1991	31.01.2017	
10	Shri Shiv Ram Security Guard CIL, P.U.	07.11.1972	31.01.2017	

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

(ix) To note the report (**Appendix-XXXV**) submitted by the Secretary to Vice-Chancellor, P.U., after his visit on 16.02.2017 to DAV College, Abohar and M.R. Govt. College, Fazilka, regarding the examination fee hike in Panjab University and student strike in these Colleges.

NOTE: Request dated 13.02.2017 of Shri Varinder Singh Gill, Fellow, P.U. is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXV**).

(x) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Shri Rajesh Kumar S/o Late Shri Hans Raj, Beldar, Construction Office, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 09.08.2016 while in service:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

Earned Leave Encashment up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xi) To note letter No. 127/PUCCSA dated 21.2.2017 **(Appendix-XXXVI)** received from President and General Secretary Panjab University Class 'C' Staff Association.

RESOLVED: That

- (i) the information contained in items **I-(i) to I-(ii) & I-(iv) to I-(xi)**, be noted, and
- (ii) the information contained in item **I-(iii)** be noted and allowed.

Items 9, 9A and 9B were taken up together.

Letter dated 03.02.2017 received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to Vice-President of India

9. Considered, letter No. VPS/15/1/2016-Vol.II dated 03.02.2017 **(Appendix-XXXVII)** received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to Vice-President of India, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi.

Letter dated 08.02.2017 received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to Vice-President of India

9(A) Considered, letter No. VPS/15/1/2016-Vol.II dated 08.02.2017 **(Appendix-XXXVII)** received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to Vice-President of India, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi.

Letter dated 05.02.2017 received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to Vice-President of India

9(B) Considered, letter No. VPS/15/1/2016-Vol.II dated 05.02.2017 **(Appendix-XXXVII)** received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to Vice-President of India, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the items No. 9, 9-A and 9-B pertain to a series of communications received from the office of the Chancellor and the Chancellor has sent these things to them that the University may kindly examine the issue raised and take appropriate action as required and the response may be sent directly to the applicant. He has made available to the members, via the office of the Registrar, everything that has been received from the office of the Chancellor and these pertain to submissions made to the office of the Chancellor by two members of the Senate namely Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Shelley Walia. So, he expected them to have gone through these and Syndicate has to be seen to have been responding to it. Whatever they decide today, it has to be intimated to the office of

the Chancellor as early as they could, because the Senate meeting is to be held on 26th March and the Senate agenda has to be sent 10 days in advance. So, that means, that whatever they deliberate today, leaving aside other items, the matters pertaining to the Board of Finance and the items pertaining to items 9, 9A, 9B as well as the item 17, have to be reported back to the Chancellor's office during the next 15 days and also to be a part of the agenda papers for the next Senate meeting, which is to be held on 26th March. This is the background. Before he opens the discussion to all of them to comment one by one, if the members have things to ask him before they commence the discussion, they could ask him or the Registrar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they go through these letters, she (Professor Rajesh Gill) is making allegations against the Syndicate and also the Senate. According to him, as Syndicate members, ultimately they decided something which she, although she should not have been present in the Senate, tried to challenge over there when the item was being discussed and then even when the Senate by huge majority did not agree to whatever she tried. She has made these allegations and sent to the Chancellor. If they look at the allegations, according to him, he has seen some very interesting things, one thing she starts with the mandate of the Act, 2013 and is talking about that they have to do things as per the Act, where the Act says clearly that the employer could constitute a Committee. But she probably forgets one more thing about the Act. The Act says that any complaint of sexual harassment has to be dealt by Internal Complaints Committee. If they look at her communication which was sent back to them on 8th February, the Chancellor office sent on 6th February 2017, what she says is that "I do hope that your Excellency shall hold the principles of natural justice and fairness and prescribe a completely independent and unbiased Committee which tilts neither towards the complainant nor to the accused, comprising of members who have no connection with the Panjab University or city of Chandigarh to ensure justice and fairness". Whereas if one goes by this, that is not what the Act says. If they look at the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, that talks about Internal Complaints Committee and Internal Complaints Committee should consist of one Chairperson, who is either the employer and a woman and if a woman of this stature is not available, then another institute of the same employer and that is also not available, then from somewhere else. Similarly, the Act talks about two members who should be the employees of the Institute. On the other hand, if they look at her contention, it could not be an Internal Complaints Committee. So, according to him, when they say and talk about this kind of Act, these kinds of complaints are to be dealt with as per the Act only because if they look at whatever she has been trying to do only that she has been trying to do is that to ensure that the complaints that she has made is not investigated at all because any time an effort is made to make a Committee or to deal with this complaint, something or the other is said by the complainant and also by some of the members who do not want that this complaint be actually investigated because when they talk about investigation, there are two aspects to that whether the complaint is true or the complaint is false or frivolous. If the complaint is false, frivolous and with a motive, then obviously the Act also provides that an action could be taken against the complainant. Somehow, he happened to be there when one of the incidents happened, i.e., at the Vice-Chancellor's office. It is clear that whatever she is complaining, no such thing actually happened. The only thing

was that she came over there saying that she wanted to congratulate the Vice-Chancellor and then when he (Vice-Chancellor) tried to advise the complainant, because she said best of luck, and the Vice-Chancellor tried to explain to her that best would happen only if people help him (Vice-Chancellor) in resolving the problems rather than fanning the problem and from there onwards, he did not know, the kind of words she used for many University employees, even the members of the Syndicate at that time, those were totally unacceptable, she started saying that and went out and after that she made a first complaint which is about misbehavior and later on at some stage, she makes a complaint alleging about sexual harassment and that too taking into account an incident which she claimed to have happened about two years ago in a hostel function. Generally, when one talks about hostel functions, what actually happens is that photographs are clicked, in that hostel function the complainant was the Chief Guest and if she was the Chief Guest, obviously, after the function is over, normally the Warden of the hostel sends a few photographs to the Chief Guest or some other guests who have been invited. Probably, she picked up one or two photographs which were made available to her and tried to concoct a story which could actually easily be demolished, if they look at the whole album. Fortunately, the whole album is available and if they look at the whole album, everybody could easily go through what actually happened in a sequence. All those things she probably knows and for that reason, what she is trying to do is to stall the investigation part because she knows that if ultimately the investigation is over, it is going to be proved that no such thing happened which she is trying to make. Of course, if they go through the other parts, she is trying to say that there is a directive from Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), which is bad in law. He did not know what is the point. But anyway whatever the Syndicate has done in its meeting when they recommended few names, that was as per the recommendation of the MHRD only. When they talk about the names, of course, there is a discussion in the Syndicate but then the Syndicate members talk to each other even before the meeting. It is not that they are talking about issues only in the meeting itself. All these names were suggested by various members. One thing was always kept in mind that one is looking at only those members whose record is impeccable and whosoever was recommended by the Syndicate was also kept in mind that most of the members were the nominated members of the Senate only and nomination is made by the Chancellor and most of the members have recently been nominated and did not have long association with the University or the University administration and that was kept in mind while recommending those names. She makes allegations that because the employer has to make the Committee. Even when the last time PUCASH was nominated because ultimately it was the Senate which gave the final approval for PUCASH because Senate is supposed to be the employer of almost all the employees of the University. So, the names were again recommended in the same manner. Some small Committee which was there that recommended few names which were again accepted by the Syndicate, forwarded to the Senate and the Senate accepted the same names. So, when they talk about the fact that a Committee is to be formed, ultimately the University's procedure is that any item that goes to the Senate has first to be considered by the Syndicate only. While considering that item, according to him, the members of the Syndicate thought it appropriate to recommend some names and, of course, the Senate could have changed those names and if they look at the proceedings of the Senate what the Senate has done is, forwarded those names

requesting the Chancellor to make a Committee and they have not said that this is the Committee and the Chancellor has to just approve that. If they look at most of her contentions, he believes, what she is trying to do is to sabotage the effort which is there after the University got a due communication from MHRD to make a Committee which could look into the complaints. Another thing, she has blamed him specifically by saying "Professor Navdeep Goyal, patron of Professor Navdeep Goyal group or so-called University group is the leader of Syndicate". He did not know how come he is the leader of the Syndicate because when they talk about the Syndicate, the Chairperson of the Syndicate is the Vice-Chancellor only. On that day, the Syndicate chose one of the senior-most persons Shri Jarnail Singh to chair the Syndicate proceedings. Then, if she says that "he is the one who jumps to the rescue of the accused Vice-Chancellor after the undersigned filed the complaint on such and such date and he presented himself as a witness of the accused and produced a character certificate". If he was present there and he is telling what has actually happened on that day: Is that a crime? It is not a crime: He is the eye witness. Then another thing she says that "the same Professor Navdeep Goyal who swiftly issued an open letter in defence of the Vice-Chancellor in response to humble request of the undersigned to all the Senate members". What she did even in that, she is calling it a humble request to the Senate members, but was that a humble request? She was blaming all the Senate members and all the Syndicate members and then she is trying to say that it is a humble request. Syndicate members are also Senate members. She is blaming almost all of them and then saying it as a humble request. Then what she says is that "Professor Navdeep Goyal, as per videography, led the Syndicate in forming the Committee and by the esteemed member by misrepresenting the fact by stating that Chairperson, PUCASH was reluctant in conducting the enquiry". When he had made those statements, he had given the reasons and the reasons are quite clear. When they talk about the Chairperson of PUCASH, she was the member of the Committee which formed this policy. When this policy was being formed, in fact, she was asked to frame a policy on behalf of Sub-Committee which was constituted by the Syndicate and then whatever was finally given by the Committee of which Chairperson, PUCASH, was a member. That is a long process when they talk about framing a policy, adopting that policy and other things. They followed the whole thing again at behest of PUCASH only, the PUCASH thought that the earlier policy which was there, that had some problems. So, that was discussed in the Syndicate. In Syndicate, again PUCASH formed a Sub-Committee of which Chairperson, PUCASH was a member and she was entrusted with the duty of framing the policy. She framed the policy. All these things were done keeping in view this particular case only because all other cases anyway are being dealt with by PUCASH, it was the only case which was not dealt. So, the same thing was done by that Committee keeping in view this particular case only and once everything is done, it is approved by the Syndicate and the Senate. Again, case is taken up by the Committee and again the Chairperson says that there are flaws in the policy that has been framed. So, from that point of view only, he was saying that effort is being made to see that this case is not investigated. Earlier, everybody including the complainant, was agreeing to this thing that there is some MHRD directive and the University should follow that. Now, because MHRD direction has come and said that a special Committee be formed for this particular case which is like an Internal Complaint Committee, some names have been recommended by the Syndicate which has been forwarded by the

Senate. Again, she is trying to stall the things by sending all these complaints.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that his contention is that they should follow the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act by all means. If at all they could not allow the complainant to suggest that this or that should be the Committee, these or those members should be included or not. Why, if anybody goes and complains to the police, could he/she dictate the terms that the following persons should not be the member of that investigation team, not at all. His contention is that they should follow the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. Moreover, there is one accusation by some members that the meeting ended in eight minutes, that item was passed. The time limit is no matter. They were following the proper procedure. If someone suggested some names, they all agreed on the plea that their stature was so high and they could not challenge or question their names. According to him, if they have to form a Committee, this should be recommended, the same Committee should be recommended to the MHRD.

The Vice-Chancellor said that that is not the matter under consideration. The Committee has already been deliberated upon. It is a reconsideration of the matter, a complaint. Is there an issue that the Chancellor has asked to deal with the issue?

Principal N.R. Sharma said that Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma have made everything clear that it has been done so many times. She (Professor Rajesh Gill) wrote to the Chancellor and the Chancellor wrote to the University to deal with the issue. They have to deal with the issue. The matter is coming again and again for the last two years. According to him, as the Chancellor has asked the University to deal with the issue and sort it out. Professor Rajesh Gill is time and again saying that a Committee should be constituted and when the Committee is constituted, she does not believe in it. The Syndicate, on its own, did whatever they could do. The target of her is not to allow the Vice-Chancellor to perform his duty and (thee is) no other target. The reason being that when 2/3/4 Committees were formed, she has no trust in the Committees, Syndicate or the Senate. He thinks that it is not possible for the Syndicate or Senate to finalize a trustworthy body (for her). Secondly, as Professor Shelley Walia has written a letter, he feels ashamed to read the letter and what is the level of a University Professor. A meaningless or a non-sense letter is written that the Syndicate took a decision within 7-8 minutes. Is a time of 2 months, 2 days or two hours is required to take such a decision? He requested the Syndicate members with folded hands that finally they should pass a resolution that whatever the Syndicate and Senate could do, have done to the best of their level. If Professor Rajesh Gill is writing letters daily, as Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma has rightly said, that there is no meaning of writing letters daily. She could keep on sending letters. The final decision of the Syndicate is that Professor Rajesh Gill knowingly is misguiding the University, Chancellor, MHRD and all others. There is no sexual harassment or there is nothing like that. Even if the Chancellor wanted to make a Committee, it is okay and it should be finalized by the Syndicate. If this goes to the Senate, the whole day is used on such baseless things.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that today also, they have formed a Committee and it took about three minutes to form the Committee. The Syndicate and Senate have constituted the Committee.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that the University is already under financial crunch. According to him, so much of paper work is done due to this issue, they have to constitute the Committee and the members have to come to the meetings, there is wastage of both the time and the money. He requested the Syndicate members that such type of issues should not be lingered on and take a final decision and the decision of the Syndicate is that the complaints made by her are fake, false.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a Committee has been formed. The case should be examined by the Committee and enquiry be completed at the earliest.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should rather request the Chancellor to take an early action.

Shri Varinder Singh said that firstly the enquiry should be conducted at the earliest. Secondly, as is being said that the decision was taken within 8 minutes, perhaps, he had a chance to meet Professor Keshav Malhotra and Professor Shelley Walia and they have also something in their mind and did not know as to what is the reality whether the allegation is a false one. It could be said to be a political conspiracy. All those persons have this thing in mind as also the other persons who know something about the University that the allegations are false. Since everyone knew about the matter, that is why the decision was taken within 8 minutes. As the names of the members were suggested for the Committee, he had also suggested the name of Justice Jasbir Singh. Neither Justice Jasbir Singh knows him nor he does know Justice Jasbir Singh. He only knows this thing that when Justice Jasbir Singh was acting Chief Justice, he had taken very good decision and is an honest person. That is why he had suggested this name. All the members had also suggested the names in this way. It could be that one member had announced the names, but these were on the suggestions of the members. There is no other intention. Everyone to whom he gets a chance to talk, says that the allegations levelled against the Vice-Chancellor are false. He had met Professor Shelley Walia and Professor Keshav Malhotra. He asked them to say from the core of their heart, leaving aside other things, whether they are supporting baseless allegations on political basis. He had also said that they could imagine it otherwise also seeing the age of both the persons. The University has to be run by the Vice-Chancellor, Professors and other senior persons and intellectuals. If they themselves indulge in such things, what kind of impression it would have on the students. Therefore, the allegations levelled are false. As Professor Navdeep Goyal said that she congratulated the Vice-Chancellor, who in return, thanked her and the next day she levelled the allegations. Everyone could understand that there is nothing like this. He suggested that as she is writing the letters again and again or the enquiry, all this could go on, the process of the Committee which had been constituted should be expedited and the enquiry should be conducted at the earliest, so that it is in the best interest of the University. He said that the process should be expedited and the matter be brought to a conclusion.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that, on page 2 in the letter dated 8.2.2017 from the office of the Chancellor, it is reproduced as if the Syndicate members had committed a crime. They could see its text. On page 3, the names are written: Shri Jarnail Singh, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Shri Jarnail Singh, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Principal I.S. Sandhu. These names have been reproduced as if they have committed a crime. In the Senate meeting, time and again it was said that it was a pre-determined notion. As far as the names are concerned, Shri Varinder Singh also said and suggested the names. There is also a mention of the nominee of Chandigarh Administration. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma also said that if they see the profile of any of the members, they are not linked with the University in any way that they are not getting any honorarium from the University, nor they have any role in financial matters. As the Vice-Chancellor had earlier said that what are the issues in it? He could not know till now as what are the issues in it and what issues they wanted to settle. The letter has come. There is a simple process of the offices that, just they send the letters to the Vice-Chancellor office which is forwarded to the concerned offices to send the reply, if any. This is a simple process. This process is taking place in every office, whether it is the Vice-Chancellor office or the Chancellor office. His biggest question is what issue they wanted to settle in the letter which has been placed here and what reply they wanted to send. As said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Shri Varinder Singh, the present Syndicate must make an earnest effort to resolve the issue and to clinch in every way. The names which were recommended were proposed names and these were forwarded by the Senate to the Chancellor office. If they give the reply that as to who said what, he did not think that they could settle the issue like this. They also live in a social set up and face the questions as to what is happening in the University and have to deliberate at that particular point by saying that what Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma have mentioned. His point is that if there is no issue, then they have to settle accordingly.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that according to him if an unknown person levels the allegations on the Syndicate that it took a decision in such and such time, he could understand it. But a person, who is a Senate member and has been a member of the Syndicate, knows the working of the Syndicate. Everyone knows that whenever a meeting of the Syndicate is to be held, they meet and decide as to what they have to talk on, which item and what decision is to be taken. All the groups do this. As he had earlier also talked in the Senate, the complainant and others also come with thinking and planning. When they decided the members, he had also suggested Dr. Dalip Kumar the names. Shri Varinder Singh had also suggested the name and others also. All these names are announced by one of the members. First the names are suggested. As Principal B.C. Josan had given a proposal and he had given his opinion on this item. This discussion took about half an hour. Whatever a person feels, he speaks on the item. If the allegations are being levelled against the Syndicate members on saying a right thing as right or a wrong thing as a wrong. If the Syndicate takes a decision favourable to a person, he/she would praise the Syndicate. Keeping in view the facts that they try to make a good Committee, they had recommended the names to the Senate and the Senate forwarded those names. Therefore, this thing is not right. Last time when he was coming for the meeting of the Senate, his wife asked him as to which meeting he is going to attend. He told her that the meeting is on the issue of sexual

harassment. He told her to be ready that if an allegation is also made against him as it is not known on whom the allegations could be levelled. Therefore, according to him, they should be very careful. They had suggested a Committee very carefully and whether that is to be approved or not. As Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the letters which are addressed to the authorities are forwarded to the concerned quarters for comments. This is the procedure everywhere. Since the letters from the office of the Chancellor have been received by the Vice-Chancellor office, they should give their opinion that whatever Committee they could constitute, they have constituted which is right and whether this Committee is to be approved or not, the issue should be brought to a conclusion. It should be done at the earliest.

Principal B.C. Josan said that since the Committee has been formed, it should investigate the matter and finalise it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Chancellor should form the Committee at the earliest. The Syndicate requests the Chancellor to form the Committee.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is no need of a long discussion. A complaint had been sent to the Chancellor who has written to the governing body to take a decision. The Syndicate and the Senate have constituted a Committee of the senior most persons for which the names were suggested by the Syndicate members. The meeting of the Committee could be held at the earliest and they could request the Committee to submit its report at the earliest to the Chancellor.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it could be made time bound.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as the members have said, he could not say anything new. But, one thing is clear that the madam (Professor Rajesh Gill) says that "the accused Vice-Chancellor has a complete control of the Syndicate and Senate and head of the institution. Thus, his subordinates cannot constitute a Committee which is unbiased". There are so many, almost all, members sitting here and they are elected from their own constituencies, nominated by the Chancellor and have their own standing and are not appointed by the Vice-Chancellor and are not the members of his staff. So saying all this is irresponsible and to build her own point by underestimating others and using undignified words, according to him, it is wrong. It is not the way. Secondly, if the respected members of the Senate showed their inability to resolve the issue, including Professor R.P. Bambah, Shri Satya Pal Jain and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and then there was only one way out that the matter came to them and they all formed a Committee. He did not know any of the members of the Committee, but they have their own standing, a public life and someone of them is a Judge, a Principal and others are individuals just like Professor Pam Rajput, who is an internationally acclaimed personality on women issues. It is wrong to say such things and accuse the Committee. The matter should be resolved and the Vice-Chancellor could again request the Chancellor, whether he wanted to change the Committee or otherwise, whatever he feels to do, he could do and there is no problem as the names were a suggestion, immediate action should be taken. The matter should not linger on and there should not be any controversy as it is not good for the health of the University. Since both the individuals are respected, it is

also not good for them. According to him, this matter should be resolved at the earliest. Whatever are the findings of the Committee, then the people could know what is the truth in the matter. So, the Chancellor should, whether he wanted to change the Committee or not, take an early action and clinch the matter so that the controversy is ended. The controversy is not good for any individual including the University. They have no other alternative. If a person is not acceptable to an individual as is said, the members of the suggested Committee have their own standing and a public life and no one in the Syndicate or the Senate was against this Committee as the Committee was formed keeping in view their standing. So, this matter should be closed and in the same spirit a request be made to the Chancellor that it is the considered opinion of the Syndicate that the matter should not be lingered on. Whatever decision the Chancellor takes, whether changes the Committee or not, it is welcomed by the members. The Chancellor should expedite the matter.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that incidentally, he was in the Chair on the day of the meeting of the Syndicate as well as the Senate. To his mind, the Syndicate in its own wisdom, not by majority but unanimously decided to name certain persons of eminence as members of the Committee as desired by the Chancellor's office in response to MHRD letter that a special Committee be formed for the purpose. Secondly, even in the Senate, the discussion took place for more than 3½ hours and the Senate by a majority vote had recommended to the Chancellor the same name Committee by its wisdom. If he was chairing the meeting, he was not a culprit, but it appears from the letter, as if he was a culprit. As anybody could have been there, nothing could have been done then also. To his mind, definitely otherwise the Syndicate in its wisdom has done it. As such, they write to the Chancellor to either approve the Committee or he could add more members or he could withdraw some of the members, it is his prerogative. This matter should be finished as soon as possible. They should recommend it to the Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is the matter of eight minutes. He want to say that agenda is issued a week before the meeting. When the agenda is issued it is the duty of each member to read the agenda and they know what to do. So, it is obvious, when we come for the meeting, we come prepared.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that naturally this happens. They come prepared.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is no issue. A lie has no stay and truth is always truth. When they see in the government and political leaders, truth is truth.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that when the names were suggested there, had any person objected.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he even didn't know them.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he think both the parties basically are sufferer in this case. Justice delayed is justice denied. Two years had happened to this incident. Two parties are suffering and University is also suffering with them, its reputation is also suffering.

The Vice Chancellor said that you are saying two parties, he is suffering.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he is saying both parties are suffering.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to where she is suffering?

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that right, he feels that they should do it fast; a time bound inquiry and make the decision.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it be sent unanimously by the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the committee has been constituted and the Chancellor's office is competent to check the credential of that committee. They should not involve in technical nitty-gritty; the issue is that the probe should be done by the competent persons and should be done very soon. These are the two issues. They have formed the committee with their wisdom. They should send one more request to the Chancellor by resolving in this Syndicate meeting that they check the credentials of the committee. If they want to change the committee, they can change or if they want to add any member, they may add. Time bound committee be constituted and the probe be done time bound so that the issue be resolved permanently. That issue is not good for the health of the University.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that that is not good for the health of the University. The complaint is false, proper action as per law should be taken.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that that should be left to the committee, that is the work of the committee. Competent people are in the committee and they know the Act.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee is not the punishing authority; it has only to give its findings.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that is the latter issue.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Committee will give it after probing and it was decided by the Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this request be sent by the Syndicate.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that it may be added some more. Actually, inquiry is done for an issue, but there is no issue. If there is an issue, one time investigations should be there.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they had constituted the committee, then why are they talking again about the issue.

Shri Varinder Singh said that first the processing of that issue be done fast.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should request the Chancellor Office that inquiry should be time bound.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that resolved part should be sent to the complainant.

Professor Pam Rajput said that there is no need to say that it should time bound. Act itself says that within this period inquiry must be completed. Every thing has been given in the Act.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that send the resolution of the Syndicate to the Chancellor Office. Make the proposal.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him summarize. Whether he is supposed to summarize it or not, he is sharing it. His assessment of what they stated is that the Syndicate suggested a committee and while suggesting the committee, they kept this in mind that the name should be such, who are considered as independent. Syndicate did not name anyone who was an employee or current employee of the University. Good work you have done. They picked up names, a large number of them from the nominated members of the Senate or such public men from the Syndics or such other persons from the Syndics like Principal Anita Kaushal, who was a Principal of a college and a nominated member of Senate. So, they did what they felt. They were expected to do, to give a committee in which, prima facie, the system should have confidence. This is what they have done. Now, they are saying, they have done their job. Names have been sent to the Chancellor. The Chancellor should take a call on it and name a committee. Those were the suggestions sent to the Chancellor. The Chancellor should frame a committee, such a committee to commence its task and complete its task as per the provisions of the Act. Is that okay? (The members gave their consent as yes). This is one part.

The second part is, as articulated by one of the members, that they express their anguish that the complainant has used terms and text for the members of the Senate and Syndicate which they think is unbecoming of a member of the Senate. Is that okay.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they are worshipper of temple, not worshipper of worshipper. They are not the worshipper of head priest. They are worshipper of temple and do all the things with responsibility so that the sanctity of this temple be remained. Why they accuse them do not give this or that, it is totally irresponsible.

The Vice Chancellor said that they also express anguish what Professor Shelly Walia has said.

The members gave their consent as okay.

The Vice Chancellor said because they know things are being made out as if there is some middle ground. There is a Vice-Chancellor of a University against whom frivolous allegations have been made by a sitting member of the Syndicate/Senate and every day in the media it appears as an accused Vice-Chancellor. Had he done something that he deserves such an accusation? This is India's oldest University whose Vice-Chancellor is an accused Vice-Chancellor, whose Dean of University Instruction is also an accused in sexual harassment case by a teacher of his own Department and that false sexual harassment case against the Dean of University Instruction has never been solved. Tomorrow, in the case of present Dean of University Instruction, if somebody puts his name for the

Vice Chancellorship of this University or for that, any other University, that he is an accused person against whom there is a sexual harassment case by his own faculty member and the matter was never resolved. At that time the present sexual harassment committee was not there, some other Committee was there. Police complaint was lodged against him. The police never settled. Case against Professor Dinesh Gupta has never been closed. The Vice-Chancellor is accused. Two days after the present Vice Chancellor's term was extended, a complaint is made against the Vice Chancellor and after a month a case is put against the Vice-Chancellor to the police on 28th of May 2015 and it is asked that the Vice Chancellor should be arrested under such and such Act, non-bailable Act. Nothing is described; there is only a mention of 31st of March 2013. He is called to Delhi, a fact finding is done. Whatever was to be done it was done, all those things were circulated to them. UGC has never given him a copy of the fact finding report. They did not do anything. They only wanted the matter be investigated by the commission. No committee will do that job.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that at that time those members were also supporting. He was also member of the Senate at that time. On whom the allegations were levelled, now who are the complainant, were helping at that time. He knows that.

The Vice Chancellor said that he doesn't know. He is telling them that the police never closed the case against Professor Dinesh Gupta. Internal committee never did its job. So that the present D.U.I. of the University is an accused D.U.I. Present Vice Chancellor of this University is an accused Vice Chancellor. When the present Dean of University Instruction was accused of sexual harassment, he (Vice Chancellor) lost no time, within minutes of, his becoming aware of it, even though he had strong reservations to what the University Business School and other people in the University Business School were doing vis-à-vis the Vice Chancellor, they were behaving in most irresponsible manner vis-à-vis the Vice Chancellor, but he did not let all those things come his way. He rushed to the I.G.P. and told that nothing should happen to the Chairman of the University Business School or the Dean of the Management Faculty. Present Dean of University Instruction was the Dean of the Management Faculty at that time. To protect the dignity of Dean of the Management Faculty, he himself went to the IGP and tried to do whatever he could do. At that stage, few days later, twenty Senate members, on a holiday, came to him asking for action against the complainant that the complaint should be dismissed, he should use the Vice-Chancellor's authority and do something against complainant. That delegation also included Professor Shelly Walia. Today, what has happened, the members of the Senate hesitate to say that the accusation is false. Only today some of them have stated that the accusation is false. Only Shri Satya Pal Jain had tried to say that earlier. The false accusation can be there against the Dean, the false accusation would be there against the Vice Chancellor. Nobody came to say or express any anguish, regret; remorse that the Vice Chancellor is being repeatedly called accused Vice Chancellor. They (Senate/Syndicate members) sit and attend meetings with him, presided over by him and he is an accused Vice Chancellor? There is an accused Dean of University Instruction, and because they don't attend to it at the right time. Last week a sexual harassment case has been filed by a Research Scholar of this University against the son of Dean Student Welfare (Women). That son is not an employee of the University. So now, the Dean Student

Welfare, Professor Neena Caplash has to go and appear before the sexual harassment committee. Every now and then a complaint has been filed against that family in the Police Station. Exactly the same way a complaint was filed by the faculty member against Professor Dinesh Gupta. So, there are three FIRs lying with the Chandigarh Police. One against the present Vice-Chancellor, one against the present Dean of University Instruction and one against the present DSW. What is it? What are you (Syndicate members) all doing as a member of the governing body of the University? Does it hurt them in any way? Does it hurt anybody in anyway? There is a Senate of this University where Chief Minister is the member, there is a Senate where Punjab Ministers are members, MLAs are the members, IAS Officers are the members, so many eminent central ministers former and present could be members of this University. And does it not hurt anyone of them that the Vice-Chancellor of this University is an accused, the Dean of University Instruction is an accused, the Dean Student Welfare is an accused. What is an accusation? Anybody can get away by lodging a complaint and the person becomes an accused. He remains an accused, because the enquiry is not processed. Professor Dinesh Gupta, he is sure, cannot be considered for Vice Chancellorship anywhere else because he is an accused. He (Vice Chancellor) has been accused after he had become a Vice Chancellor. They can destroy anyone's career, make him an accused. Then, they write stories, they do everything. How will they protect the image of this University? They are an autonomous body; they want to protect their autonomy, governance etc. Are they worth being called governing body? Only if they seem to be governing. If their governance is just limited to having some people appointed here and there by some Committees, then serious issues of governance they have given up. He is sure, one day somebody is going to write, anybody wants to tarnish the image of the University can write that the Vice-Chancellor of this University is accused, Dean of University Instruction is accused, Dean Student Welfare, present is an accused and former DSW is an accused. Who is not an accused?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have made the system like this to put on an accusation on of any person. He doesn't know whether this should be told or not, but he feels that how many times someone had to congratulate a person, once.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever he said, whether he said it in a tone that is unacceptable to (someone), that cannot be turned into sexual harassment. That does not give you a licence to go to the police and put a FIR against him under a non-bailable offence. He doesn't want to speculate on it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that, as said by Shri Varinder Singh, they take an exception to her statement. They are not all saleable persons.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to speculate that.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as some member has a behaviour or attitude, it is known what he is doing and saying. It is clear in his mind that how much he is positive or constructive or some naughtiness. When anyone comes again and again and says congratulations, it is quite genuine to get irritated. He remembers a case, he wants to refer that, Shri Raj Naryan Ji was then the Health

Minister of India and Shri Morarji Desai was the Prime Minister. The style he (Shri Raj Naryan) had, he used to speak rubbish. Once, when Shri Morarji Desai came back from a foreign visit and were at the airport, Shri Raj Narayan Ji started spraying perfume on him. He said (Shri Morarji Desai) that you say rubbish things behind me and now you are doing this? That is the same thing, he understands how they do these things. He understands that thing like this. He is not an eyewitness to it but he understands and can anticipate that this would have happened.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that but the people know all what the opinions are there. All knows the Vice Chancellor is very honest and a scholar. They can speak as an opposition. They can ask in anger, but all know that as a director there is no other person like him (Vice Chancellor). All know this. Maybe that you have allegations against you but all know about your character. You are a gentleman

Shri Varinder Singh said that truth is always truth, whatever may appear in the newspapers.

The Vice Chancellor said that no one believes. There was an accident by son of Neena Capalash in front of his house in the evening at 8.00 p.m. It was raining at that time. He was at home and his wife was at home. Her son came in a car from one side and a research scholar came from its perpendicular direction. He was at home and heard the sound. His wife ran down, after some time he also went down. He asked from Dr. Neena Caplash. She told that it was an accident and what to do. After 23 days, on 31st January, he went to Bombay for four days. He received an e-mail on 1st alleging sexual harassment that Dr. Neena Caplash Ji's son was chasing; he said this and that and hit the car from the side and alleging sexual harassment. He came back and asked. The Dean of University Instruction said that he has marked the complaint to the Committee. What can he do? All people become daring to put a sexual harassment case. Put a sexual harassment and there will be no inquiry. Influence any one. And that student happened to be the student of a sitting Senator of the P.U. That student is registered with the sitting Senator of the University, a Ph.D student. How can it be permitted? Teachers lodge a complaint against the Deans, Senators lodge sexual harassment complaint, Senate and Syndicate members lodge sexual complaint against the Vice-Chancellor. So many sitting Senators support it and now, a research scholar has become daring because research scholar is working with a Senator, she has gone and lodged a complaint against the Dean of the University

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it looks there is solution that it (enquiry) should be put on the fast track. Complaints are coming everyday. Wrong complainants should be punished. Till the time false complainants are not punished, complaints will continue coming.

The Vice Chancellor said that who will give the punishment.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the punishment will be given by the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that yes, you are the government of the University.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the authority (Syndicate) can give punishment. False complaints are coming one after another.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the person (teacher) is Dr. Jagdish Mehta.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that his involvement is not there.

Principal B.C. Josan said that his (Dr. Mehta) involvement is not there, but the girl is doing Ph.D. under his guidance.

RESOLVED: That the Syndicate had considered on 21 January 2017 the letter from MHRD in accordance with the regulations and had recommended a Committee of independent members to the Senate and the Senate in turn resolved to forward those names to the Chancellor which they reiterate. The Chancellor has now to take a call on it, to accept it or modify it, however, the Committee should commence its task as per the provisions of the Act at the earliest. The Syndicate also expressed its anguish over the expression and text used by the complainant for the Syndicate and Senate, which is unbecoming of a member of the Senate.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Syndicate also expressed its anguish over what Professor Shelley Walia's action of writing to the Chancellor.

Issues contained in the letter received from OSD to Vice-President of India

17. Considered letter No. VPS/15/1/2017 dated 08.02.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to Vice-President of India, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi and Email dated 18.02.2017 & 22.02.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) received from Professor Vijay K. Chopra, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that said once again a series of communications received from the office of the Chancellor and this time it pertains to Professor V.K. Chopra, whose case was considered during the last meeting. Since the last meeting, what stands done is that he has asked him (Vice-Chancellor) what is his status as a teacher after 31st January. His re-employment term, initially when it commenced was for 5 years but as per the University stipulation, the Vice-Chancellor had a right to express displeasure and curtail it on the basis of examination of academic progress. So, his re-employment was recommended to be curtailed, went through the Syndicate and the Senate approved the curtailment. Once the minutes were signed by the Senate, circulated, waited for 2 weeks time and on 30th January, everything was over. On 31st January, he was served a notice that his re-employment stands curtailed on 31st January. He was unhappy surely and started writing series of letters.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he had stopped reading these letters.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could stop reading them, but he could not stop reading them because he has received the letters and he has to reply. So, he (Dr. Chopra) wanted to know his status and he had filed an LPA and somehow the Judge said that his case be

combined with the other cases where several teachers were seeking extension in their retirement age. So, the Judge said that it should be attached to that and whatever happens as with the similarly placed cases. Professor Chopra was a re-employed teacher who had taken all the retirement benefits. He has taken everything. He had also vacated the house. So, his case falls to a category of those people who have taken away their retirement benefits and are continuing as re-employed teachers. These people are after the age of 60 years and they could serve until the age of 65 years or the date of conclusion of their re-employment, 5 years is the upper limit, it could be less. In his case, it has been made less. So, he could serve only up to that day. He said that the house be given back to him. But it could not be given because the re-employed employee could not have a house. Right now, the people who are retaining their house are those who were staying in the house before they went to the court or, there is one teacher, who went to the court during her re-employment and had not vacated the house until then. The Court gave her the relief.

Shri Varinder Singh said that this case should have been a separate one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case was fixed on 14th February and the hearing of the case could not be somehow held, due to the agreement amongst the Advocate for next date hearing. He asked the Senior Law Officer of the University as to what happened in the Court who said that he did not attend the Court. He asked one of the teachers, who continuously were asking him about this case, who said that his Advocate did not go to the court. The Advocate appearing on behalf of the University also said that since the matter required a long discussion, now the matter is postponed to end of April. So, now it is delayed for another three months. Till date, nothing has happened. In the meanwhile, he wrote to him (Professor Chopra) that he is neither having the employment nor the house. There are lots of correspondence between him and Professor Chopra which have been sent to the members. After that, last time it was decided that he (Professor Chopra) is a habitual offender and things would be collated about him. He had a meeting with the former Presidents and present President of PUTA and two Committees have been formed, one to help him to collate all the information about his past and the other Committee is supposed to come out with some algorithm how to protect the re-employment scheme of Panjab University because if they have defaulters like Professor Chopra, the society would not have the confidence as to what kind of people they are giving the re-employment. The UGC has certain norms for re-employment. All the national institutions have certain norms for giving re-employment. They have liberalized the Panjab University re-employment scheme and made it from three years to five years. They also restored the DA after three years and also allowed HRA, half of it on the contractual part of the salary. They actually improved the re-employment scheme of Panjab University so that the employment conditions for teachers in the University remain comparable to those where the retirement age is 65 years and did not want to lose the good teachers when they cross the age of 50 years and could go to the Central Universities. In order that they do not lose good teachers, they made the re-employment as attractive as they could. But, all the same, if there are bad reports about the re-employed Professors or if re-employed teachers indulge in gross indiscipline which causes damage to the University image and it would have negative repercussions, then the re-employment scheme should be stopped.

Re-employment scheme of Panjab University is under attack from various quarters, it is under attack from neighbouring Universities because they do not have that attractive re-employment scheme, it is under attack from several others also. The College teachers do not have the re-employment scheme.

Shri Varinder Singh said that now Professor Shelley Walia has also started. Earlier there was only one person, now there are two persons.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is the reason he had asked the re-employed senior teachers and President, PUTA as to what should be done that they could be protective of themselves, what should be the code of conduct for the re-employed teachers.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that a Committee could be formed about this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has formed a Committee.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that it should be made time bound.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has collated together everything pertaining to Professor Chopra ever since he joined the University and provided all the documents to the members. He did not know how many of the members have tried to read through the documents. He wished he knew all these things when the re-employment had to be given to Professor Chopra. Given his track record, he has seen all the files, he wished had they examined all these files, he wished an authority of the University on behalf of the Syndicate, he wished some authorized person or a body of persons had examined all these things on behalf the government of the University, that is the Syndicate of the University, he wished somebody had examined these things on behalf of the Syndicate because the things processed reach to the Syndicate and then to the Senate and the Senate puts a stamp to it and that is how a person is eligible for five years re-employment in one go on the stipulation that the academically active report would be submitted once every year. The Department would send it to the Dean of University Instruction, who would send it to the Vice-Chancellor and he would opine on it. But if he had known these things which he has come to know in the last 15 days, he would have never recommended this case for re-employment to this august body. This man's (Professor Chopra) record is so horrendous that he thought that they owe a regret to the society that they recommended and accepted the re-employment of such a person. If some of the members knew his (Professor Chopra) past when the re-employment was extended, he thought that they should have warned him (Vice-Chancellor). People, who have been member of the Syndicate and Senate for long time, he thought, have failed in their duty of cautioning the Vice-Chancellor of this University when the re-employment case of Professor Chopra was recommended. He is saying it consciously. This gentleman (Professor Chopra) joined the University in the year 1987. From the papers that have been placed before the members, it is clear that within first few years, he was not attending to his responsibility. He was abstaining and not attending to the duties assigned to him by the Chairperson whether it pertains to examination duty, admission duty and so on. His whole career is full of wrong doings, defiance, bullying, blackmailing and

whatever. Everything has been collated and stands given to all the members and he (Vice-Chancellor) feels that he personally has not done a service to this august office by recommending this person for the re-employment. His (Professor Chopra) service book was with himself and in his service it is recorded that he had been misbehaving. He kept the service book with him. This person had taken all the benefits, and thereafter a ruling of the Supreme Court came and under the guise of that ruling, he sends his joining to him (Vice-Chancellor) via the Chairperson, who is a Senator of long standing, a Syndicate member of long standing, people who have been part of the governing body of the University for the last twenty years and know everything in this University, they ask him to do a wrong thing. Someone, who is a part of the government of the University, recommends to him (Vice-Chancellor) to do a wrong thing. He had to issue a notice that no other Chairperson of the Department would send the joining report (as regular employees) of those people who are re-employed Professors. He had to do this. Then, this re-employed Professor started sending RTIs and asking for probe for financial misappropriation in the University. He tried to warn him (Professor Chopra) that as a re-employed Professor, he should not do all these things. Nothing happens, all kinds of threats are used, all kinds of accusations are used. He collates the information. They could see all that in the last communication that he has sent. He handed over collated material to the National Student Union of India who put a complaint against the Vice-Chancellor and all the officers of the University for having misappropriated the University money. All this was done on the day the President of India was on the campus on 14th March, 2015. His (Vice-Chancellor) extension comes through, on 8th April, the Vice-President signs the gazette notification where he is given the second term. Within a few days, ABVP writes a letter which is exactly a carbon copy of the letter that the NSUI had sent and that letter says loot and plunder is going on, misappropriation is going on, everything whatever Professor Chopra fed it, first via NSUI.

Professor Mukesh Arora intervened to request the Vice-Chancellor to forget the old matters.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "no". They are doing a disservice. An amount of Rs.250 crores from the Centre comes to the University.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the grant is being given now.

The Vice-Chancellor said that wrong things are done and the Centre is misled. When the Centre is misled, Centre appoints a Fact Finding Committee. The Fact Committee sends things to Delhi. The Centre realizes that they have been misled. They impose certain conditions and continue to release the money. If they have managed to pay the salary to all the employees over the last two years, it is because the truth has become known to the Centre that some people were misleading the Centre. When he personally met the Finance Minister, he was extremely courteous to him. When he met the Home Minister in Chandigarh, he was also extremely courteous to him. The University has no complaints with the Government of the day. But, if wrong things are fed to the Government by their own faculty and if they could not put a check to it, who is to be blamed, it is the self-governance that has been permitted to this University ever since this University was enacted by Universities Act, 1904. As he told in the morning, no other governing body of any University is like this. So, who has failed? They have themselves failed by not being proactive in

attending to these things. It is not what Professor Chopra is doing, was not made known to the governing body of this University. But, they were hesitant to do these things. Because they were hesitant to do it, that is why, Professor Chopra's case had to be considered in 3-4 meetings of the Senate before they could arrive at a decision that the right that the Senate had given to the Vice-Chancellor to examine the academic activeness of a person that whatever he has done was expected to do. So, where are they today? They are here today that Professor Chopra, who is an errant boy, from 1987 when he joins and he has made the record available from 1990 onwards, he has been misbehaving and anybody who tried to check him, he blackmailed him, sent issues legal notices to them. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is here, was a legal notice not issued to him. He has found in the record that a legal notice was issued to him.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that not only a legal notice but Professor Chopra also filed a defamation case against him as well as against the then Chairperson Dr. (Mrs.) Santosh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the benefits of Dr. (Mrs.) Santosh were stopped. Her retirement benefits were got released via the Justice Garg Committee report. His (Professor Chopra) increment was once stopped for two years because he had remained absent. He browbeated the then Vice-Chancellor and got his increment released. He is such a menace that, they could see the example of his menace, a given Vice-Chancellor could just throw his hands up and starts acceding to act according to this person. His (Vice-Chancellor) predecessors made compromises with him. It is because his predecessors made compromises with him that they are suffering today. It is because of this man, whatever he wanted, that the University is in a financial mess. If such a report had not been sent to the Centre that they are misappropriating money, they were inflating the income of the University, they would not have come under such a scrutiny that for nine months no money was released. After scrutinizing everything of the University when the Centre realized that the governing bodies of this University and his predecessors were not misappropriating, were not misruling this University, but were doing their duty in governing structure of the University. No Vice-Chancellor could do anything here without the participation by the governing bodies of the University. Could they tell him any University where the governing body meets every month? There is no University in the country where the governing body meets every month. Records all these things in camera, puts and uploads everything on the website, etc. So, all this was challenged, they took all the minutes of all these things, they dug out the things and showed to the Centre. Long before the UGC asked the people to have an accounts manual, this University prepared an Accounts Manual as soon as the University campus started to function in 1960. Another Accounts Manual was prepared in 1990 and the third in 2012. The only thing that they were slow was that they had not shifted from the single entry system to the double entry system. That is the only thing that they had not done. They were slow in it. Now, they have a double entry system in place, they had to do it quickly. For that, they had to take the help of professionals. The University of Delhi, a Central University, takes the help of professionals and gives lacs of rupees (as fees) and everything is fine. If to make the University accounts properly, double entry system and have audited statement, etc., if they have to do all these things in a short time and if they do this then it could be said that since the University is in a financial crunch, they

are misappropriating money by taking the professional help in preparing these documents. They have done it all, but the complaints against them are going on every day. So, what could they do to check this person? So, the call before all of them (Syndicate member), as he (Vice-Chancellor) is not the government of the University and he is receiving all these things from the Chancellor's office and it has been forwarded to them, they are expected to respond as government of the University as to how or what could be done whether first they opine whether what Professor Chopra is saying is right or wrong. Is the Vice-Chancellor incompetent, is the Vice-Chancellor corrupt, or the officers of the University are corrupt, are the governing bodies of the University not doing their work properly. So, these are the things that they have to opine on. These things could not be ignored. Whatever answer they give, he has to take it to the Senate because this person is not going to stop here. He is defaming the University. Should an individual defame an institution, should the governing body of that institution keep quiet about it?

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that late Shri Chatrath used to say that if they punish a person, it would be an eye opener for others too.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this gentleman (Professor Chopra) had scared his predecessor to such an extent that he seemed to be a special (person) and he (Professor Chopra) was also made the Chairperson of the Department of Indian Theatre. A person whose track is so horrendous, was made the Chairperson of the Department of Indian Theatre and remained the Chairperson for five months. Some money was made available to rejuvenate the Department of Indian Theatre. He purchased a laptop for himself and did not return it. A RTI application was filed in the year 2016 and it is only then that he returns the laptop. In his (Dr. Chopra's) eye, everybody is corrupt, everybody is misappropriating funds, the DSW is the biggest corrupt man in the history of the University. What is this going on? Why is the governing body of the University would keeping quiet? Members of the governing body of this University, members of the Syndicate in a Senate meeting would accuse another Senator. He (Vice-Chancellor) has got all those matters investigated by the CVO and given all the reports to the members. If they want a special session, the governing body of the University wants a special session to consider the reports of the CVO, they could give him a date and he would convene a meeting of the Senate and the Syndicate, so that this matter could be put behind them. Whether this University is misappropriating the money, are the teachers of this University misappropriating money, are the officers of this University misappropriating money? They have to be protective of their governance apparatus and this responsibility is on all of them. For the future, he wanted to propose that anyone who is seeking re-employment in the University, on behalf of the governing body of the University, his/her record would be assessed by a Committee. It should be done as soon as a person crosses the age of 58 years. The report of his/her last five years activities should be asked relating to(his/her) academics performance so that they have a reference point what is it to be compared with during the next five years. The report of academic activities of the last five years, between the age of 58 years and 58 and quarter year (58.3), every person would submit that report. That report would be assessed by another Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh said that since Professor Chopra has already taken all the benefits, they could send a reply citing the court decision and the Punjab Government also does the same in such cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter of Professor Chopra has ended and he has been relieved. He (Vice-Chancellor) has to ask him (Professor Chopra) to vacate the office in the Department. The members could pass a resolution whether they ask the other re-employed persons (who have completed their terms) to vacate or not. But, as a governing body, they could take a call whether he should be asked to vacate the office of the University. He (Vice-Chancellor) recommended that the kind of damage that he (Professor Chopra) has caused to the system, he should be asked to vacate the office, occupied (by him) in the Department of Evening Studies, within three days.

This was agreed to by the members.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that it should be got vacated with immediate effect keeping in view the record.

The Vice-Chancellor said that within three days also, is also immediate. In future, a person would put in a request for re-employment and it is not automatic.

This was agreed to by the members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a person would put in a request and his/her entire record would be checked, all files and everything would be checked. He would send a proposal as to which Committee would do it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that a check-list be prepared in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that and then a person will be asked to give a report on last five years work. That report will be examined by another committee. That committee will make a recommendation before a person reaches the age of 59. All that will be brought before the Syndicate and the Syndicate will approve the re-employment for a period of five years as per the present system. All the things will be brought there (Syndicate) and reference point will be there. He will go after one year, his term will end.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there has been a lot of debate on the issue of re-employment scheme of future. He pleads that as they need teachers who do work and others also automatically come with them. They should make a check list as that is already. Some departments are there, where there is no workload. Teachers do not go in the departments after re-employment. But, still it is there. They want if there is any good facility for University teachers, they should get it. But it should be selectively given. But, there should be no discrimination in that case. As far as Professor V.K. Chopra is concerned, he (Vice Chancellor) says he is responsible for that. He and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma are also responsible.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that no, he was not there for four years, therefore he is not. He was given employment in 2013.

What he (Shri Jarnail Singh) is saying if he would have been there, extension would not be given.

Shri Jarnail Singh said they knew it, but at that time there was no case in which re-employment was not given. It was given to all the teachers. That's why they have no fault. As far as his work is concerned, they already knew it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that excuse him, when he (Shri Jarnail Singh) was the member of that committee who made his red-entry, then why he did not speak at that time.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it is not possible that he would have not spoken, he knows all that. There might be recording. He doesn't remember now. He was not a silent spectator.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that on re-employment in a case of education department, of Professor Ghakhar, did not allow working of Senate for 15 minutes because he knew that he (Professor Ghakhar) is a corrupt person. All the people came to requesting him not to do this, let it be, there is no problem. After that, he stopped this. It happened in 2014, he was not a member of Syndicate then. But it is quite right that his files should have been checked. That is a lapse. Lapse is at the level of Chairperson.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he himself was the Chairperson.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Chopra) was the Chairperson.

It was informed that he kept his service-book with him.

Professor Pam Rajput said that his service-book was tampered.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that they should not think much on this issue. That such type of persons are born after thousands of years. All are not that type of persons. Therefore, you don't think these types of things happen, they may quote anything.

The Vice Chancellor said that on 15th November, 2015, Professor Vijay Chopra writes to the President, PUTA that it is really laudable that the PUTA leadership has taken upon itself mantle of overcoming the present system crisis into which Panjab University has been hurt, hurt head long as the complaints registered by the students organisation NSUI and ABVP with the MHRD and UGC. Writing themselves, he had supplied it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that students have accepted it (that they received the complaints/materials).

The Vice Chancellor said that for alleged financial irregularities, mismanagement by the concerned authority.

Shri Varinder Singh said that some other persons were also with them. He doesn't want to take their names as party's persons were are sitting there, when this (ABVP) note was sent, some other persons were also there.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he is not talking about Professor Chopra, in general, there might a system of re-employment, officials might know better. After all, Dean of University Instruction might have been checking their academic record. It is not that re-employment letter is given without checking these things. It is his duty. Reality is that whomsoever is re-employment comes, either it is A or B, he will take the name of either Navdeep or Ashok Goyal or someone else, all the persons of University become one and say to do it. Whatever they do in future, they will say to do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the blame will not be on them, the governing body.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu that now listen, what Shri Jarnail Singh is saying, they have come from outside, now they are searching record of A, B, C , they (outsiders) don't know their record. Only the person from University knows the record of the person of University. Why don't they speak there? Why any person does not give dissent. Many of his issues have been given dissent.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay, another thing he would like to propose. Whatever all this whole record is, it should be sent all those Officers, where he (Dr. Vijay Chopra) has lodged complaint against the Panjab University i.e. Prime Minister's House, Vice-President, MHRD, UGC Secretary.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this should go in the reply

The Vice Chancellor said that all these things go there.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that this is very less, there must be much more.

The Vice Chancellor said that all these things should be sent to wherever he had send that he is a whistle blower. Is he a whistle blower?

Some members said that he is a blackmailer.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is trouble maker.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has blackmailed not only him but also blackmailed his three predecessors, Professor Puri, Professor Pathak and Professor Sobti. All records are there.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that one more word is added he is incorrigible mischief monger.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he think that incorrigible is sufficient.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Chopra) is saying that let they build Panjab University as a new. He wrote this to the President, PUTA in November 2015 that, "Nothing is beyond President, PUTA and do remember till eternity that our Akshaya is a much mature person today, reluctant determination to look beyond sermonizing generalization. The two issues in the attachments relate to invisible pension scam in force since 2004 and has recurring financial implications that unfold liabilities on the pensioners present,

could be for generations of the wrongful gainers, beneficiaries of leave arrangement appointments". There are leave arrangement appointments in the University and who is protective of this. This guy is against this leave arrangement. Who is approving this leave arrangement, it is the governing body of this University. Whatever they are doing to give benefit to the employees of the University, in which they are unanimous, you are causing financial loss to the University. This is what he is going and telling all over the country, he would go and tell the MHRD that the University's decisions have financial implications and the governing bodies are indulging in misappropriation. How would they protect themselves? Is there any protection? Professor Chopra's letter further says that, "Let the cardinality of the equity, parity and uniformity reign supreme at Panjab University and the holders of transparency and accountability guide administration to at least participatory governance sans any inclusive repetitive non-performing artifacts of sycophancy and self glorification. Be decisive and let all this Calendar roll and repay our alma mater with all that we have received so far with gratitude and love. Let us rebuild Panjab University a new". Would these people rebuild Panjab University a new? Could they leave it and forget it? All of them should feel remorse for their acts of omissions. What is happening here? This person has a sexual harassment case against him. The sexual harassment is proved. He even wins over the witnesses. The girl, who was sexually harassed, is in tears. The Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) also knows that this sexual harassment case is true. But since the witness has turned hostile, the Chairman, PUCASH gave the direction that Professor Chopra should not be in contact with any student.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that actually interim order was given but the Chairperson did not implement that. That order was that Professor Chopra should not be allowed to come in contact with the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he had ordered that no classes be given to Professor Chopra, it is in this context. They could not have such a person who could do more damage to the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the classes were allowed but the girl was asked not to attend the classes.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired whether Professor Chopra is out of the service or he had got a stay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Chopra has not got any stay, but he has just misled. He has not got any stay and the Law Officer of the University did not guide him (Vice-Chancellor), he has no hesitation to say this. When he realized that Professor Chopra is not entitled to stay at all, then he lost no time in reconfirming to him he is not on the rolls of the University from 1st February onwards.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that hats off to the Vice-Chancellor that he is determined to handle such a person in a way he is saying. Professor Chopra is such a person that whatever adjectives he has used for him are less.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has read all the related files.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Administrative Committee including the so-called friends of Professor Chopra were unanimous that the matter be reported to the authorities and the matter was reported. Thereafter nothing happened. There is a record available that in the year 2002, he had said that Professor Chopra is drawing the salary from the University while sitting at Jalandhar and is being protected. An action should be initiated against him. A Committee of President, PUTA, Chairperson, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Professor S.L. Sharma on the spot was formed. They regularly tried to put a check on this person. But, unfortunately, the earlier Vice-Chancellor dealt with him in a totally different manner. The Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor S.L. Sharma, which was formed by the Senate, could not meet regularly and could not submit the findings. In between, the Syndicate formed a small Committee in which Shri Jarnail Singh was also a member. The Committee felt that he is liable to be heavily punished but said that let him go and the Vice-Chancellor also requested that red entry be not made.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he took a stand.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if he (Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma) had told him about this person in the meeting of the Senate itself, he has collected so many documents by contacting some persons. All these documents are not available in the record. One is draft regarding possible action against Professor V.K. Chopra, Reader in English "Malicious Campaign against Panjab University". Dr. Chopra since long has been indulging in malicious campaign against the Panjab University as a whole and has been leveling false, frivolous, baseless charges against the officers of the University without adhering to the guidelines as contemplated in Panjab University Calendar Volume III. It is specifically mentioned that the complainant has to prove his bonafide by making his complaint supported by affidavit duly attested. When Professor Chopra complained against the DSW and the CVO asked for the affidavit, he refused the affidavit. But the same complaints are now repeated in the Senate. Since there is no need of the affidavit, he has given all these to the CVO. They could read the CVO reports and if they want a special meeting to be convened, he is okay with it. Let them thrash the CVO report one by one threadbare.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that a meeting be called and the matter should be closed. They could discuss all the things in the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why should a needle of suspicion hang against the officers of the University. Why it is being reported in the vernacular press daily? They could also see the vernacular newspapers of Punjab and find that Panjab University is being maligned. Conniving and conspiring enquiry of the writ petitions against Panjab University: Dr. Chopra earlier made number of complaints, number of attempt to malign the University in which he failed. Ultimately, he conspired and connived by filing a writ petition in the form of a PIL in the Punjab and Haryana High Court against the Panjab University as well as against other offices of Health Centre, Estate through some Advocate. Are they so weak that they could not handle an individual? This institution of 130 years of standing could not handle an individual. Could they not file a case against him (Professor Chopra)? Why does not the Syndicate think over it and

opine next time whether the University should file a case against him for maligning the University so that he could feel some heat.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in addition to whatever is there in the files, there are more complaints and enquiries also.

It was informed that there is a Brar Committee, Garg Committee, Devi Sirohi Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that think over it and do not take a decision in a hurry. They would come back to it next time. Tell him (Vice-Chancellor) what should be done to checkmate these people. Could all of them not checkmate an individual?

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the complaints are false.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such a message should go. This person (Professor Chopra) has blamed all, including political leaders. The country has been ruled by the Congress and BJP alternatively, both the UPA and NDA ever since Pt. Nehru went away in 1964. After that the country is ruled in this way. The people who rule the country do not fight like this. They know how the former Prime Minister Shri Man Mohan Singh and Shri Narendra Modi contact each other and take advice of each other when it comes to national interest. They contest the elections, politics apart, they do not run down the nation. The agenda of liberalizing the economy, etc. which was started by Shri Atal Behari Bajpai, Shri Man Mohan Singh has followed that and Shri Narendra Modi is taking that further. Has Modiji disowned Gandhiji or Sardar Patel?

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that for future would they have the re-employment for five years or something else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the re-employment would be for five years and there would be no change in it except that there might not arise another Chopra. He (Vice-Chancellor) is just trying protecting the governing body of this University. Whatever a person has done till the age of 59, after evaluating that, the re-employment of five years be given so that nobody is given punishment when he/she reaches the age of 63 years.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the requirement of workload should be kept in mind. He requested that the requirement of workload at Hoshiarpur should be reviewed whether there is workload or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would give a concrete proposal how they are protective of the re-employment scheme as well as the responsibility of the governing body so that there the governing body might not do anything wrong by default.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if there is not much workload and the research is not being done, they should review it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the re-employment could not be done in such a way that there is workload at one place while not at the other place. But it should be ensured that the record of the person be checked.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if there is no workload, then how could they pay the salary.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is going on.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that then it is wrong as they are facing the financial crunch.

The Vice-Chancellor said that except the Regional Centres, he has got complete auditing of the academic position in the University. He instructed the Registrar to provide these details in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that when it comes to the re-employment, in one case the Chairperson would say that there is workload while in the other case, the Chairperson could say that there is no workload. So, the criteria of workload could not be implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has got it independently checked. He would provide the complete record so that they do not take any decision for which they would have to regret later on. His duty is to see that the governing body is protected, is seen to be relevant and is not accused at any stage as they spare their whole day for the University. He knows that some of the members are travelling for long hours ranging from 5-6 hours, coming a day before and going back the next day. He knows the strain that the members put themselves to and attend the governing body meeting regularly. So, he wanted to be protective about it. The reforms which are to be brought in the University, could not be done without the participation and cooperation of the governing body. Let them respect this governing body. It might not have tall people like Shri Gurdial Singh Dhillon today. There is no individual here. But collectively they could rise to the stature of Shri Dhillon and Shri Mehr Chand Mahajan. There is nothing like that. He is also not Shri A.C. Joshi, but they are holding the meeting. So, let them work with the confidence and they shall deliver. It is the second meeting and still they have to conduct 10 more Syndicate meetings. Let them set an example that this Syndicate (of present Senate) to perform on behalf of the governing body. The resolved part is that all the material would be sent to all the places and they strongly condemn what Professor V.K. Chopra has indulged in and his appointment in the University stands finished on 31st January and he has to vacate the office in the University within three days.

This was agreed to by the members.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired whether the matter ends here. Whether it would go to the Senate?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the minutes of the Syndicate would go to the Senate and it would be for information.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that could it be said that Professor Chopra is a whistle blower and raised some points?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Chopra) is not a whistle blower. They could resolve that he is not a whistle blower and

also that he has been indulging in wrong things to harass the successive Vice-Chancellors and the officers of the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this person had disturbed all the Chairpersons, teachers, colleagues, students since the year of his joining in 1987, till the year 2017. He is saying all this honestly. This person is incorrigible, a nuisance for everybody. He wished that the members had guided the Vice-Chancellor that Professor Chopra did not deserve the re-employment. He did not teach the classes earlier and also not during the re-employment period. Honestly speaking, this person has harmed the students, maligned the name of the University. Consistently, persistently, he has used the Press and damaging the University and he did not perform the teaching, not performed any harmony, did not perform any duty and unfortunately, he claims as a whistle blower.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Chopra) is not a whistle blower.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it would be on record that when the meeting of the Syndicate was held in the year 2014, he and late Shri Chatrath had definitely talked about his behaviour.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the case came up in the year 2013.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it (records) would be looked into.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the Syndicate condemns the misdemeanours of Professor V.K. Chopra during his service;
- (ii) since, as per resolution of the Senate, as his term as reemployed Professor stands over on 31st January, 2017, he be asked to vacate the office in the Department within 3 days; and
- (iii) all the material related to his misdemeanors during the service be collated and sent to all the quarters where he has made the complaints.

General Discussion:

- (1) Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they had appointed Dr. Ruchi Bhardwaj on compassionate grounds. She was already working somewhere and drawing a salary of Rs.65,000/-. So, they should see to it that whatever scale is given to her, her salary should not be less than Rs.65,000/-. Accordingly, it was recorded. The Finance personnel fixed the pay in such a way that they granted the basic pay of Rs.15,600/-+GP. 7000 + DA as applicable and the rest was paid as special allowances. As and when any instalment of DA is given, her allowances are getting reduced in that proportion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should not be so.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when she would get the increment, the same thing would happen. So, they need to

resolve today that her salary be fixed on appointment in such a manner that the basic pay be fixed at a salary so that her salary becomes Rs.65,000/-.

It was informed that a higher start could be given and that has to be defined in the form of increments.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the total number of increment should be defined in a manner that her salary becomes Rs.65,000/-.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to prepare a note in consultation with the Finance and Development Officer for consideration as an item so that there is no ambiguity. They have taken note of it that they need to attend to it. The proposal be put before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

- (2) Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as has been done the last time and it was very helpful, first of all, the resolved parts should be prepared in the same manner.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is against it. They had earlier also reversed the decision which Professor Navdeep Goyal is talking about. The complete and comprehensive minutes should be provided because recently a letter has been issued to all the Chairpersons to send the names of 6 Professors for the Chairs. He had raised the issue and it was discussed and it was clearly decided that if a person is the senior most but has not worked in a particular field, how could they consider such a person for appointment as a Chair Professor to which the Vice-Chancellor had assured that it would be looked into. When the circular has been issued, this thing was not mentioned in it. It seems to be very democratic that it be clearly mentioned in which context, in which background and how after discussion by all the members, a viewpoint emerged and a particular decision was taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he gives a resolution of the problem that the resolved parts would not be issued for implementation until the same are circulated to all the members by e-mail. The members could check the same. They would wait for 3-4 days and only then the resolved parts would be implemented.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is right.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would wait for inputs from all the members. If any of the members of the Syndicate says that a particular resolved part should be withheld and should be sent with proper discussion.

- (3) Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is a lot of agitation going on, on the issue of examination fee and the students of the Colleges are not depositing the fee and the last date for filling up the examination fee is also nearing. He suggested that the last date be extended by a week or 10 days.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as requested, the date be extended. He further said that the three representatives would visit the Colleges and inform the Principals that the students belonging to economically weaker sections who are not able to pay the fee would make a representation, the University would try to meet the expenses.

Principal I.S. Sandhu enquired whether the income limit for EWS students is Rs. 2.5 lacs or Rs. 5 lacs.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in the meeting of the Senate held in July 2016, it was decided that the EWS category students would be those whose parents' annual income is less than Rs.5 lacs whereas the notification which has been issued mentions the income as Rs.2.5 lacs. It should be clarified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that his impression is that the students in the income bracket of Rs.2.5 lacs to Rs.5 lacs would make a case for fee concession and those seeking fee concession, would be granted.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma wanted a clarification as to which certificate would be valid for this income criterion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a certificate which defines the students as EWS could serve the purpose.

Shri Varinder Singh said that since there are no clear guidelines to the Colleges regarding this there are regular strikes in the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why the members should visit the Colleges and know the difficulties.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested that a letter regarding the concession be circulated to all the Colleges.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the fee is not clearly specified whether it would be Rs.1550/- or Rs.2500/-

Shri Varinder Singh said that the fee is not clear.

It was informed that a circular in this regard has already been sent and is also available on the notice.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as pointed out by Shri Varinder Singh that the students are protesting in Abohar, Fazilka and Ferozepur. Even the students are protesting at the residences of the Fellows. He came to know that the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor had visited some Colleges, it would have been better if this information could have been provided.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is having a report. The number of students is not less. By chance, he was at DAV College and they tried to convince the students. He has also talked to the Controller of Examinations. He made it clear to the students that since the practical examination could not be taken in December for which a fee of Rs.2500/- was charged, next time the fee would be reduced by Rs.1000/- and only Rs.1500/- would be charged. The students were convinced.

There were so many students. 80% of the students were those having practical subjects. Earlier the fee was Rs. 900/- and Rs.1100/-, but now the fee of two semesters is Rs.3000/- (Rs.1500/- each). Now the students are raising an issue that the fee for the practical subjects has been reduced, but they do not know as to how it has been reduced. The number of such students is very large. They should also examine this issue.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that two-three Syndics/Senators be requested to visit those Colleges and pacify the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members could talk to the students and resolve the matter.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is ready to perform this duty. He further said that, for example, in the case of his College, the fee had been fixed at Rs. 6400/- which has now been revised to Rs.11000/- which means that the fee is almost double. He had made it known to the public that the fee is Rs.6400/-. Since, now the fee has been revised to Rs.11000/-, the parents are approaching him with complaints. He suggested that whatever fee is to be charged from the students, that should be decided well in advance before the start of the session so that the same is published in the prospectus. The parents' grouse is that since a fee of Rs.6400/- is mentioned in the prospectus, why should they pay more fees which has been increased mid-session. If he has to print the prospectus, he would get it printed as Rs.6400/- plus examination fee. He suggested that the date be extended and it would help the poor students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the date be extended and the students in the income group of Rs.2.5 lacs to Rs.5 lacs would seek the concession which would be granted.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that criteria could be fixed as to how much concession is to be given to the students in the income group up to Rs.2.5 lacs and Rs.2.5 to 5 lacs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the students in the income group of Rs.2.5 lacs to Rs.5 lacs would make a case for concession and the relief would be granted.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a circular in this regard be issued.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is a confusion in the subject of Commerce as in the first year, there is a practical paper which is to be Rs.1500/- whereas the total fee has been fixed at Rs.2500/-. He further said that in the case of honour subjects, none of the Principals knows as to how much fee is to be charged from the students. This needs to be checked whether the fee of Rs.1500/- or Rs.2550/- is to be charged. He is ready to provide his help.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be got checked.

- (4) Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the Colleges have applied for a course of M.A. Education and the inspection team for this purpose be formed.

It was clarified that action on all the cases which had been received has been taken and if any specific case is pending that could be brought to the notice and action would be taken.

- (5) Principal B.C. Josan said that since the DAV College, Chandigarh has also applied for MBA, it should also be granted.

It was informed that the case has been sent to the General Branch.

- (6) Shri Varinder Singh said that about 2-4 days ago, such sports students who did not attend the practical sports grounds were being detained. In this regard, he would like to point out that since the Campus Sports is having only one coach, what kind of coaching/training/practice the students would get without the necessary facilities while attending the ground practice. Some of the sports under which the students have taken admission are not available in the University. He suggested that such students should be allowed to get their attendance marked at the stadia in Chandigarh where the coach facility is available.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the students are practicing somewhere, their attendance could be marked there where they are practicing.

- (7) Shri Varinder Singh said that the University has appointed some temporary coaches. He suggested that their annual performance report be asked and the interview be held every year when the appointments are to be made as there are so many complaints against these coaches.

The Vice-Chancellor said that matter is with the DSW.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after the bifurcation of the Departments, now it is with the Director, Sports.

Shri Varinder Singh said that every year the interview be conducted and the performance be also examined.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that every time the same coaches should not be appointed but could be changed.

- (8) Shri Varinder Singh said that the 'C' class employees get a promotion after a period of five years for which a test is conducted. He said that their test should be conducted earlier. Supposing if their promotion is due in January, the test is conducted in the month of October and the promotions get delayed for a year or so. He suggested that the test should be conducted in advance and whenever such employees complete the service of five years, they could be promoted.

It was informed that the test is conducted once every year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be conducted in advance.

It was informed that whenever the employees want to take the test, the test is conducted and the employees get promotion.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should be allowed to appear in the test in advance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it might be wrong as some of the employees must not be knowing the matter.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if an employee has completed the period of 4 years 8 months, that could be allowed to appear.

- (9) Shri Varinder Singh said that since they are running the courses like Defence Studies and Police Administration and other courses, he suggested that these courses should be started in the Regional Centres and the Constituent Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the Constituent Colleges first stabilize.

- (10) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, he had shared that there is a problem in the 3rd and 5th semesters. Some of the students have got the jobs. The Controller of Examinations must have received the applications. He has also received an application. If a student has passed the 5th semester and was having the subject of Physical Education which has a practical paper. If such a student wanted to change the subject, he/she would have to appear in 5 deficient subjects. He suggested that if such a student has to appear only in the last semester, he/she should be allowed to appear as a private candidate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it be allowed.

- (11) Shri Varinder Singh said that he has raised the issue regarding conducting interview for sports, it should be taken up.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

- (12) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is a provision in the University for the post of Joint Controller of Examinations and Joint Registrar. During the last so many years, there have been Joint Controller of Examinations and Joint Registrar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they have to see the decision of the Court in the case of Deputy Registrar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this charge could be given through promotion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no promotion charge could be given.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the designation could be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'no'. At the moment, there are financial implications involved in it and it could not be done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that no new posts are to be advertised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to talk to him later on.

- (13) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that recently a meeting regarding the issue of CMJ University had been held and the recommendations have been submitted, a decision is required to be taken on that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there have to be some papers and how he could do it without the papers.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the papers have just been submitted and that is to be adopted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if it has come just now, it would be taken up in the next meeting.

- (14) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as is being discussed, a golden chance should be given to the students.

It was informed that the related file has been approved and it would be notified.

- (15) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 21st January, the academic calendar was adopted. At that time, he had said that they have resolved on the issue of 5-day week. He has no knowledge whether a letter has been written to the Punjab Government or not so that the Punjab Government be contacted and the issue could be discussed. That should be expedited.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the letter should be sent to the DPI and the DHE.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

- (16) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that now the College teachers would also become Professors. He had moved a resolution in the year 2014, that they should be part of the concerned Faculties. Professor Bhoop was Chairman of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee is to be revived.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there is a need to revive that Committee as there has been no meeting of the Committee since March 2015.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dalip Kumar to hand over the related material to SO to Vice-Chancellor and the Committees would be revived.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he and Dr. Dalip Kumar are members of the Committee.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is also a member of that Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee would be revived.

- (17) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in the last meeting he had also raised the issue of list of journals. The list has not been prepared till date. It should be made time bound as the teachers are facing difficulties.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be done.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the list of the journals of the Punjabi, Hindi and Music also needed to be prepared.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he would like to supplement the statement of Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu that when the issue of journals/books comes up, the Syndicate/Senate members belonging to the Colleges should also be taken into confidence.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be kept in mind. The inputs would be provided to Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that some of the Departments provide their own journals whereas the good journals being published by the Colleges are not taken into consideration.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it should be done in a time bound manner.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

- (18) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the teachers are doing the evaluation work. When the teachers apply for higher scale, a certificate is required to the effect that the teacher has done the evaluation work for so many hours. Since the teachers are evaluating the answer books of the University examination, he requested that a certificate should be issued to the teachers on the spot so that the teachers do not have to apply individually.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

- (19) Principal N.R. Sharma said the problem of the Education Colleges is genuine. The inspection of the Colleges has to be done. As per the Guidelines of 2014, there is a requirement of 2 Professors and 2 Associate Professors. He suggested that either this relaxation be given for a semester or a Committee should be formed in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to attend to it.

- (20) Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a discussion took place regarding the formation of Committee to look into the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th February 2017

NCTE guidelines regarding the issue of required percentage of marks from 50%/55%, but the same has not been formed. He requested that the Committee be formed.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR