

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on **Sunday, 21st January 2018** at **11.00 a.m.**
in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

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

48. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
49. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
50. Professor R.P. Bambah
51. Shri Raghbir Dyal
52. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
53. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
54. Dr. S. S. Sangha
55. Dr. Subhash Sharma
56. Shri Sandeep Singh
57. Ms. Surinder Kaur
58. Shri Satya Pal Jain
59. Professor Shelly Walia
60. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
61. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
62. Shri Sandeep Kumar
63. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
64. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Shri Amanpreet Singh
2. Dr. Amar Singh
3. Ms. Anu Chatrath
4. Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary, Education Minister, Punjab
5. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
6. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
7. Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu
8. Professor Deepak Pental
9. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
10. Dr. Harsh Batra
11. Justice Harbans Lal
12. Shri Harjit Singh, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
13. Smt. Kirron Kher
14. Shri Parimal Rai
15. Shri Parmod Kumar
16. Shri Punam Suri
17. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
18. Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal
19. Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, D.H.E., Punjab
20. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
21. Shri Sanjay Tandon
22. Dr. S.K. Sharma
23. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
24. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
25. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
26. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
27. Shri Varinder Singh
28. Shri V.K. Sibal

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

- i) Prof. R.S. Loyal, Department of Geology, PU, on 10th January, 2018,

- ii) Prof. Savita Dhir, formerly of the English Department at University School of Open Learning, on 6th January 2018,
- iii) Professor (Dr.) Amrit Tewari, wife of late Prof. V.N. Tewari, former Head of Department of Punjabi at Panjab University, Chandigarh, and mother of Shri Manish Tewari, she passed away on 14th January, 2018. She was member of Senate of PU from 1984-1996. She was also member of Syndicate and Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences at P.U. and she also occupied many pivotal positions.
- iv) Prof. K.K. Bhutani, former Director, NIPER, SAS Nagar (Mohali), PU Alumnus and founder member of CRIKC, on 6th January, 2018,
- v) Smt. Shimla Devi, sister of Sh. Pawan Kumar Bansal, Fellow, PU, on 16th January, 2018,
- vi) Shri Amolakh Josan, elder brother of Dr. B.C. Josan, Fellow, PU and Principal, DAV College, Sector-10, on 9th January, 2018
- vii) Shri Gurdip Singh, Former President PUSA and Fellow, on 17th December 2017
- viii) Shri Arun Gupta, brother of Shri Anupam Gupta Ji (Senior Counsel), on 21st January 2018

The Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Prof. R.S. Loyal, Prof. Savita Dhir, Professor (Dr.) Amrit Tewari, Prof. K.K. Bhutani, Smt. Shimla Devi, Shri Amolakh Josan, Shri Gurdip Singh and Shri Arun Gupta and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

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

- i) Prof. Dharendra Pal Singh, former Director, National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), has assumed the office of Chairperson of University Grants Commission, for a period five years from 1st January 2018.
- ii) Prof. V.K. Rattan of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Inst. of Chemical Engg. and Technology, has joined as Vice Chancellor of GNA University, Phagwara (Punjab) on 19th January, 2018 for a term of three years.
- iii) Mr. Justice Jagdish Singh Khehar, former Chief Justice, Supreme Court of India, will receive LL.D. (Honoris Causa) on 4th March 2018 during the 67th Annual Convocation of Panjab University. Mr. Justice Khehar could not attend the 66th Annual Convocation of PU last year.

- iv) Prof. Sir. Tejinder Singh Virdee, scheduled to receive 'D.Sc. (*Honoris Causa*)' on March 4, 2018 during the 67th Annual Convocation of PU, shall deliver Second Prof. H. S. Hans Memorial Lecture on March 5, 2018 in the Department of Physics.
- v) Prof. Man Mohan Sharma, FRS, scheduled to receive 'D.Sc. (*Honoris Causa*)' on March 4, 2018, shall deliver an Annual Expository Lecture on 3rd March, 2018 to commemorate Birth Anniversary of Dr Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar every year this lecture is held in the University.
- vi) Prof. R. C. Sobti, Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow and former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, has been honoured with INSA Senior Scientist position from January 2018. The position carries an honorarium of Rs.30,000/- p.m.(Thirty Thousand per month) and contingency grant of Rs. 1,00,000/- per annum. He returns to PU Campus after he completes his term as Vice Chancellor at Lucknow.
- vii) Prof. Rumina Sethi, Department of English and Cultural Studies, has been nominated as a member of General Council of the Sahitya Akademi (National Academy of Letters), New Delhi, for a period five years w.e.f. January 2018.
- viii) Prof. S.K. Sharma, Fellow and Professor Emeritus, PU, has been nominated as member of the International Adhoc Group on Carbondioxide utilization, constituted by the International Standards Organization (ISO). This group comprises of representatives of ten countries, namely: USA, France, Germany, Japan, China, The Netherlands, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Korea and India.
- ix) Shri Devesh Maudgil has been elected as a Mayor of Chandigarh, he is an alumnus of Panjab University and he has been a Joint Secretary of PUCSC in 1999 and he is also a member of Board of Studies in Law
- x) Prof. Seema Kapoor, Enactus Faculty Advisor and Coordinator, Swachh Bharat Abhiyan in the Dr S. S. Bhatnagar Univ. Inst. of Chemical Engg. & Technology has bagged Best Faculty Award 2016-2017 from ENACTUS India (Supported by Mahindra) and a cash prize of Rs. 25000/- as appreciation for dedication and hardwork.
- xi) Dr. Vanita Kakkar, Assistant Professor in University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, has received the Biotechnology Ignition Grant (BIG) amounting to Rs. 50 lakhs by the Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC) for her work on Pediatric Dermatitis.
- xii) Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, has been nominated as a member of the Indian National Young Academy of Sciences (IN-YAS) under the aegis of INSA, for five years w.e.f. January 2018. He is the first young scientist to be inducted in IN-YAS from PU. He had also received a research grant of Rs. 63 lakhs from Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB) for a project in collaboration with CSIR-IMTECH, Chandigarh.

- xiii) Dr. S. K. Upadhyay, Department of Botany, has been invited by the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences to join Academy (NAAS) as Associate from 1st January, 2018.
- xiv) As per a recent communication received from office of Principal Scientific Advisor to Government of India, New Delhi, 10 Clusters have been asked to be created all across India for strengthening education and research base of the Universities. One such Cluster was proposed to comprise 4 Universities (Panjab University, Chandigarh, Punjabi University, Patiala, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra and Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar) and 6 National Research Laboratories in the region (CSIR-IMTECH, CSIR-CSIO, NABI, CIAB, INST and SCL). These National laboratories belong to the CSIR Network to the department of Space, to the department of Science & Technology, DBT and supported by various ministries in Delhi. The Chairman of this Cluster is Vice Chancellor, PU and Co-Chairman is Executive Director, NABI, Mohali. The inaugural meeting of this Cluster was convened on January 5, 2018. The other institutions of Chandigarh Region Innovation and Knowledge Cluster would also synergise their activities with the new Cluster. The Minutes of the first meeting have been submitted to the Department of Science and Technology, New Delhi. 'Centre for Policy Research' devoted to promote Academy-Industry collaborations which was created at Panjab University Campus in 2014, has been entrusted the nodal role for the new Cluster. Prof. Rupinder Tewari is the founder Coordinator of CPR at Panjab University Campus. So an initiative which we had voluntarily commenced and registered as a society. It has received national attention and it is a part of the national agenda now
- xv) Panjab University had adopted regulations for the institution and administration of Honours Schools in Oriental languages, History, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Botany and Zoology nearly a hundred years ago in 1918-19. Provisions were made in the regulations to appoint University Professor and Lecturers and establishment of Boards of Control. The Honours Schools in Arabic, Sanskrit, Botany, Zoology and Mathematics commenced in 1919. It is proposed to commemorate the initiation of academic activities on behalf of Panjab University Campus and Honours School System in 2019. Coincidentally, 2019 is also the centenary year of Prof. Ram Chander Paul born on October 20, 1919), the Vice Chancellor, PU from 1.7.1974 to 31.12.1984. We have sought release of a postal stamp in the centenary year of Prof. R.C. Paul. It is proposed to hold a 'Centenary Commemoration Symposium' on behalf of PU Campus and Honours Schools. A Committee has been constituted under the Chairpersonship of DUI, to plan for these commemorations. Incidentally Mr. A.C. Woolner, Principal, Government College, Lahore, was appointed the first DUI to coordinate various academic activities on behalf of PU and its Honours Schools nearly hundred years ago.in 1921. We have been informed by Dr. K.K.Paul S/o Late Professor R.C. Paul, currently he serving as a Governor, Uttra hand and the government would release the stamp next year to commemorate centenary of Professor R.C. Paul and we would also commemorate centenary of the existence and the continuation of the P.U. Campus and the Honours

Schools. Hopefully many new initiatives would get started in this background in the next year.

RESOLVED: That:

- (1) felicitation of the Senate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Prof. Dharendra Pal Singh, former Director, National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), on having taken over as Chairperson of University Grants Commission, for a period five years from 1st January 2018
 - (ii) Prof. V.K. Rattan of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Inst. of Chemical Engg. and Technology, on having joined as Vice Chancellor of GNA University, Phagwara (Punjab) on 19th January, 2018 for a term of three years.
 - (iii) Prof. R. C. Sobti, Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow and former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on having been honoured with INSA Senior Scientist position from January 2018
 - (iv) Prof. Rumina Sethi, Department of English and Cultural Studies, on having been nominated as a member of General Council of the Sahitya Akademi (National Academy of Letters), New Delhi, for a period five years w.e.f. January 2018.
 - (v) Prof. S.K. Sharma, Fellow and Professor Emeritus, PU, on having been nominated as member of the International Adhoc Group on Carbondioxide utilization, constituted by the International Standards Organization (ISO).
 - (vi) Shri Devesh Maudgil on having been elected as a Mayor of Chandigarh
 - (vii) Prof. Seema Kapoor, Enactus Faculty Advisor and Coordinator, Swachh Bharat Abhiyan in the Dr S. S. Bhatnagar Univ. Inst. of Chemical Engg. & Technology on having bagged Best Faculty Award 2016-2017 from ENACTUS India (Supported by Mahindra)
 - (viii) Dr. Vanita Kakkar, Assistant Professor in University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, on having received the Biotechnology Ignition Grant (BIG) amounting to Rs. 50 lakhs by the Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC)
 - (ix) Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, on having been nominated as a member of the Indian National Young Academy of Sciences (IN-YAS) under the aegis of INSA, for five years w.e.f. January 2018

(x) Dr. S. K. Upadhyay, Department of Botany, on having been invited by the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences to join Academy (NAAS) as Associate from 1st January, 2018

(2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. Nos. (iii), (iv), (v), (xiv) and (xv) be noted.

II. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-1 on the agenda** was read out and viz. -

C-1. That the proposal of certain Syndics with regard to change in rule for extension/re-employment of Principal of aided/unaided Colleges, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 39)

Professor Akhtar Mahmood enquired whether it is a regular meeting or special meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that it is a regular meeting. Some agenda items were left last time. So, they decided to focus on some selective number of agenda items and one more agenda item has been added to it.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that they have the resolved part of item which says that special meeting of the Senate will be convened to consider the Item C-38 and other issues. Therefore, they are not sticking to what they had resolved in the last meeting and they are doing something which is against our resolution.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a special sitting of the Senate where they are focussing on issues relating to Colleges' and one more item is being added to the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to inform the House though the Vice-Chancellor had replied to the Syndicate and he was not sure what was recorded in the minutes. He had specifically mentioned in the Syndicate that the special meeting of the Senate would be convened. In the special meeting no other agenda item could be added except what was decided by the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor in the Syndicate read the notice wherein it was read that a meeting of the Senate would be held. Now as what Professor Akhtar Mahmood has read, it is specifically resolved to hold a special meeting of the Senate to discuss Item C-38 and other items or issues related to colleges. He wanted to remind the House that after long deliberations and discussions, the Senate had decided to convene this special meeting of the Senate with the intervention of some senior experienced members and a date, i.e., 7th of January, 2018 convenient to all those who were present in the House was fixed in the Senate itself. But the meeting is taking place on 21st January, 2018. Subsequently, they came to know that the decision taken by the Senate has been reviewed by the Syndicate and date has been changed and the issue of date of special meeting of Senate was discussed in the Senate itself that whether it could be held after 16th January or not. After long discussion, date of 7th January, 2018 was fixed. Not only that the Syndicate reviewed the decision of Senate for which it is not empowered. If they go through the minutes which have been circulated it is mentioned that the special meeting of the Senate would take place on 6th January, 2018 and not 7th January, 2018 as it was decided unanimously by the Senate

and it is only after referring to the diary, the Vice-Chancellor agreed to hold the meeting on 7th January, 2018. According to him, every day they are not only compromising with the sanctity of the Regulations of the University, they are also consciously or unconsciously undermining the authority of the Senate also which to his mind should not be acceptable to anyone. In fact, it is the moral duty of all the members of Senate to ensure that the dignity of the supreme body of the Panjab University is not allowed to be compromised by anybody, howsoever important a high dignitary he may be. So he would like the Vice-Chancellor to respond that under what provision any agenda item could be added to a special meeting and under what provision the Syndicate could change the date of the meeting of the Senate which was fixed by the Senate itself and that too unanimously.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that it was decided from the day one that agenda would be sent online. He asked as to why online agenda has not been sent and what problems are being faced in sending supplementary agenda. Details of selection committees, inspection committees and guest house booking (hard copies) have been provided and all these are time, money and energy wasting and are not environment friendly. He is repeating that thing only because he has not the courage to go to the Registrar and would be able to maintain his dignity as a teacher. When they approach the Registrar for some suggestion or request then he says that without permission and appointment, how they could enter his room. Senate is the governing body of the Panjab University. They are all present in the Senate to maintain the glory of Panjab University and teachers. So at least could they not discuss for a while about the faculty, non-teaching and other staff of the University who are protesting outside the administrative office. Why they are present there, it is only due to some minor problem from the Registrar. When teachers enter the Registrar's office, he says that dictatorship would be carried on and not the democracy. In the past, there were Registrars, but they did not have so many problems. Whenever they face the problem regarding research and LTC, all these should be routed under Registrar's signature. He has read the page No. 147 of Panjab University Calendar I, which says that if somebody wanted to avail LTC and his/her form is signed by the Director/Chairperson concerned, Registrar's approval would be sought thereafter. In that case Director is eligible to sign the LTC form for availing LTC. He wants to cite a living example. First his LTC form was misplaced in the Establishment Branch. When he approached the Registrar, the Registrar asked him to fill up the second form. There is no provision in the LTC rules that form be filled 2nd time. Post-facto sanction is not approved in the LTC cases. Then again LTC form misplaced. The Registrar agreed the same in written.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a relevant matter and requested Dr. Parveen Goyal to take his seat.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is continuing on the points raised by Shri Ashok Goyal. He further said that he is a Syndicate member. In the meeting of Syndicate, a notice was read that it was decided in the Senate that any other item be taken up. When the minutes of the Senate came it was found in a clear cut manner that today meeting would be of Colleges related issues. He and Shri Goyal constantly said that do not take colleges issues so lightly. Colleges related issues are in large number and after so many years this type of meeting is being held. They should be very serious about the colleges' issues and do not bring any other item in the agenda. That might be cleared why other item has been brought in the senate meeting. In today's Senate meeting all the issues related to colleges would be discussed threadbare along with suggestion. In the past also similar meeting was held for colleges issues. Earlier issues were discussed but no solution came and today they should discuss the issues

and provide a solution. For the colleges' issues they are ready to attend the meeting till 10.00 p.m. and they would also arrive at some solution. It might be cleared in today's meeting, why other item has been added in the agenda.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in the past also whenever a special meeting is held, one or two items are also added in the agenda that might be cleared. Even on the very last day also, e-mail regarding meeting is received.

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

Principal H.S. Gosal said that in the past also dates of several meetings had been changed. During the tenure of Professor Sobti, the dates of meetings had changed frequently. It was not finalised that meeting would be held on 6th January or 7th January, 2018. Earlier also, the dates of the meetings have been changed.

Professor Ronki Ram said whenever the Senate meeting or special Senate meeting is held; Fellows from different colleges have to attend the Senate meeting. In the Senate meeting agenda is discussed, but sometime some urgent items needs consideration of the House and meeting of the Senate could not be held frequently so some urgent and important items which need immediate consideration only of the Senate, could be brought to the special Senate meeting.

Professor Chaman Lal said that his opinion is that sometime issue is not so big, as is framed because of lack of communication. As the meeting of 7th January is being held on 21st January, at the start of the meeting had the Vice-Chancellor explained the reasons for the same, many members could have been satisfied. The second issue is that the special meeting would be for college related issues and if there were some urgent items that needed consideration of the House, permission of the House might be sought that if after discussing the colleges related issue, the House has some spare time then other items could be discussed. If they say something with reason then most of the matters are settled. But if they stick on their stands then the matter is not settled.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that he wants to talk about calendar for the year 2018 to which the Vice-Chancellor said that he would not permit to talk about calendar for the year 2018.

The Vice-Chancellor responded that it was intended to hold the meeting on 7th January, 2018 but to hold the meeting, lot of material had to be prepared and sent. The Dy. Registrar (General) who manages these meetings, prepares all these things. He could not give adequate time and of course he was very busy. There were so many pending matters. He (DRG) retired last month. So with the result these papers which were to be prepared for that, new person joined in and these papers could not be prepared as so much material is to be prepared for the meeting. It was in that background that the meeting had to be postponed because he had not had all these papers. He could have intimated all these things that why the matter has been getting delayed. But, intimation indeed was sent that the meeting would happen on 21st January. Now in the background of that, an emergent matter arose, a communication has come from the MHRD and they have to hold one point agenda meeting of the Syndicate in response to something which became emergent. So, the Syndicate discussed it and at the end of that meeting they have made the resolved part, they had a brief discussion as to whether they should submit that emergent matter to the planned sitting of the Senate. So, it is technically a special meeting, special sitting. It is not a special meeting convened for a new agenda item. All these things are part of

the Senate meeting for which they have had already two sittings. The agenda of those left over items, they are still more left over items. That also does not complete all the agenda items which were referred to the Senate meeting for which they had two sittings. In fact, the Syndicate meeting happens the other day, the first meeting of the new Syndicate. Certain agenda items were supposed to be discussed in the next sitting of the Senate. That meeting of the Senate is to be devoted only to the issues of the colleges. Since it is only the issue of the colleges, all the issues which do not relate to the colleges specifically there are issues remaining which relate to the colleges as well as the University, so all those items are dropped and in this today's sitting the only matter that is before them are the matters which are exclusively related to the colleges plus an additional item which has been put in. So today's meeting first would only discuss the issues pertaining to the colleges. If for whatever reason they could not handle whatever is proposed before them, then another sitting of the Senate would have to be convened. So, if per chance they manage to complete the issue of the colleges and if there is time left, then please consider an additional item which has been put to them. If there is no time left at the end of the day then another sitting of the Senate has to be convened.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the item with resolved part which has come in today's meeting, but the resolved part is not attached with the item. They need time to read the resolved part. They have to read the statements given by different persons.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting is progressing. In due course of time they would get the resolved part. For him (Professor Keshav Malhotra) there is no need to read the minutes as he had participated in the meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is talking of himself. He has to check that the minutes have been recorded properly. He has to read every single word of the proceedings. Sanctity of the special meeting might be maintained. In today's meeting, serious issue of colleges have come up in the meeting after a long time under the leadership of the Vice-Chancellor, those issues have come up after having been given a thought.

The Vice-Chancellor said that University has evolved out of the colleges. The Senate has discussed in its 137 years of history more issues of the colleges than that of University campus. He said that the first item has been discussed numerous times in the past. That is an item which in his perception has become an issue or has assumed the shape only on behalf of their University. That has not assumed these dimensions on behalf of several universities which are campuses, affiliated colleges, which have emerged out of the Panjab University after the Indian independence. This is not an issue in just that complex a form on behalf of Punjabi University, Patiala. They have fortunately the Vice-Chancellor of Punjabi University, Patiala with them who has been a part of their University and is also an alumnus of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar in the past. That is also not an issue in Kurukshetra University, MD University. That is also not an issue in that form at GNDU. So that is an issue, which would not have been an issue prior to the 6th Pay Commission. The implementation of the 6th pay Commission and desire of an alumnus of Panjab University namely Professor G.K. Chadha who devised the salary scales and the career advancement scheme and made career advancement scheme available to the college teachers all across India. What does the UGC do? The UGC uses the occasion of implementation of the new pay commission to impose certain regulations and to maintain certain minimum standards, higher standards of performance on behalf of the University teachers and so on, so forth. In an effort to see that all teachers whether Universities or Colleges, have similar

career promotion possibilities, UGC prescribed certain conditions when a teacher enters a College or university, it is the same minimum qualification. UGC during the domain of the 6th pay Commission has been continuously changing things. They should not be changing things. But they have their own compulsions. They introduce something. Whatever they introduced, it was not giving satisfactory output. So they have been continuously changing. In the background of all that is a left over thing of 5th Pay Commission where an attempt was made to change the retirement age for the faculties in the colleges and the universities, particularly the universities because the teachers enter the universities or the institutes of higher learning like AIIMS, IITs, PGI at a much older age. The average age of entry into college level as a faculty member is between 25 to 30 years. But in universities and institutes of higher learning, average age of entry as faculty is closer to 35 years or above 35 years. So in the background of all these things, the retirement age was initially supposed to be enhanced from 60 to 62 years and then 62 to 65 years. So how the people would have career progression and what would be the retirement age because they have a career progression only when the teacher would be in regular service. In the background of all these things, many changes have occurred during last ten years. So, the first issue they are having, it concerns the colleges because some things have been introduced and adopted on behalf of Panjab University Senate which amounts to giving some leeway when it comes to going beyond the age of 60 years to college Principals but that thing is not available to the college teachers. They have re-employment scheme in the University because for a very-very long time University always had that option for availing the services of the teachers beyond the age of 60 years either in terms of inviting them to participate in the teaching with remuneration or without remuneration but Panjab University Campus is practising that for a very-very long time. The teachers in this University after the regular curtailment of their services at the age of 60 years, he still remembers even when he was appointed a Professor for three years in Physics Department, several retired faculty members in the Physics Department were continuing to be part of the regular teaching. He remembered Professor S.P. Puri who was beyond the age of 60 years and was teaching in some capacity in the University. So University has had this re-employment in one form or the other with remuneration or without remuneration up to the age of 63 years. In between Panjab University had tried to put the age of 62 years. It ran into rough weather. The Court struck it down. So when he came as Vice-Chancellor on the Campus, there was retirement age at 60 years and reemployment age up to 63. They made the re-employment up to 65 and also added few riders and few benefits so that they could continue serving up to the age of 65 years. At that stage, Court case was already on in the Supreme Court. During his term only Supreme Court has given a judgement on it and various changes have occurred. It is in that background only at some stage on behalf of the educational colleges, the University sometime in 2012, there was some proposal that the teachers in educational colleges could continue beyond the age of 60 years under some special circumstances. That has led to a dilemma whether the college Principals in affiliated colleges could also under some circumstances continue beyond the age of 60 years for the college Principalship on behalf of the Panjab University and their colleges which are traditional colleges and grant in aid colleges. In the grant in aid colleges there are some positions including the Principal for which the State Govt. gives the grant or the Union Territory Administration gives the grant. But in these colleges now there are self sustaining courses then teachers appointed on behalf of the management of those colleges whose salaries are entirely paid by the management. But teachers are teachers. Nobody carries a label when they go into a college and says that he is a grant in aid teacher or is self sustaining teacher. Teachers are teachers in a college. So now the issue becomes very-very complex. The circumstances in which a college Principal is supposed to continue for which the Government would not pay the salary. The salary has to come from the

management and now if they are not taking the grant from the Govt. and they are continuing as college Principal, then surely that position as far as Govt. is concerned is vacant and is not being claimed as grant in aid. So the college teachers naturally have a concern that their colleagues who become college Principals are continuing beyond the age of 60 years and deriving some benefits or have the satisfaction of being associated with the academic institution whereas their colleague who may be of equal senior, may be even more seniority. In some sense the students may find that teachers one found to be more valuable because Principal might have administrative duties and the students have less interaction with him but there could be very distinguished college teachers who are forced to retire at the age of 60 years and students desire that they should continue. The teacher are willing to continue. But no provision could be made that he should go beyond the age of 60 years. They have made a regulation that a teacher could go beyond the age of 60 years and they sent a regulation on behalf of the University through the Senate to the Centre Govt. that the retirement age of the teachers in the University should be enhanced to 65 years. So it is teachers on behalf of the University. It meant that teachers on the campus as well as the regular teachers in the affiliated colleges. But Central Government has not responded to it. They are an inter-state body corporate. They have teachers from the colleges of Punjab and the teachers from the U.T. Colleges are also not in uniformity when it comes to State support. They have some teachers who are on deputation from the Punjab Govt. serving in the Union Territory. There are some teachers who are directly appointed by the Union Territory administration via the UPSC route whatever it is. It is a desire that the academia should have uniform service conditions. Everybody should have a retirement age which is 65 years. If there is re-employment, there should be possible re-employment for everyone. The different funding agencies are involved. There is Central Govt. and Punjab Govt. involved when it comes to Panjab University. For the U.T. Colleges, U.T. administration is involved which has its own dynamics. Punjab Govt. has its own dynamics. Punjab has multiple dynamics as Punjab has three universities. Punjab Govt. has Govt. colleges where there are quasi-Govt. Colleges which are being administered by the Panjab University, Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University in the form of Constituent Colleges. Now who would go to the constituent colleges? These numbers are not small. If the U.T. has 22 or 28 colleges today, number of constituent colleges in Punjab on behalf of the Punjab Govt. administered by the three universities of Punjab that number is far more than 20. There is non-uniformity in career opportunities for all these people. The College teacher has a desire that whatever happens to a senior colleague who happened to become Principal there should not be many changes. At one stage if they have appointed a principal, they continue till the age of superannuation. But then it is said that they could not have a Principal continuing for more than 10 years, it is 5 years + 5 years. So many new things and so many heterogeneity had got introduced when it comes to the service conditions of faculty members on behalf of the college, he treats Principal as faculty member. There is naturally a discomfort in the teaching fraternity that the things are not same. The opportunities are separate in the colleges for the teachers to move to the rank of Principal. Those opportunities are getting curtailed because in several situations, the managements for whatever reason have appointed retiring principals to continue in contractual mode in an incremental way. If it is not that, then the other option is that whosoever is the senior most Associate Professor in a college, let him serve as the acting Principal. But that option is not uniformly being practised across all the affiliated colleges in different geographical regions of the Panjab University. So this item should be viewed in a holistic way in that entire background. Of course, the University system permits certain things as rules, rules to be approved at one level on behalf of the Senate and implement it. So that is an added complication. They make certain allowances that somebody could continue beyond the age of 60 years

exercising the option that the Syndicate considers it and approves it and it is implemented. Syndicate of this University changes every 12 months on behalf of a given Senate. It is a very complex thing. It appears when they read through all this whatever has been presented to them. A decision is taken, a decision gets revised at a very short interval and then things become more and more complex and to someone who is not aware of all these dynamics, it looks that there are so many contradictions in which they are living. Life is nothing but a mix of contradictions and they are striving to have a uniformity and perfection but in practice that the uniformity and perfection is not there. Many issues have been raised. There is Principal for the University and there is Principal for the funding agency in the sense there is Principal who is an approved Principal of the Panjab University and that approved Principal is not being recognised by the funding agency. As far as the funding agency is concerned, Principal is not supposed to continue beyond the age of 60 years. So there is a Principal, there is another Principal and the practicality has demanded as if it co-exists and lives in a superposition of a Principal and an acting Principal for the purpose of funding agency. So all kinds of documents would be presented and complaints would come in that there is no uniformity the way the administration is being performed on behalf of the Panjab University as a whole. So, it is in that background today's event has to be seen. From the office side, one has tried to piece together whatever documents are available in the office, some kind of structure is attempted to be presented before them. It is possible that there are still some documents which have not come before them and they might have access even to those documents before they arrive at a decision. He does not know what could be the possible decision. The possible decision is strict compliance of whatever is in the Calendar of the University. Now strict compliance of whatever is in the Calendar of the University, has its own repercussions. Strict compliance, he does not know, whether there is ever written that they could introduce re-employment scheme in the Campus or whether they could extend re-employment scheme of the Campus beyond whatever was once the decision, then further, a decision and within a week of his arrival he got confronted with that problem when Shri Kapil Sibal, then HRD Minister visited Mohali Campus. There was that concern as the case was already on in the Supreme Court that retirement age in the University should be 65 years. But they do not have 65 years, they have 63 years. He went and asked Mr. Kapil Sibal if they could have 65 years. They wanted the Panjab University to be a Central University. But circumstances are not permitting Panjab University to become a Central University. They could not enforce it. Shri Kapil Sibal said okay, tell him if the re-employment scheme of Panjab University is extended from 63 years to 65 years. He said do not ask him that question. Did they ask him when the Panjab University introduced the re-employment from 60 years to 63 years? He said if they did not ask and are facing no problem in continuing that, what they want, do not involve him in the process. It was in that background, that 63 years was converted into 65 years, five years re-employment in the sense that every year Syndicate and Senate had to increase from 60 years to 61 years, 62 years to 63 years, 63 years to 64 years and so on. So he made certain practical changes and introduced that five years of re-employment to the provision that every year one has to give an annual report which has to be validated by the Vice-Chancellor, etc. It is a very complex situation and the office has attempted to put before them everything. In certain cases of Principals, some number is given. They have 190 odd colleges in Punjab and U.T., Chandigarh and amongst those there are only less than 20 Principals who are continuing on extension. Each person is continuing on extension under his/her unique circumstances. Somebody is on the first phase of extension of one year, somebody is in extension for two year, somebody is in the second phase, it is 2+2. Somebody is in the first phase with three and then it would be added to two. So it is a very complex thing but it was the desire of several Senate members that for once everything should be placed before the entire House. Today is

the day when all matters pertaining to them are before them. It is also put before them the circumstances under which somebody got two years, somebody got three years. What happened in the affiliated colleges? What happened in the educational colleges? He has been in consultation with his colleagues from Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and he found that in some of the constituent colleges which have been opened on behalf of the Punjab Govt. that means taking money from the Punjab Govt. and disbursing money on behalf of the Punjab Govt. These college principals are continuing up to the age of even 70 years. It is a very complex situation. He has personally no simple solution as to how to introduce that uniformity and how to remove the feeling of disparity that the teachers who have moved to the rank of Principal and teachers who have not moved to the rank of Principal. In Govt. of India or in the National labs., Central Govt. devise a thing that if one is either a Director of National laboratory or a scientist in the Director's scale, means that one gets the same material benefits without being that thing. But there, they could not do the same. Associate Professor is an officiating Principal. He does not get the benefits of Principal. There is no way of doing that. There is more dissatisfaction permeating than the more satisfaction which is permeating. There is not an easy solution to that. Situation is so grim that a vast fraction of colleges on behalf of this University do not have regular Principals. Number of regular Principals is not a vast majority. Actually it is of the orders of 50%. Once there are no regular Principals, only regular Principals could participate in the process of governance via having eight Principals being elected on behalf of the colleges of Panjab University. So people have that also that by not becoming a regular Principal, one does not have a say, he does not have a possibility of participating in the governance of the University. That is also a concern as they have evolved a system of democratic way of functioning, that is also an issue which could not be brushed aside. He does not know what is an easy answer for that. It is a very complex thing. But on behalf of the office, whatever they could put together and whatever the kind of summary, they could give, they have tried to provide. Nothing is being hidden and there is no intent. He has been serving at this position for five and half years. He has few more months left before his term concludes and he has no personal agenda that anything should be hidden. If during his term a meaningful solution could emerge before they cross over to the implementation of the Seventh Pay Commission, he would feel satisfied. So he has taken enough of their time, now they could debate on that.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that he has no issue with the raising of age from 65 years to 70 years and it does not make any difference. But the way this issue has come up, the nine members of the Senate asked for this kind of resolution. Out of that a sub-committee is made of five people or four and three of them who have signed initially are also the members of the same Sub-Committee. If someone gives a resolution and made a member of the Committee to go through the same thing, what kind of decision they expect from them. Are there no other persons who could discuss the issue. What are they doing here?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is of the opinion that the matter is subjudice and it is in the court. So, it should not be discussed in the house and let the Court decide it.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they should think of eligibility and not suitability. As has already been said by Professor Akhtar Mahmood, if a Committee consists of the same members who have raised the issue in the Syndicate, then how they can expect a right decision. So, there should be at least a member from the Punjab and Chandigarh Colleges of Technical Education, as in the Panjab University, the PUTA Present is put on the Committees. In the absence of their participation, how they can expect that

everything would be right. Secondly, in order to give benefit to the Principals of aided and unaided affiliated colleges, which may be four or five in number, they are violating the UGC regulations. Already, they are facing financial problem by violating the UGC regulation. He said that the Vice Chancellor has a very wonderful career and after giving a statement in the Court that the University would close after January, 2017, he has got the University out of the financial problem. If everything is going right, then why such things are being done. He said that some people say yes even if something is not proper just to get some benefit. He requested the Vice Chancellor to think about those persons who are unemployed. There are lot of younger faculty members with Ph.D. degree who are eligible for the post of Principal and they should think about them and not about giving extension to the Principals. There was a scheme of 2+2+1 for giving extension which is being changed to 3+2 and he is not in favour of this.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as Dr. Ranga has said it should first be decided whether they could do it or not.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he has no information about the issues pending in the Court. But he would like to say that when they discuss the problems related to colleges, they usually to forget the basic fact. The fact is that the services of private teachers working in Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh, are governed by the Punjab Affiliated Colleges (Security of Services of Employees) Act. The Court has said it time and again for all the Universities, i.e, Panjab University, Guru Nanak Dev University etc. that if any rule or regulation is against the provisions of this Act, then the provision of Act would prevail. Twenty years back in the case of Principal Kamlesh Kumari of Jalandhar Kanya Mahavidyalaya, this decision had come. They should take into consideration that if the High Court has given a stay, then they cannot discuss the issue, but if there is no stay, then they can discuss the case. Secondly, before taking a decision by the University, they should also keep in mind the provisions of their rules and the Act. If the age is prescribed in the Act, whatever it may be, they cannot go beyond that. If they do that, then their decision would be considered against the Act. Thirdly, some members were saying to resolve all the problems which have come up. There are also limitations in it as for service violations, there is a Tribunal. Justice Rajiv Bhalla who is Chairman of the Punjab Education Commission was telling him that he has received lot of issues concerning Colleges teachers and they are deciding it as per the rules of the Tribunal. Lastly, he said that they have to draw line somewhere. A High Court Judges also retire at the age of 62 years and a Supreme Court Judge at the age of 65 years. Everyone has contributed to the best of their capacity, but there has to be some end somewhere. So, whatever decision they have to take, it should be uniform keeping in view the provision of the Act.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma gave a detail of the cases pending in the Court i.e. CWP 24547, CWP 2061, 18161, 19810 and 20709 of 2015. Another case which will listed for hearing on 30th of July is 25252 or 2017 Vinay Sofat Vs State of Punjab and others. So, he felt in view of these cases, this case should not be discussed at all as the same is sub-judice.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would come to this issue, but before that he has a very small query related to this agenda item. In the first meeting of present Senate, when he did raise the issue of appointment of certain Principals, particularly in the Colleges of Education, he fears that some people, some teachers and principals who were not qualified, were appointed. Through the Vice Chancellor, he requested the Dean College Development Council and Dean, Faculty of Education who were present

here, to tell him about the eligibility conditions for the Principal in the College of Education.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will get reply for this but right now the issue is something else.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested to record it and said that he raised this issue in December, 2016 and the issue is pending for the last one year as to what are the eligibility conditions as per NCTE regulation or as per Panjab University regulations for appointment of Principal, particularly in the Education Colleges. Whether the appointments have been made as per the NCTE Regulation since 2016. He informed that this issue is pending and requested to put on record.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said he has no problem with the issue of reemployment or extension of teachers. He is not concerned whether the age be enhanced to 75 or 80 years. But he would like to request that 4-5 years ago, the Punjab Government has granted extension of two year in service for its employees and the same rules are being followed by the Panjab University. In view of that a Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Late Shri G.K. Chatrath by the Senate. Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri V.K. Sibal ji were also members of that Committee. That Committee took a decision that the non-teaching employees of the University should be given extension in service i.e. firstly for six months, then again for six months and so on. However, it was stated that the Punjab Government is giving extension to its employees because they do not have money to pay their employees at the time of retirement. If that is the situation in Punjab Government, the University is also facing the financial crunch even today. If they can think for an amendment in the Act for the teachers, as Shri Satya Pal Jain ji has said that there should be uniformity, they should also think of extension in service for non-teaching staff also as in the Act the age of retirement both for teaching and non-teaching employees is 60 years. He requested that if an amendment is to be made in the Act, the age of superannuation for non-teaching employees also be got amended and it should be made 62 years. This is what he has to say.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said speaking on the issue, he would like to make a declaration that he is not speaking against a particular individual. He would like to talk in general and rationally on this issue. Education is a service sector and in this service triangle consists of Principal, teachers and students. A Principal may make any efforts to provide quality education to the students, but actually, it has to be delivered by the teachers. But there is some sense of anxiety in the mind of teachers, an anti-environment is there. They are demoralized and their morale is down. He referred to P.U. Cal. Vol. I, Chapter 8(e) where it is written that any college which has completed its 3 years, there the temporary or adhoc staff could not be more than 20%. But in the Colleges of Punjab, more than 50% staff is working on temporary basis. They are not protecting their own regulations and the teachers are being victimized, they are frustrated and they also being victimized emotionally. They are not being given promotions. Hope sustains life. Everybody wants that he would get promotion. University teachers desires to become Vice Chancellor and College teacher thinks of becoming Principal of the College. They are snatching away his promotional avenues from them. It does not behove their elder brothers that they are demanding such a thing at the cost of emotions of their fellow teachers. They are their well wishers, they wish for their good health. It is also not good for their health to work beyond 60 years. He said that they should think that the teachers are not victimized, they should not be affected emotionally and permanent job should be ensured. The teachers in their respective colleges should ensure that the number of teachers working on temporary

and adhoc basic should not be more than 20%. The promotional avenues of the teachers should also be protected.

The Vice Chancellor asked, what a Vice Chancellor or a private citizen can do as he would be a private citizen in the next six months. Can they enforce the Government in the States of India that this spirit should be respected. He said that even in Panjab University, there 400 positions still lying vacant. They have filled them with temporary arrangement. They are pleading with the Central Government to permit them to fill these position.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that they have made regulations and they could send them the relevant regulations. From the private managements, they can ensure that all teachers positions should be filled. For Principals, the University is making so many efforts and they are also saying that if the Principals are not available, the current Principals be given extension. Now the Principals are also available otherwise there was no need to convert the 2+2+1 formula into 3+2, because by doing so they would like to ensure three years period for them. That is why they would like to change it.

The Vice Chancellor said that whenever this issue started to progress incrementally it was stated that the position would be advertised or only if no one is found eligible and found suitable. Now there is a strange thing that they should have 400 API score. Most of the senior Associate Professors in the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, it is his (Vice Chancellor) personal view, when there was the most productive period of their life, there was no API score. They have modeled their academic career by disseminating of knowledge and not by focusing and extending the frontiers of knowledge. These were not the conditions. A Lecturer could become a senior Lecturer after 16 years. If they are Ph.D., they could become Lecturer after 13 years. In between, there was a stage. In Kothari Commission scale or 4th or 5th Commission, there was a sub-scale which was starting from Rs. 2200. There was a scale which was starting at Rs.3000 and at Rs.3700. They could get the scale of Rs.3700 without having Ph.D. if you have 16 years of service. They could have Rs.3700 scale if they have 13 years of service after Ph.D. and that scale went upto Rs.5700 which was the end of the Associate Professor's scale in the IITs of India. So, teachers had modeled themselves by focusing on good teaching, by writing text books for their own students. So, when it was their most productive phase, they just concentrated on text book teaching. It is these people who are in the age group of 55 plus who are actually the aspirants of the Principal's positions. But in the norms of 6th Pay Commission, UGC has said that they should have 400 API points and they should have papers published in reputed journals as specified by them. These people who are most deserving to become Principals, because of their long dedicated service to those institutions, these people unless they indulge in questionable practices, they cannot earn 400 API points. They are not even eligible to be considered for the post of Principal. So, it is a very complex issue. Only those people become eligible for the Principal's position in the prevalent norms enforced by UGC in the 6th Pay Commission. Some managed to get 400 points, if not by writing a quality paper, but by quantity papers in arbitrary journals. But now the UGC has put a cap on the arbitrary journals by specifying the list of journals. Earlier there was mushrooming of the journals. The papers were published just by paying to them. So, all those unhealthy practices emerged in India and the nation became a laughing stock in the academia of the world because they have maximum number of questionable journals. He can understand their anguish, but he does not know the amicable solution.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that they say that they are not getting eligible persons for the position of Principal and so they are enhancing the age to 65 years. He asked, what would happen after 65 or 75 years. Would the teachers be hanged till death.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he (Vice Chancellor) should just listen to the members and not defend the Principals.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has no simple solution of this problem and also he is not defending anything.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he (Vice Chancellor) is listening the members, rather he is defending the issue.

The Vice Chancellor requested not to level unnecessary accusations and assign insinuations to him as he is not doing any such thing. He is just presiding over their meeting. The Syndicate is elected by them and they are not nominated by the Vice Chancellor of this University.

Dr. K.K. Sharma stated that the Vice Chancellor has said that a Principal is also a teacher and there is a regulation Vol. I for teachers that they will retire at the age of 60 years and there will not be any extension beyond the age of 60 years. So, why they allow them to go beyond the age of 60 years. Shri Satya Pal Jain has also said that everybody has made his contribution. No one should think that after him, the college would be closed or would not work. So far no college has been shut down because of Principal. All are capable to shoulder the responsibility and everyone should get a chance. No one should think himself as indispensable.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan said that they are talking of extension. It is not a new issue. When he was a student in the year 1972-73, the management of DAV College, Jalandhar extended the age of retirement from 60 to 65 years. Principal B.S. Behl was to retire in 1973, though there was no rule at that time for giving extension, but the management decided to give extension upto 65 years to Principal Behl and the GNDU recognized it. He said that to discuss the need of extension, he would like to speak for some time. When the resolution came to enhance the age till 65 years in 6th Pay Commission, it was the teachers who first retired, they got their gratuity and provident fund, but they went to the Court and got the stay and they served in those institutions till 1 ½ years till the case was reverted. It is not that the teachers do not want extension, everybody wants extension including teaching and non-teaching and the Principal also want this. The Guru Nanak Dev University passed this resolution before the 6th Pay Commission that the age of superannuation of Principals be extended from 60 to 65 years. He has served in the Guru Nanak Dev University for eight years as Principal before coming to Panjab University. In constituent colleges, first Principal was Dr. Atamjit. He retired as D.P.I. Punjab and he joined A.S. College, Mukandpur as Principal after retirement which is now a regional centre. Earlier it was self-financing and then it was handed over by Dr. Atamjit at that time to the University and he was above 60 years of age. There was another University college in Jalandhar but now it is a constituent college. Principal Jaspal Randhawa retired from Lyallpur Khalsa College, Jalandhar and he joined a University College after retirement. Another Principal from Dinanagar, she was also selected by the Vice Chancellor for one constituent college, but she requested her management that she did not want to go to a constituent college, rather she wanted to serve in their college where she had served for 34 years and the local management gave extension to her after 60 years. That Principal was Nirmal Pandhi of Dinanagar College. Then there are more Principals who are still working i.e.

Principal Dharamvir Verka. He became Principal after 60 years in Talwandi Sabo, an SGPC College. The main reason is this that the managements are not getting the eligible teachers for the post of Principal. He informed that interviews for two Colleges were held in here in Panjab University. There was only one eligible candidate. She applied in both the colleges and she was selected in one college, but in the other interview for DAV College, Garhshanker, nobody was selected.

The Vice Chancellor said that the problem is very complex because the Punjab Government is paying Rs. 37400/- p.m. to the Principal. The teacher who is drawing one lakh salary, why he would apply for Rs. 37400/-.

Continuing, Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that first, they are not getting the eligible candidates. Government says that they will give basic salary i.e. Rs. 37400/- . One Principal at Mukerian joined that college on this salary i.e. Rs. 37400/-. When the management came to know that she is going to the Court to get full salary, she was terminated from the college before two years. Another Principal joined GTB College, Dasuya. She also faced the same problem. Even in Jalandhar Khalsa College, the management asked the Principal Ms. Navjot Kaur that they would pay her full salary, but they won the case in the Court. They went to the Court, but they went to the wrong Court. They won the case, but now they have to go to the Tribunal for that. There are many reasons. The managements are not getting Principals in the Colleges. They know that the officiating Principals cannot run the college as they all are colleagues, so there must be a Principal. They have never discussed these problems with the managements. They should invite the managements and hold meetings with them and listen to their problems in the colleges. But they never done this thing. They should listen to their problems. He has seen, a few days ago, when he was in D.H.E. Office. He was watching one appointment letter. In Chandigarh administration, they pay 15600/- p.m. for three years to a teacher appointed on a grant-in-aid post. Also a line was written that no experience would be counted for three years. The teacher would spend three years of his age, but that would not be counted towards his experience. The teachers must fight for these things. He had been a teacher and so he is not against them. They have suffered the atrocities of the police, but got their demands fulfilled. But today, which demand of teachers is being fulfilled? D.P.I. office works in an arbitrary manner. If one gives money to them, one can get his/her work done, otherwise not.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he should not level accusation. This is not the forum to level accusations. They should understand their limitations. Even the Secretary of the All India Federation cannot level accusations against the officers of the Government.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he is a witness to that what he is saying. He had complained against that person and that person was transferred from that seat. He has demanded money from him. Whatever he has been saying, it is a truth. Being the Secretary of All India Organization, he had discussed the issue of extension with many Principals of other States also. In Goa, Jharkhand, Delhi and in 4-5 other States, it is 65 years. The Karnataka High Court has given the decision in favour of 65 years. He informed that today the Allahabad High Court has also directed the Government to enhance the age till 65 years. On a query, he clarified that the age has been enhanced for all teachers including the Principal. It is the management which decides to whom they want to give extension. The University cannot decide anything because they frame the rules. A management can extend this in one college and it may not extend it in the other college. It is their prerogative to give extension or not. They have to follow the rules, if rules permit, no doubt the rules do not permit, but if they are not getting the

Principals, then what to do. They must convene the meeting of the Management persons and listen their problems. Only then they can solve the problem.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the complications started to increase after 6th Pay Commission. In his (Vice Chancellor) introductory remarks, he (Vice Chancellor) has mentioned that the limit of 65 years a come in the 6th Pay Commission. The post of Professors were created in the 6th Pay Commission which has not been implemented so far in the aided and unaided colleges. When they talk of 65 years of age, it has been written in the UGC Regulations 2010, that a teacher could be appointed upto 65 years. This provision was for teachers only. Though they say that the Principals are also teachers, but it is specifically mentioned that only Assistant Professors or Associate Professor could be given extension upto 65 years. In the Act or regulations where the teachers are to be benefited, those are not implemented, but within the Act a policy of pick and choose is adopted. The Government has started giving Rs. 37400/- to the Principals, so they say that the Principals are not available to them. The Principals who are at present working on extension, the managements are giving them one lakh or one and half lakh salary. If the managements add Rs. One lakh to the amount of Rs. 37400/- being paid by the government, he thinks, there would not be any shortage of Principals. In the 6th Pay Commission, a new concept had been introduced and at that time no teacher was having the required API score. It might be possible that at that time the persons with 400 API score may not be available. But after the implementation of this concept, the teachers started working in this field. The University has also established research centres in the colleges. All of them know that now all the teachers are participating in research. He thinks that today there is enough number of teachers having 400 API points. But most of the teachers do not apply because they knew it whether he would be appointed there or not, whether he would be a suitable candidate or not. They know it in advance whether they are suitable or not in the eyes of the management. Ultimately, the word eligibility is replaced with suitable. There is no definition of the word suitable whether a candidate is suitable or not. It depends how one suits them. So, this word is very vague. The speaker who was speaking earlier to him, he has given many examples about the enhancement of age to 65 years. It is right that many states are giving benefits to the teachers as well as to the Principals. About 90% States are giving pension to the teachers of private colleges. But unfortunately, they are the one who are not being given pension. It would be a nice thing if the benefits which are being extended by the other States are also extended by the Punjab State and Chandigarh Administration.

Dr. Naresh Gaur said that first of all he would like to compliment the Vice Chancellor for his saying that the regulations should be abided by and if it is done in reality, it would be much better. He has been in this Senate for quite a good time and every time there is discussion that the this regulations has not been accepted. So, he requested the Vice Chancellor to stick to his words. The other issue is regarding the extension of Principals. He added that the State of Punjab has suffered a lot during the period of terrorism and he attributed it to the unemployment prevailing in the State. The State of Punjab which was number State in the country slipped to a lower place. Now, perhaps they are again taking it back. As already told by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu that when these regulations were framed, most of the teachers were not having the API score of 400. He has also been given to understand that the Principals who are continuing today, they are not having the API score of 400 points. The new teachers are having the API score of 400 points and they are eligible. A meeting on this issue relating to the colleges was held in the year 2013 and 2014. The discussion was held for the whole day and it was discussed that the managements are not able to run the colleges and so fee should be increased. But it is very surprising that if the colleges are

not running due to paucity of funds, then how the managements are paying salary of Rs. 2 lakhs to a Principal whereas the teachers are exploited there and they are paid only between Rs. 12000 to 15000. At some colleges they pay Rs. 21600/- to a teacher and get back from him Rs. 12000/-. In a way, it has become a nexus of many people. So he requested that it is the demand of teachers that the age of superannuation for Principals should not be enhanced to 65 years and no extension should be granted. As told by Shri Satya Pal Jain ji, rules have been made. People will demand to enhance it from 60 to 62 and then to 64 or 65 years. After all some criteria has to be fixed today. He pointed out that after the age of 60 years, the working capacity of a person starts decreasing and that is why the age of superannuation has been fixed as 60 years. It is being said that the case is subjudice. He clarified that this individual case is subjudice and it is not applicable to all the cases. When the decision in such cases would come, they could deal it accordingly. But, there is no such case where the University has been debarred. He again requested that the date of superannuation should remain 60 years.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that it was talked about in the last Syndicate meeting that extension to the Principals is being given and it is not being given to the teachers. Then a comment came from the Syndicate that if extension is given to the teachers, the new recruits would not be able to enter in the educational institutes. On the one hand about 60% posts of Principals are lying vacant and teachers with 3-4 years experience are officiating there as Principals. He wanted to say as to why the University did not put pressure on such colleges to appoint regular principals so that the working of such colleges could be smooth. There are 70 colleges where the posts of Principals are lying vacant and so 70 teachers could be adjusted there as Principals. Further he wanted to know as to where are the routes of reemployment. Here they are talking about the reemployment of Principals. In data given by the office, it has been shown that 9 or 10 positions of Principals vacant. So, if they talk about the absorption of youth, then only 9-10 persons could be absorbed. But he wanted to know the routes of reemployment. The issue was of re-employment of University teachers. If they take the argument of the Syndicate that the new teachers would not get a chance if the teachers are given extension, why the same argument is applied on the University. The UGC is time and again saying that the University is doing mismanagement of funds. They are not following the regulations of the UGC as the retirement age in the University is also 60 years. Why re-employment has been in the University where more than 150 teachers are reemployed and the process is going on. To his mind in future there would be 200-300 re-employed teachers. Then why the chance is not given to the new persons. One re-employed teachers is being paid about Rs. 1.5 lakhs. In this amount they can recruit three Assistant Professors in place of one re-employed teachers. If they have to do the re-employment, it should be done at all levels, i.e., they may be in aided or unaided colleges or in the University. Either this scheme should be extended to all or it should be stopped in the University also, that is most important.

Professor Mukesh Arora said the rule for re-employment and extension was made 6 years earlier. What was the reason to make this rule and for whom this rule was made, perhaps it was known to them. He informed that this rule was made to give extension/ re-employment to the Principal of Dev Smaj College, Ferozepur for the first time. He was also a member of that Syndicate and they all are the part to it. He said for the Government Colleges, there is no need of API score for the post of Principal, but 14 posts are lying vacant there also. There is no provision for extension. The re-employed teachers are not appointed as Principals, if they are not already working as Principals. As requested by Dr. K.K. Sharma, the posts should be filled. The extension was being given by saying that there is a shortage of Principals, is it now finished. In Guru Nanak Girls College, Khalsa College Model Town, Ludhiana, why the post of Principal is lying

vacant there. There a teacher has been given the post of Principal. It should be seen as to how many person such as Dr. K.K. Sharma, in the scale of Rs.37400/- are eligible. They all want that the posts should be filled in the Government colleges also. Now 10-20 persons are on extension, but why the other 40-50 posts are lying vacant. The posts are getting vacant day by day. He informed the Vice Chancellor that before his coming to the University, the Syndicate had taken a decision that if a post of Principal remains vacant continuously for some specified period in a college, that college would be fine at the rate of Rs. 50,000/-. But now that decision has also been got declared redundant by Senate members. They also want that the posts should be filled, but before that they should request the Government to remove the deficiencies of the scale. The teachers should be given full salary. He said there was a teacher of Economics in Ramgarh College who was being paid a salary of Rs. 21600/-. When they asked the college authorities to give her full salary, they, instead of paying her full salary sacked her from the college and discontinued the course of Economics. He again requested that the posts should be filled so that no post remains vacant. It should be done for the Government Colleges also.

Professor Ronki Ram said that to understand this whole matter, two-three issues are important. The issue which has been talked about by the College teachers is important and also whatever has been talked about by Dr. Mahajan and Professor Mukesh Arora, that is also very important. This question came out from the overall problem which the education system is suffering from. When Late Shri Arjun Singh was the Minister of Human Resource Development, the issue of raising the age to 65 years in the IITs , IIMs and Central Universities was also raised at that time because due to enhancement of seats to the tune of 7% for OBC category, the teaching staff was required. But since there was no teaching staff available, it was talked about to enhance the age of retirement to 65 years. At that time this issue also appeared in the newspapers abroad that the teaching staff in their Universities is different from their bureaucracy. Now there is a globalization age and India is also adopting such things as they have also to compete with them. The experience gained by a teacher during his sixty years could be properly used if the age is enhanced as they have to compete at the world level. In the foreign countries it is felt that they can work till the time they are capable of working. This concept was accepted throughout the world. But this concept has to affect the teaching of their colleges. Since quite a long time the recruitment was not being done in the colleges and many seats fell vacant. So, when the members from the University used to go to the Colleges for making appointment of Principals, the managements say that they have advertised the posts twice and thrice, but could not find a person. Such things were happening sometime ago. But in the year 2012, they have received a case where the Dhudike College as requested for extension to their Principals which has also been mentioned by the Vice Chancellor in his note and the same was granted by the Syndicate and Senate of this University because that was passed by the management of the college. Such things keep on happening. The problem was that this extension was implemented in the case of Principals and in the case of teachers. So, the teachers who were working there, a concept has developed in their mind that they would not get the chance to become Principal because during that period the concept of 400 API points was introduced. He said if the extension upto 65 years was made applicable in the colleges for all teachers as has been done in the University, there would not have been this problem because in that case they would be knowing that if the Principal would retire at the age of 65 years, they would also retire at the same age. If the age for college teachers is enhanced to 62 or 63 years, even then they have the chance to become Principal. So, this was an anomaly. The problem of the management was that if they did not have the Principal, their college would get disaffiliated. Some teachers from the Panjab University went to the Court and the

Court granted five years of extension to them. After the expiry of this period another group went to the High Court. And the High Court gave its permission again. Though the case was rejected by the Supreme Court. Now those persons are working for the last three years. So, it means that the Court also considers that the problem of extension of age to 65 years is a serious problem and in educational institutions, it should be 65 years. He requested that instead of indulging in various other things as to when it was done, who has done it or who were the members, etc. etc., they should find a solution of the problem. They should understand the problem of teachers as also of the college managements regarding appointment of Principals and take some decision, he was of the opinion that they would not accuse themselves in the next meeting of the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that sometimes some issues remain untouched while discussing them. Many of the members have talked about the payment of Rs. 37400/- to the Principals. While referring to the list of Principals available at pages 136-138, he said there are only 15 Principals in the affiliated colleges in the State of Punjab who are on extension. There are four aided colleges of Punjab which come in the bracket of Rs. 37400/-. If it is accepted that the Principals are given Rs. 37400/- p.m. only, there are only four such Principals. The other Principals are in unaided colleges and the scale of Rs. 37400 is not applicable to them. Most of the members have just discussed about the problem and they did not give any solution. If the Principal is retiring at the age of 65 years and the other teachers at the age of 60 years, the heartburning is must to occur. Though the case is subjudice in the Court, but there are many other cases in which it has been decided that as per the regulation, the age of retirement is 60 years, so no one could go beyond the age of 60 years. The re-employment was done and as said by the Vice Chancellor that it was passed by the Syndicate and they are part of the Syndicate. It means that the Syndicate did not take a right decision because earlier it was 1+1 then it was changed to 2+2+1 and then to 3+2 When the interview is to be held, there would a Vice Chancellor's nominee. He said that there is one thing which he could not understand and requested the Vice Chancellor that he could tell him in a better way. He wanted to know that when there is nominee of the Vice Chancellor, nominee means Vice Chancellor, when the nominee of the Vice Chancellor is sitting in the Selection Committee meeting, how the nominee or the management could say that the person is not suitable when they have not seen his work and conduct. In the first year of one's appointment, he remains on probation. If his work is not found satisfactory, his services could be terminated. How, without seeing his work they could come to know of his suitability. If the Vice Chancellor's nominee or the experts could endorse the view of the management, on which grounds he could say so that the person is not suitable. The issue of giving pay of Rs. 37400/- is applicable to four Principals and not to others. He informed that the B.Ed. colleges did not even pay Rs. 8000/- to a Lecturer and what to talk of 6th Pay Commission. So far, no recommendations of any pay commission were implemented in B.Ed. Colleges. There is provision of periodic inspections in the Calendar. But to his mind, he does not think that periodical inspections are being done. If the periodical inspection teams are going to the colleges, then why no action is being taken on their reports. As told by Professor Mukesh Arora, for B.Ed colleges, the government had taken a decision that where there is no Principal, the college should be fined Rs. 50,000/-, because at that time the salary of a Principal was Rs. 50,000/- and this amount was also deposited with the Dean College Development Council by some of the Colleges. So, due to this the colleges started appointing the Principals. But now the posts are lying vacant because the University now did not pay any heed to this. The government says that they have issued NOC to the unaided colleges and so they have nothing to do with that. As regards the post of Principals in aided and unaided colleges, they are being paid a salary of Rs. 2 lakhs.

The burden is on the managements. But where from the managements are getting money? They are getting it from the students by way of fees. Then they ask to increase the fees. Though the management is giving his salary, but ultimately, the burden is shifted to the students. So, when it comes to increase the fee, they say in one voice that the fee should not be increased. Whatever pay is being paid by the management, the base of that are the students. When they would increase the fee, the parents of the students would ultimately be burdened. They can see the manifesto of any party in which they say that they would give employment to one lakh students or so, but none has said that they would enhance the age for retirement from 60 to 65 years. Finally, giving the solution and requested that the persons who are continuing they should let them to complete their term, but for future the age should be 60 years and not 65 years. Whatever Dr. R.K. Mahajan has said that could be done only if the State enhances the age of retirement and till then it cannot be done. The 15 Principals should be allowed to continue and most of them are completing their term shortly. This is the only amicable solution which could be acceptable. He further said that the age of retirement should not be increased beyond 60 years.

Dr. Nisha Bhargava said that she would like to mention that as per the Panjab University Calendar Principal is a teacher first. Secondly, when the retirement age was fixed as 60 years, the life expectancy in India was 32 years and now it is 68 years. Therefore, if the UGC has enhanced the retirement age as 65 years, there must be some merit in it. She said that she has been attending some Selection Committee meetings, she found that there is dearth of persons for the post of Principal. She, therefore, requested Professor Parvinder Singh, Dean College Development Council to provide her the data of eligible candidates for Principalship because when a candidate applies for the post of Principal, he sends a copy of the same to the Dean College Development Council Office.

Ms. Surinder Kaur said that she has requested earlier also that the eligible candidates must be given the chance because to secure 400 API points is very difficult as they also have the desire to become Principals, otherwise, they would retire as teachers. In case no eligible candidate is found, then the senior most teacher could be asked to officiate as Principal because they are also having experience ranging between 30 and 35 years.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the detail which has been provided from the 2013 till date, nobody, in the Syndicate decisions has said that there should not be reemployment. The issue revolved just around the number of years. Sometimes these were made from one to two or sometime from two to three. Now it is being extended for five years, but he does not understand why this issue is being raised again. Although in the year 2014, Shri Ashok Goyal ji has also said that it is a Syndicate decision and this need not to be discussed in the Senate. If they see before 2013, at the time of Professor R.C. Sobti in the year 2008, extension was given to Dr. R.S. Pannu of Mehna College (Moga) and it is on record. He said as per the list there are 71 colleges where there are no Principals. As said by Shri Satya Pal Jain that rule should be one for all and for this also anybody can apply. This rule is for all and not for any individual Principal. But some persons are mentioning the name of one or two Principals as it is being done for them. At present, there are twelve colleges where such Principals who are presently working on extension and 59 colleges are such where the posts are lying vacant. If they see practical then these posts are of the management and the Principal has to coordinate. As stated by Dr. K.K.Sharma, the role of a teacher is very important, but it is said that a useful person is always considered good. So, the managements give good salary only to those Principals who are needed to run the college and Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal is a living example for this. When Dr. Gosal joined, the salary was not

being paid for the last ten months and in the last ten years. During those ten years, the management has paid him a total salary of about rupees 1 ¼ crores, but Dr. Gosal brought Rs. 3 ½ to 4 crores from the UGC for the college. With that amount the college building, gymnasium and hostels and administrative block were built. It is all because of his contribution. So, wherever a Principal has contributed, the managements have hired that Principal. They can see from the data that out of the 71 Principals, only 12 Principals are working on extension. He said that the Guru Nanak Education Trust has filed a case and another case has been filed by Shri Vinay Sofat Vs.State of Punjab, D.P.I., Panjab University, Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur, G.N.C., Narangwal and the next date of hearing has been fixed as 30th July, 2018. As said earlier, this issue could not be discussed being subjudice. Secondly the date for hearing has already been fixed, so they can do nothing in this regard. He was of the opinion that it should be left to the Court to take whatever decision it wants to take. He said that the demand of the teachers should be that all the teachers should be given extension as in the case of Principals and University teachers where there is non-availability of Principals. The problems which come in the way i.e. API score, aided and unaided colleges, they should be solved. The Punjab Government has neither implemented 4th Pay Commission recommendations nor they implemented the NCTE regulations of 2014. In the Punjab Government, the experience required for the post of Principal in education colleges is 15 years and at Panjab University, it is of 8 years. This is a very big confusion and both these amendments have not been implemented and requested that these things should also be implemented.

Shri Raghbir Dyal wanted to know whether the 8 years experience from the date of eligibility or just 8 years without even being approved as a teacher and requested Principal Sangha to clarify.

Principal S.S. Sangha clarified that the experience is counted from the date of eligibility as per UGC norms. He suggested that there is no need to discuss this being subjudice.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it is nowhere written that the experience would be counted from the date of eligibility, rather the total experience is counted and the date of eligibility concept is produced by the Panjab University only.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that only total teaching experience is counted.

Principal S.S. Sangha wanted to know whether the decision taken by the Syndicate could be discussed in the Senate or not and secondly, if the case is pending in the Court, can it be discussed here.

Dr. R.S. Jhanji said that the matter which has come up to them, it is a very sorry state of affairs. They have two regulatory bodies i.e. Panjab University Chandigarh, Punjab Government and vis-à-vis Chandigarh Administration. Both these regulatory bodies should work in uniformity. That is the disparity and that is why there is confusion because the State Government says something else and they mean something else. So, there is a confusion among the honourable members and other colleagues. He said that he would like to remind the honourable members that this issue of reemployment for the University teachers came up a few years back. All of them were sitting there even at that time. At that time also all his college colleagues i.e. Principals and all the teachers, they pointed out not to do this and requested to send a letter or resolution to the MHRD or the UGC. Then a resolution was sent to the MHRD and the UGC that the age may be enhanced to 65 years as there is a provision in the

UGC Act. But his colleagues from the University said okay and let the University people go for reemployment and let others i.e. Principals and the college teachers follow suite for that. As far as the University teachers are concerned, they adopt it. The fate of the resolution sent to the MHRD and UGC is not known. No reply came from the MHRD and the UGC till date. Then from time to time the University teachers have been benefited with enhanced age of 65 years. The teachers from the Government Colleges and aided colleges went to the Court when they retired. So, in the Court the split verdict was there. In a particular case the University teachers were given extension till 65 years whereas in the case of other University teachers, the plea was rejected and they went to the Supreme Court also. Similarly, the appeal of the Government teachers was rejected in the High Court for enhancing the age to 65 years after the retirement age of 58 years. So, the Courts also did not decide the issue. Initially, two regulatory bodies could not decide and again the third one was Judiciary, again it was unable to fix the date for that. Then suddenly a circular from the State Government comes that no extension would be given to teaching or non-teaching staff beyond 60 years. After 2005, they were not allowed to fill up the vacancies for teachers even. Then contractual system came. Government also did think about all these issues. So, they started it for Principals also i.e. 2+2+1 because they were not getting Principals. Then API score came and they were not able to find suitable Principals. Then the situation changed and the people started working for research. Earlier there was no consultancy in the colleges. Then the universities also allowed for that. Research Centres were created and they were made to go for research. Now the issue was again raised and of course, heartburning was there because there was disparity between teachers and Principals. He was of the opinion that in spite of fighting with each other, they should send a strong resolution to the UGC and to the State Government that they should adopt it. Some of the managements might be able to continue with the old Principals because the loyalty, belongingness and work and conduct also matters a lot. The managements think that these people are beneficial to them and that is why they pay them more than one lakh or so. But there should be some consensus that if the age is to be enhanced to 65, it should be given to all uniformly. If it is not there, then the University teachers should also not be given. He said that when earlier this issue had come up, they have an altercation with the then PUTA President that why it was being implemented for University people. At that time they had requested that other issues would also be handled. Had those issues were handled at that time, then this issue would not have been here. So, even now this is a line of caution for everybody sitting here because the matter is subjudice. When the extension was given as 2+2+1, but was the need to convert it in 3+2. It was decided that every year an advertisement would be given. If no candidate is found eligible, then one can continue and before the person completes one year, an advertisement should be given just one or two months before, if nobody applies, then one must be given extension. When they changed it from 2+2+1 to 3+2, it became the bone of contention. Earlier it was accepted. Now to resolve the issue they should send it to enforce the age of 65 year for retirement to State Government because the State would not agree to that. UGC might say to go ahead as there is a provision. Though everybody i.e. teachers, Principals, University teachers all right in their way, but, what is the solution. The solution is that the regulatory bodies should be uniform in their decision.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that one of their young colleague said that people above 60 years of age go senile. He said that he has strong objection to that because that is not correct. Anybody can go senile at any age from year one to 90 years and 60 is no landmark. All over in the world the age of retirement in the US is 68 years and somewhere the judges go on till 90 years. Most of the politicians would be out of the job if this thing is accepted. Now, the present point is that the University teachers are

continuing beyond 60 years, the Principals were also allowed to continue. So, based purely on the sense of responsibility and equality of everybody, it may little sense to exclude the teachers. If they say that the eligible teachers are not found and hence the Principal would continue for two more years or they say suitable candidates are not found. So, suitability is a criteria which is subjective. He thinks some of the persons are not eligible for Principal. Now the debate between use and optimal use of experience and training has been going on for ages. They have made available to the managements a pool of candidates which they can use beyond 60 years. That option they have not given to the managements for the teachers. If a teacher is really competent and the students want him and the management wants him, then they should give the same option to the management as well. It is unfair on their part to that option to the management only for Principals and not for the teachers. He said that they should go ahead and give that to all management both for the teachers and Principals.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to clarify the point stated by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi because that point is very important. The point that he has made that any management which intends to reemploy the Principal and protect his/her salary, that they have advertised that position as a grant-in-aid position. In the grant-in-aid position, the salary to be given is Rs. 37400/-. On this salary, people do not want to apply. He said, if he understood correctly, what Shri Malhi has said that any management which intends to re-employ the Principal, that management should first make it intent known that in spite of the fact that the government would give on Rs. 37400/-, but they would protect the salary of every other person if they have Associate Professors applying from wherever they are. They will not offer him Rs. 37400/-, but they would first offer to protect his salary and may be given re-advertisement and see that he would not apply if the government gives him Rs. 37400/-, but he would apply if they protect his salary. He asked if he is correct because this is a very new idea.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is absolutely correct because that gives the equal pay, but he said that the he would like to say in the other way. Because if it is done as clarified by the Vice Chancellor, then the management would still strike the same candidate.

The Vice Chancellor said that that the point is that then they can select the same candidate if second time they did not find anybody.

Continuing, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if a teacher is an excellent teacher and he does not become Principal and the management still wants extend his tenure as a teacher, such an opportunity should also be available. Only, then it would be fair to everybody. One point, what the Vice Chancellor has said is absolutely correct and the second is that a teacher who is an excellent teacher, he should be given an opportunity. Management should re-employ him/her after sixty years.

The Vice Chancellor said that this means that he (Shri Malhi) is making two points. The Vice Chancellor said alright as these are new entities.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he has also talked about this issue in the last Senate. The root cause of this problem is the salary of Rs. 37400/- and on the salary of Rs. 37400/- nobody would like to apply. Now eligible candidates are available. Many other speakers such as Dr. Jagdish Mehta and some other member has also talked about this. So they should pay the same salary to the College teachers as is being paid to the University teachers.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he endorses the point what Principal Jhanji has said that they are the regulatory body and they pass the resolutions here which needs approval at some stage, it may be the approval of State Government or the UGC. Further, there is angle of the Court also. This is the whole scenario, but he would like to draw their attention to the letter which has been proposed by the Syndicate. The letter begins, 'that due to non-availability of eligible candidates many aided and unaided colleges are not able to fill the positions'. In such cases as per the decision of the Syndicate if a suitable candidate is not found, extension could be thought of. So, now there is a confusion between eligibility and suitability. They are taking a resolution and quoting the guidelines that eligible candidates are not found, but they are again changing the term from eligible to suitable. It is again mentioned that that due to ever changing rules and amendments for the eligibility of the college Principal by the UGC. They are not saying that the ever changing rules and amendments for suitability of rules by the UGC. They are just saying eligibility. In the last they are saying that the outgoing Principal be allowed to be re-employed for three years at the first instance. The letter further mentions that 'if after re-advertisement no suitable candidate can be found...' Now again there is a confusion. They started with eligibility and ending it with suitability. So, whatever Principal Jhanji and many of other colleagues have also said, there is no doubt that a Principal has to manage the whole college and he needs the support of the management also. So he might be suitable to the management, it is right in one aspect, but it should be very clear as to what they are proposing. What is the proposal. Is this proposal based on the eligibility or suitability.

Dr. I.P.S. Sidhu said that that this issue of extension and reemployment, has been a problem since the last 4-5 years from the time when the Punjab Government has implemented new pay scales in 2009, and now the issue of API score was also added to it. It has been a problem that eligible candidates were not available as there were no candidates available with 400 API points needed for the post of Principal. But from the last 2-3 years, the number of eligible candidates has increased and this point must be underlined. Secondly, he wanted to know as to how much salary is being paid to the 15 Principals of aided and unaided colleges whose list is there in the agenda papers. If the management is giving him salary to the tune of Rs. 1.5 lacs to Rs. 2.0 lacs, then they should mention in the advertisement that they would pay a salary of Rs. 1.5 lacs to Rs. 2.0 lacs to the Principal. By doing so, the number of candidates applying for the post of Principal would enhance and there would not be any dearth of eligible candidates.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that it is the duty of the universities to frame policies as are needed for the development of the society. There is no dearth of educated and literate people in India. He has always focused his discussion on the issue that, are they not depriving the younger generation of their rights just due to the greed of extension. So, he said that the root cause of this problem is because of the extension being given to the University Professors. On an average, if they see the employment cycle or thirty years, they would come to know that if they will be able to give employments to one thousand candidates in thirty years, then due to the extension policy, they would be able to give employment only to five hundred people only. Secondly, if they talk about suitability, he said that this word is very ambiguous. They should only talk about eligibility and not suitability. If they promote a person at the age of 65 years, then he would remain an old person even till the age of 90 years. The situation of the society is such that they are lacking the human resources. While talking about the Colorado University, he informed that a revolution took place in 1916-17. The Universities were under the control of a Justice and the retirement age of Professors was till death. When the revolution took place the universities were taken by the other side of governance. At that time, the retirement age was fixed. It is a human nature that they do not consider any other person more intelligent than themselves.

So, he was of the opinion that they should rise above from their personal gains and think about the society, about the country and the students who are studying here and take a decision by keeping all these things in mind. He said that he strongly disagrees with those who say that there are no eligible candidates. If they say so, they are blaming themselves as they have not produced a good product as a teacher. They should keep all these things in mind as they have repercussions. All these things would be viewed by everyone outside the University and the people of affiliated areas and related with Panjab University. They should also keep in mind that the matter is sub-judice in the Court. He said that he strongly disagrees with this that if this menace is allowed to grow, it would have impact on the other staff also. The non-teaching staff in the University and the colleges would also ask for the same and it would have a drift impact. So, they should take in these things in mind before taking any decision.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he does not agree with the view that people get senile after the age of 60 years because most of their Vice Chancellors have been more than 60 years of age. He said when earlier the issue of re-employment was discussed, he and Dr. Randhawa had spoken against it. If the UGC has made a rule, they should try to get permission from the MHRD for all, but they have implemented it only for the University. If he calls it a backdoor entry, it may not sound well, so he would say it a by-pass entry. They have made a policy for giving re-employment for five years. He said that re-employment is not the only way to contribute. Today they say that they cannot recruit new teachers as the UGC has banned the recruitment of teachers and if the reemployment is stopped, there could be a great problem. First, when the re-employment scheme was made, there was no ban at that time, so this logic does not appear to be correct. Secondly, why those people are not hired as Guest Faculty. Why they should give them re-employment. He has pointed out in the last meeting also that there is a problem due to this. Earlier, this scheme was for three years, but his (Vice Chancellor) first decision was to enhance the reemployment to five years and he could prove that though he (Vice Chancellor) might say that this was done by the Senate. He would not say that he (Vice Chancellor) he has done something wrong, but they should go by the straightway. Today which they have to listen about, it is because of this re-employment scheme because this is the only root cause for this problem. He admitted that the qualification for the University and college teachers is the same, rather some of the could be more qualified. The College Principals say that they have enough representation in the University Syndicate and thus they run the University. If a University Professor could work till 65 years, why a Principal cannot go till the age of 65 years? Even today, he is ready to say that they should adopt the right path and stop the re-employment. He said they should say that if the extension is to be given, it should be given equally to all the teacher whether they are University teachers, college teachers or Principals. If the University is one, there should be one yardstick for all. If this reemployment policy would not have been there, perhaps, the University would have become a Central University and there would not be any problem of enhancing the age to 65 years because in the Central Universities, the age of retirement is already 65 years. It is wrong to say that qualified candidates would not be available. Kerala which is one of the highly literate State, the age of retirement of teachers there was 55 years, though he is not aware of the latest position. Once he had the opportunity to go there to attend a seminar. He asked the people there whether they resort to any agitation for enhancing the age of retirement. They said that do not do so because if they do not vacate the seat, how their younger generation would get an opportunity if they ask for enhancing the age of retirement. He could give an example that the teacher who has not done Ph.D. during whole of his service, he has also taken the employment. The system has become a mockery. On the one hand a teacher is having a letter from the High Court and on the other hand they are having re-employment and they are processing

both the letters together. If they admit that they have retired, then how they can ask for re-employment. If there is a stay from the Court, it means he is not reemployed and he is in service, and if he is in service, then how he could apply for re-employment. So, they have to see it very carefully otherwise a message would go that the University people do everything for themselves. So, they have to go by some a system. They should take a decision today that whatever they would like to do, they would first get it approved from the MHRD. If they do not want to make it a Central University, let it not be. Whatever proposal they have sent, they should get the approval for that, which could be applicable for all and till then, this should be stopped. There is no problem if somebody wants to contribute. There should be no problem for those who have the old pension scheme which is a very strong pension scheme. Had he this type of pension, he could come and teach the students without any salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that in brief he (Dr. Gurmeet Singh) would like to say that the re-employment scheme should be discontinued to which Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he had said that it should be for all. The Vice Chancellor said that he is not proposing that it should be stopped. They are the governing body and they could send a resolution to the Syndicate and get it passed from the Syndicate and then it would come to the Senate. Right now, they are not discussing it to discontinue in the Panjab University.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that to discuss the issue of re-employment, Senate meeting has been called, but the issue of the nation is unemployment. To his mind, the issue of unemployment is more important and they should think about it in that context, though exceptional cases are everywhere. The service which are extraordinary or the persons who have rendered a very good service for the betterment of the nation, they could think for their extension/reemployment. During the discussion, a question regarding suitability has also come up. If a candidate is not able to make a niche for himself throughout his whole service, how he could think of getting reemployment. Either they could say that he is not that much capable or he could not make a place for himself. So, he said that reemployment of any type should not be there, neither for teaching nor for non-teaching staff and they think to solve the problem of unemployment which the nation is facing.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that that he would like to repeat the things. It has been elaborated under which circumstances, the extension of the College Principals was done. The first thing which he would like to say is that the extensions were done with the concurrence of statutory bodies. Such extension were being done in the past also. Principal Bedi of S.D. College, Hoshiarpur was given extension in 2003 and Principal Vijay Sharma of Khalsa College, Dasuya was also given extension. Moreover, the University Selection Committees have been selecting Principal one year and thereafter for another one year. Now, in this case the suitability of the candidate being selected is, concerned, to managements mind, only the suitability has to be seen. The problem is, where suitability is compromised, selectively, where the management feels, in extending the term of the existing Principal in that College. But at the same time, if a Principal is suitable in one College and he retires from there, how he can be suitable in some other college. Only the same management can continue him for two. years or whatever they decide. But if a Principal has to compete with some other candidate in some other college, he must have to fulfill the new conditions for the post of Principal.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said the rules i.e. 2+2+1, these are the provisions laid down by the University, but these are not a mandate from the University that they would give extension to each person. They can take the case of Chandigarh colleges also. Last year there was an interview in the Dev Samaj College for Women and no candidate was

found suitable there. What is the requirement now, a lot of discussion has taken place on this. They have to define the dimension of the word 'suitable' because if they just stick to this word, 'suitability' then on the one side, Govt. India or any State Government, they are always talking about the state of higher education, what is taking place, quality of education and that they should have a very good qualified human resources to impart quality education. The first extension was given on 1st July, 2014 to a Principal of Dev Samaj College of Women and the last was given on 31st January 2017. If they look at the list provided, the list has a lot of variety. If they see the table, there are two Principals who were selected after re-advertisement and fulfilling all the API conditions etc. They cannot be considered as, that they have been given the extension. One of the Principal in this list is on contractual basis. The question is, as Shri Prabhjit Singh has mentioned that there are four aided colleges, but to his knowledge, there are five such colleges under the Punjab Government. The story of Chandigarh or Punjab, they are very critical in one sense that most of their colleges i.e. more than 40% colleges, are without regular Principals. Whatever the provisions they were having earlier, that should also be mentioned. It should be stated that if they do not have a regular Principal, a fine would be imposed on them. The Principal is such a unit in that particular system i.e. he is a leader in that very particular institution and lot of things which has been mentioned whether they want to give the extension or not. He agreed that they should continue with the present arrangement, however, they should stop this arrangement for future.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Panjab University Act provides for making regulations and rules and there is procedure given as to how to make the regulations. As far as rules are concerned, these are made by the Syndicate of Panjab University. When re-appointment of College Principals was decided in May, 2014, it was decided as a rule and for that reason although the case went to the Senate of May, 2014 and there it was referred back and finally in July, 2014. If they go through the discussion, there it was pointed out that when they talk about the working of the University, one should be careful with that if something is to be decided by the Vice Chancellor that should not go to Syndicate. If something is to be decided by the Syndicate that should not go to Senate and so on. As far as this rule is concerned, this should not have gone to Senate, it should have been notified immediately and based upon the discussion of July, 2014, this rule was notified. When it was decided that Principals can be reappointed initially for two years and after two years there should be an advertisement. If no eligible and suitable candidate is found, that Principal could be given another extension of two years. Then after two years, again it would advertised and if nobody is found, the extension can be extended for one year. Now the new proposal is to make it 3+2 because of the fact that colleges were finding it difficult. There were some administrative problems in it because they were advertising the post again and again and then looking for approval from the University. Now the question is that when it was approved first as a rule in 2014, then in how many colleges, regular Principals were there and what is the situation now. The fact is that whatever the situation at that point of time, situation seems to be similar even now. What has happened is in 2016, the UGC has again changed the criterion for 400 API score which many people are pointing out. The people were getting this 400 API mainly by attending conferences. People were attending lot of conference like 50 conferences in a year. Sometimes they were getting 200 points only for attending conferences. So that sort of thing was happening earlier which is changed now by the UGC. The thing is obviously they have taken that decision earlier. It was based upon certain circumstances and those circumstances still prevail. He believed that for that reason, let this scheme continue for few more years and they may again look at it after another two or three years.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is feeling a disappointment after listening the discussion. It is discussed that suitable candidates are not available and so at some colleges the appointment could be made only at some colleges whereas the posts are still vacant in other colleges. He feels that they are going opposite from the trend of the world. In the world, the trend which is running is that the young people are leading. If they see the trend of the world, they would come to know that the whole trend is changing. France has elected their President who is just 38 years old. If they see the average of big companies of US, it continuously coming down. The young and brilliant minds are suitable to the whole world, but in their University, the young people who are waiting for their turn to contribute, they did not see suitability in them. Most of the positions are lying vacant because of this reason. He feels that the 'suitability mindset' is a problem. He said that the word 'suitability' should be removed and stick to the eligibility only. This is a very vague word and it is being misused and they do not think any young person suitable because they have such type of mindset. The only solution for this problem is that they should stick to the eligibility. They could think for re-employment only if there is no eligible candidate, but if the eligible candidates are available, they should remove the word 'suitability' from there and give opportunity to eligible candidates. He was of the opinion that such a person would be more suitable for management and colleges. There is another issue. At some places, the eligible candidates are available, but they are not coming forward. So they should discuss as to how to find a solution and remove the word 'suitability' and stick to eligibility. Secondly, they should discuss to find out the ways so that the eligible persons should apply for the vacant posts. He further said that India is the youngest country in the world and thousands of young minds are waiting to contribute. If they did not allow them to contribute, it would be a great disservice to education, University and the society.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that she agreed to half of the portion, what Dr. Subhash Sharma has said. She further said that they should try to enhance the number of people applying for these positions. They should try to enhance the salary of Rs. 37400/- being paid to the Principals and motivate more persons to apply and there is no need to remove the word suitability. Package should be made more attractive. If they are able to attract more persons, then they can select suitable persons out of those. So, she agreed on half of the view point expressed by Dr. Subhash Sharma and further added that they should motivate the young people to apply for these positions.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he agreed with the view point of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra that if more candidates are available, then they can choose the most suitable candidate. But if the eligible candidates are available and just in the name of suitability, they neglect the eligible candidates, that would not be fair and he is against that only.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he would like to talk about the enhancement of retirement age to 65 years. He informed that the Central Universities have done it. The Govt. of India has taken a decision with their wisdom and it is not true that after 60 years, one becomes senile. In PGI, they have retirement age as 65 years. They have people sitting over here in this House, they are over 60 years. So, he does not agree with the idea that beyond 60, there is no wisdom. Teachers in the Universities abroad, they do not retire, they keep on working till they are active and this should be the criterion. In Central Universities, it is 65 years, then why it is denied to their colleagues whether they are in Universities or in Colleges or acting as Principals. They should try it to extend it to the College teachers also so that there is no heartburning.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that he agrees to what Principal Sangha has said. He has given an example of Principal Gosal. He has himself visited that College. When

Principal Gosal had joined the College, the college was in a very bad position. But they see his college today, the college looks like a University. He was of the opinion that if some persons are doing well, then there should not be any issue of age and they should be considered for extension.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that first of all he would like to compliment all the Senate members for discussing this issue with great majority in spite of representing different interest groups. This has set an example. If they have to make a policy, the 3-4 things are necessary. First, there must be uniformity and it should not be done for one college rather it should be done for all the colleges. Secondly, there must be transparency where everybody should be given equal chance. Thirdly, objectivity is also must and the extension should be extended to a teacher also. If the age of retirement is extended to 65 years for Principals, it should also be extended for teachers also. This discussion could be more healthy if this house resolves to extend the age of retirement uniformly for Principals and college teachers, then they could postpone this discussion for another five years.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said there is no doubt that wherever the extension has been given, it has been given keeping in view their contribution. When the Principals were not available, then they had decided that if the Principal is not available even after advertisement, he should be given extension in his college. But it has happened then that the Principals whose management did not give him extension, such Principals got re-appointment in some other college. So, he has some objection on this and the teacher organization and retired teacher organization raised this issue and they started discussing it whether it should be done or not. Though the resolution does not say this and he will talk on this later on. He would like to bring their notice one thing, but he would not name any person because it create bitterness. Suppose, he is of 55 years of age and he would like to go to some other college. If he is not eligible because at present the basic qualification have been amended and earlier only a simple M.A. could be appointed teachers and those persons became Principals. At that time there was a rule that once approved, always approved which has now been stopped and now it has been required that he should not get approval only, but he should also fulfill the conditions. The basic qualifications for a Principal today are that he should have 15 years teaching experience, he should be Ph.D. holder and he should have 400 API score also if he has to go to another college. If they leave aside 400 API score, sometimes they do not fulfill the basic qualification of experience and Ph.D. and such persons are being appointed Principals in other colleges. The panels which have gone in such colleges for appointment, where he was also included, they did a many things. The objections which have been raised by the teacher organization and retired teacher organization are because of such things and not because of 2-3 teachers, their contribution might be there. So, they should check it or he could also tell who is the teacher. If a person has applied for Principal at the age of 58 or 59 years, he is not eligible. But after 60 years of age, if he applies somewhere else, he was made eligible and appointed there as Principal. This problem has come out of this re-employment which should be checked. Why it is happening. Shri Prabhjit Singh has also talked about it because he is working in D.P.I. Colleges and knows the whole procedure about this and a nominee of the D.P.I.(Colleges) has been a member of the Selection Committee for the grant-in-aid posts. Suppose in DAV College, Chandigarh or S.D. College Haryana or Govind National College, Narangwal, there is a post. But, he was of the opinion that perhaps no eligible person would apply there for a salary of Rs. 37400/- under grant-in-aid-posts because the management would not give them full salary. But for the self-financing posts there is no such thing, it should be in their mind. In one of the Syndicate meeting he has specially got it noted that they would give panel only for the grant-in-aid posts and not for any other posts because they give relaxation only in grant-in-aid posts so that

teachers could be appointed against these posts. The government has made a policy to first appoint the teachers on contract and then to give full salary to teacher after three years of service. He further said that to give basic salary is only for grant-in-aid posts and not for self-financing posts. The data which is given, maximum of the colleges in the given data are self-financing colleges. He has been talking about the grant-in-aid posts. The persons who have retired from such posts, they are not eligible. If such ineligible persons are appointed somewhere else after retirement on a salary of Rs. 50,000/-, it is sufficient for him. Their colleagues who were fighting for this, they joined somewhere else because any amount for them could be sufficient. Maximum of such appointments are done in the self-financing colleges because they do not give full salary. A working Associate Professor who is getting Rs. 1.30 lac salary would not apply there, but a retired Principal would be ready to go there even if he is paid Rs. 50,000/- p.m. as there is no pension in the private colleges. They are the people who appoint them and this is a wrong thing in the name of re-employment. It needs to be checked whether they have allowed the Principal of that college only or they have allowed if he goes anywhere. Secondly, it should also be checked that the new eligibility conditions would also be applicable to him. They should see whether he has secured 400 API points. They have approved the Principals who have come from other Universities and they would also cast their votes, were they eligible. So, all these things needs to be checked. Continuing, he further said that actually the resolution is to extend it from 2 years to three years, so their discussion should be whether they should extend it from 2 years to 3 years. As pointed out by Shri Amit Joshi and Principal Jhanji that the word 'suitability' should be removed and it should be eligible only, he also agrees to it. Though he was a signatory to this resolution, but perhaps this thing escaped his attention. If it has to be passed, then they should keep the word 'eligible' and remove the word 'suitable'. He suggested that if they have to take a decision on the issue, they could do so by adopting the process of raising hands who are in favour of it or who are not in favour of this, as is being done in the Syndicate meeting. If anybody does not want to participate, he should give his opinion. This is the only way, otherwise this issue cannot not be decided, even if they discuss it for five days or more.

Professor Shelley Walia said that let they not consider the post of a Principal as God sent. As he listened to the arguments going on, he felt that the teachers are not capable and the existing Professors acting as Principals are the most capable, a gift from heaven. He would not discriminate between the Principal and the teaching faculty of a College. He also did not believe in the fact that there is no merit in the Colleges. According to him, there is merit in the Colleges which one could find. He felt that the Managements do not exercise enough to evolve a procedure of selecting a Principal. The solution that the people are talking about is very complex. Let they do away with the whole idea of extension and re-employment. He is totally against the extension and re-employment. They could fix the retirement at any age, i.e., 60 years, 62 years or 65 years, but do not hang a carrot in front of the Principals or the ones to take up. Let they be like the judiciary where there is no question of extension. So everyone does go away. Let the Principals realize that they have to call it a day. He is saying so because all of them contribute in some way or the other. Some persons contribute more while some do not. Someone's contribution is recognized or someone else's not. But just because of the contribution, he did not think, one needed to be given the extension or re-employment. One could be made as the Advisor if the Management wanted. But let they be very strict on fixing the age whether it is 60 years, 62 years or 65 years. But according to him, to fix it at 60 years or 65 years is alright but this House should decide whether it should be 60 years or 65 years. But after that, no extension or re-employment should be given. If they fix an age, how would they find a person suitable. When the suitability is talked about, he was thinking that in the University, they have

not thought about suitable Chairpersons as they come through rotation and it could not be known whether a Chairperson could be good or bad. When a Chairperson comes, he/she, with the aid of the rest of the faculty, manages to look after the department fairly well. It means that in the Colleges also the senior most person should be given a chance. The exercise that is carried in most of the Colleges in the West is that 6-8 months before the retirement of the Principal, the Search Committee meets and begins to look around for a suitable person by inviting applications, short-listing the applications and holding the interview from within the faculty or outside. This way, by the time the Principal retires, they have a person in place. When a person is in place, there is no doubt that the rest of the faculty would help the person. He did not go by suitability and eligibility is a huge misnomer in the whole academic game because there are people without being eligible also could be really good as administrators. They have to follow the rules and regulations and let them go by the fact that they must fix a superannuation age and not going for any kind of extension. The Managements should decide through a Search Committee or a procedure by which at least 8-9 months in advance they begin to advertise, short list and finally have a candidate. If they follow this principle, according to him, there would be no confusion, no arbitrariness and they would go by strict rules and regulations and also they would make sure that no carrot is hung before a person that he/she could get the extension or not.

Dr. Gurmit Singh said that he would not comment on whatever has been discussed earlier. A detailed information regarding the vacant posts has been provided. Regarding the vacant posts, he said that it is not an issue of suitability and eligibility as the selection of the Principals has been done by a selection panel. He has come to know a couple of cases where the selection panel has selected a Principal but the Management is not allowing the selected person to join. The persons so selected are waiting for the last about 4-5 months. If even those posts are being shown as vacant in the information provided, had any steps be taken to enquire from such Managements as to why the selected persons have not been allowed to join. There is no issue of eligibility as the persons have already been selected.

Principal I.S. Sandhu intervened to say that the fine should be imposed on such Managements.

Continuing, Dr. Gurmit Singh said that the selection for the post of Principal has been made and the Managements do not allow the selected candidates to join. But the Inspection Committees raise objection on it being the vacant post. He enquired about what follow up action is taken in such cases.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that he would like to point out what Principal Sangha has said. He is not sure as to what is the nature of the court cases. But since Principal Sangha has pointed out that the matter is in the court. First of all, it is important whether they could take any decision on the issue or not, the matter being sub-judice. If they go by the Principals appointed in aided Colleges, though there is no difference for the University between an aided and unaided College as all are equal, it is only for the Government to see what are the differences. Mostly, the Principals who have joined the Degree Colleges specifically about whom he is talking about, have come from private unaided Colleges where they were being paid less salary as Principal I.S. Sandhu has pointed out. Even they were willing to join on the basic salary of Rs.37,400/-. Otherwise, the availability of Principals at present is not there because no one who is an Associate Professor and drawing a salary of more than Rs.1.25 lacs would like to join any College and taking all the burden of a Principal on a salary of Rs.37,400/-. First of all, before changing this rule whatever it is being

implemented nowadays, they should ensure that the Principals are given the salary over and above Rs.37,400/-. That would make availability of Principals and suitable persons would come forward to apply for the post of Principal if their pay is protected. So, the University could work on two lines. First is that whether they could take up this issue because of it being sub-judice. Second is that even if they could not take up it now, they should ensure that their salaries are protected and wait for 3-4 years and then they would see that the suitable candidates would start applying and then this system could be withdrawn.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua thanked the Vice-Chancellor for providing the thorough background of the issue as to what and how it happened. He hoped that the Vice-Chancellor should have elaborated on the other items also. When the issue was discussed last time, perhaps they are not looking into the problems which are being faced. Instead of looking into the issue being an issue of a person or two, they should see as to what is happening in the Colleges. In most of the Colleges, a problem has arisen that the Assistant Professors are not being allowed to become Associate Professors. He has no issue whether a particular is to be allowed to continue or not. From the information provided, it seems that out of the total aided Colleges in Punjab as has been seen by Dr. Dalip Kumar and a few other members, there might be about 5 such persons on extension and there might one or two such cases. This is a problem of such Colleges which had been opened in shellers and godowns. He had raised the issue that at least the Inspection Committee should check the conditions of the building. But the Inspection Committees in bulk used to go for inspection and granted the affiliation on the spot. All this was happening. This problem is a creation of those persons. At that time also he used to curse those persons but today would curse even more as they have ruined the teaching community. He pointed out that the College teachers are not being paid the salary even to the level of Provident Fund being deducted of the University Professors. Is it not the duty of those persons who visit Colleges to bring this to the knowledge of the University? Could they name even a Principal who could run the College without the staff, could organize a function? Let alone organizing a function, could the Principal even hold the classes with the teachers. Every class of staff of the College including non-teaching staff, gate-keepers, peons, teachers have an equal role in functioning of a College. It is right that the Managements are patting the Principals as their work is going on. But it needed to be looked into that it is not the Principal alone who is running the College. Some of the Principals are taking the credit but at many of the places, the proposals are prepared by the teachers. They would have to accept it that the younger generation is wiser and vigilant than them as they are associated with the newer technologies. They, including himself, are dependent on the younger generation in the form of use of technology while uploading, downloading or other such issues. It could be clarified by the Dean College Development Council (DCDC) that as they are having in front of them the inspection reports of about 150 Colleges, could the DCDC tell the name of even 5 Colleges in the District of Hoshiarpur or Ludhiana which are paying full salary to the teachers. He clarified that the full salary is not being paid. There could be only 5 Colleges out of a total of 25 in Ludhiana which might be paying the full salary. The Principals, except a few, adopt double standard as they say something in the meeting of the Senate and something else in the College. Everything is submitted and evaluated by the University. When the income and expenditure report of every College is submitted to the University in the month of February, then why the same are not evaluated. Has any member talked that keeping in view the inspection report, any course has been rejected.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he has rejected the course in a College where conditions are not fulfilled.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has rejected the course where conditions are not fulfilled but that has not been accepted.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua requested that the University should seek the information through a letter from the Colleges, the list of which has been provided, whether there is any eligible candidate. He pointed out that last month, interviews were held in a College but most of the Associate Professors and Assistant Professors could not apply even though they had more than 400 points. When the API score was implemented suddenly in June, 2013, at that time the teachers did not have the required points. At that time, the extension was given in a few cases to which he was also a party because at that time the eligible candidates were not available for the post of Principal. But they should see as to how that is being misused now.

Principal I.S. Sandhu pointed out that at that time only two persons namely, Mr. Khosla and Mr. Bhushan who at present are working at Chandigarh, were eligible for the post of Principal and no other candidate was eligible. One teacher of Economics at DAV College, Malout was also eligible but he did not apply. But as of today, at least 100 teachers are eligible.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they give an advertisement for the post of a Principal in any College of Chandigarh, they would not find that no suitable candidate is available. He had been waiting patiently for the last 4 months to get the record. He had been requesting for the last about 6 years to send Inspection Committees for periodic inspection of the Colleges but no inspection has been done. He enquired as to what is the force working behind it. The last meeting of the Senate was postponed because the Vice-Chancellor at that time had said that the data was not available. He enquired whether the data which has been provided to them in a format is right as only the years have been mentioned whereas it should have been clearly mentioned that such and such person has gone for inspection as Vice-Chancellor nominee in most of the Colleges. Such persons have rejected a particular candidate in one College while the same person is selected in the other College. This is the exact form in which the data should have been provided. When the Vice-Chancellor had brought military persons in the administration, he appreciated it and thought that these persons would bring transparency. But what kind of data has been provided? Such kind of a data would have been prepared even by a student. Only a list has been provided. Earlier, it was said that the data could be seen as available in the files but now it is said that the members should compile the data on their own from the information which has been provided. He has prepared a list from the data provided to them and found that a particular person has been nominated as Vice-Chancellor's nominee for 17-18 times. He had rejected some courses in some of the Colleges. These issues are interlinked as to why the extension of the Principals is being sought. From the information provided, could they imagine that in Ludhiana city eligible persons are not available for the post of Principal whereas there are so many eligible persons in other small cities. An eligible Associate Professor does not appear for the interview when he looks at the formation of the Committee thinking that he would get insulted by such a Committee. It could be informed by the Vice-Chancellor as he has chaired so many meetings of the Selection Committees that how suitability criteria is being adopted out of the eligibility. This issue was going on and was also not a part of the discussion. What was the need that the Syndicate decided to change the criteria of extension from 2+2+1 years to 3 years? Such an intention creates doubt on the integrity of the Syndicate which is elected by the Senators. The people have faith in the Senate. But a stakeholder sitting in the Syndicate asks for extension. Just for face saving some other proposal could have been given. Information could be sought from the Colleges as to how many teachers are due

for their next higher grade and the Colleges should be asked to pay the same. He pointed out that in every College, many eligible candidates are available. The idea being proposed is good that if the management pays a sum of Rs.1 lac in addition to the salary of Rs.37,400/-, it is no issue with the Management whereas the Managements are paying even Rs.1.5 lacs to the Principals. If a Principal has contributed for an institution and wanted to serve, then he could contribute in some other form but should not degrade someone by showing the academic record of not good standard. Such persons could even perform better. So, they have to take a clear-cut decision whether the extension beyond 60 years has to be given or not. Most of the members are of the opinion that the extension to the Principals beyond the age of 60 years should not be given and after completing the retirement age should provide an opportunity to the next eligible persons.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is in the Senate since 1st November, 2012 and since then his consistent stand is that he is against all kinds of extension and re-employment whether it is for the University teachers, though he has good friends in PUTA, or for the Principals in the Colleges. If this matter is sub-judice in the Hon'ble High Court, then why it is being discussed here as also in the Syndicate. The issue is an algorithm of period of 2+2+1 years, and if the next date of hearing in the Court is on 18th June, 2018, just after about 6 months, and as is the process in the Court, if it takes about a year for the final decision, then it would automatically become 3+2 years in some of the cases. Then what was the need to bring this matter to the Syndicate. He is not against any particular person or the Principal but what Shri Prabhjit Singh has said is also right that out of the 4 Principals in question, two are the members of the Senate and if they consider Chandigarh also, then the number is three. So, it is a bonhomie, synergy and a game to control the Senate politics. How the panels are exploited is a live example of that which is evident from the list provided to them. A person who goes as the Vice-Chancellor's nominee, it is a mockery, a panel does not find a candidate suitable in the college of the same Management whereas after a month the same candidate is found eligible by the same panel in the same Management without the API score. What kind of an example it is? So, the clause of 'suitable' should be rejected and removed. If a Principal has made an outstanding contribution, he agrees that someone must have done so, then there is no objection if the Managements appoint such persons as Director or Academic Consultants and might even pay a salary of Rs.5 lacs. But if the Principals in collaboration with the Managements pay a salary of RS.15,600/- to the well qualified teachers in the affiliated Colleges, then nobody thinks about it as the teachers do not say anything. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua has rightly said. He also agreed with Shri Harpreet Singh Dua. He had gone to a College and had clearly mentioned that this College should not be given the affiliation. But the Syndicate and the College branch has granted the affiliation without taking him into confidence. That is why he agreed with Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and said that he had rejected such a course. So, it is an illogical collaboration to control the Senate politics and panels. So it is not good for the academics. So, in his personal capacity as a member of the Senate, as a former member of the Syndicate and Board of Finance of the University, he is totally against it.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as far as he knows, the ground of the court case is that the Principals have been given the extension and there is no other ground and base. But here it is being said that the matter is sub-judice in the Court, the base which is being taken is that even if the Punjab Government does not accept those persons as Principals, but the Panjab University has given the extension. He said that if the University withdraws the extension, they could immediately come to know about the decision of the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal expressed his heartfelt thanks for convening the special meeting of the Senate specially to discuss this item which he did not know for whatever reasons some of the friends including the Vice-Chancellor were hesitant and had to withdraw the item from the Senate. He had requested that without expressing his opinion in the matter, he just did not endorse the idea of withdrawal of an item on which almost all of the members of the Senate barring few wanted to have discussion. He felt very satisfied and happy and was sure that the Vice-Chancellor also must be happy that the way the issue had been discussed at least for more than 3 hours. He is sure that the friends who earlier were hesitant to discuss the issue must be happy as Professor B.S. Ghuman has rightly pointed out that see how healthy atmosphere the issue is being discussed. But at the same time, he was hoping against hopes that as Chairman of the meeting, the Vice-Chancellor instead of anybody else calling the meeting to be put in order by way of raising a point of order, the Vice-Chancellor as Chairman should have explained to the Senate what exactly the agenda for discussion is. Most of the members in the Senate have discussed whether there should be extension beyond 60 years or not. To his knowledge, this probably is not the agenda item. The agenda item which he could read is to consider the proposal of certain Syndics with regard to change in the rule for extension/re-employment of Principals of unaided Colleges be approved. So, what they are supposed to discuss what they wanted to discuss in the last meeting also that whether this change in the rule from 2 years to 3 years has rightly been done by the Syndicate or not. Some of the members pointed out that it was he (Shri Ashok Goyal) who pointed out it in the Syndicate in the year 2014 that why this item was taken to the Senate. Since Syndicate is competent body to frame the rules, the item should not have been taken to the Senate. He did not remember that he had said that. Had he said that, the Vice-Chancellor would have done the same thing in 2014 in the Senate which he did last time in the Senate. But had he said that, the Vice-Chancellor would not have deferred the matter but would have withdrawn the matter. Last time, if it was to be considered at the same footing, the Vice-Chancellor, because of the paucity of time or for whatever reasons, instead of withdrawing the item would have deferred the item. Of course, after the item was deferred in the Senate, he never said why the item was brought to the Senate. He had said that if a decision had been taken by the Syndicate which is the competent authority to take decision, instead of notifying the decision of the Syndicate, the matter was placed before the Senate. He never said that why the item went to Senate but he wanted to say that the simultaneous action was required to issue the notification. In the last meeting, he did not object why the notification has been issued. In the last meeting also he did not want to flare up the issue that an item which was deferred in the meeting of the Senate in 2014 has never been brought back to the Senate. That is the difference between a deferred item and withdrawn item. The deferred item specifically mentions that it is deferred till the next meeting of the Senate and the next meeting of the Senate was held in September 2014. They have already passed more than 3 years but the item did not come. Luckily, the same item in whatever form came to the Senate on 10th December which was adjourned, the item was withdrawn. There was lot of hesitation in the minds of some of the people that why at all it should be discussed. His simple query to the Vice-Chancellor is that even if something is within the prerogative of the Syndicate and if the Syndicate has taken the decision, is it not within the power of the Senate to review what the Syndicate has done. The Vice-Chancellor always keep reminding the members that the Syndicate has not come from the seventh world, it is their own elected body. So, could they not review or suggest that something could be done like this also. The papers which have been given to them relate to the minutes of the Syndicate dated 30th April 2017 and the annexure which is provided is a letter written by 9 members of the Syndicate and the letter is undated. The letter which was placed before the Syndicate is undated. That is why he is taking

this liberty to ask that after verifying from the record, he be told that on what date that letter had been written. Why he is raising this question is because that there is a noting of the Vice-Chancellor that let this be kept pending till the next meeting of the Syndicate. It is the prerogative of the Vice-Chancellor to bring any item or not. But in spite of the Vice-Chancellor having ordered in writing that it should be kept pending till the next meeting of the Syndicate, from the record what he found is that probably it could not wait for the next meeting of the Syndicate, it was placed before the meeting of the Syndicate probably the next day itself. That was also demanded on the floor of the House, as he could understand, that it should be placed as current item before the Syndicate. He keeps on requesting time and again but did not know whether he would succeed without misunderstanding him, he requested the Vice-Chancellor to tell whether they are not supposed to follow any norms, rules of the game. Just because 9 members of the Syndicate have given in writing and just because that 2 members raised the issue in the Syndicate, the item is included in the agenda and that too by taking away the prerogative of the Vice-Chancellor to bring some agenda. The current item is being placed on the demand of the members of the Syndicate. When he went through the proceedings, except that the resolved part is there, he did not think that barring one or two persons, anybody has endorsed that this rule of 2+2+1 years should be changed. So much so that even the Vice-Chancellor has, in fact, in the form of personal opinion has tried to guide the Syndicate that in case they change this rule at this stage it would look as if the earlier formula of 2+2+1 years has failed while the fact is not that way. The Vice-Chancellor had further warned that this would unnecessarily create more complications and most of the concentration is that this enhancement should be extended to the teachers also. Most of the members have said that only and in the end it is just one member who has said that it should be approved and the resolved part is in spite of the Vice-Chancellor's own opinion and reservation, it is approved. Thereafter, the notification is issued. When he says things just because he did not want to forget and did not want to miss his flow of speaking, he has observed many times that whatever clarifications he demands, whatever document he demands in the Syndicate or Senate, are never supplied to him and he also forgets about the same. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to help him as to what is the date of the letter and how the item came to the Syndicate as an agenda item in spite of the fact that it was not even included in the supplementary agenda of the Syndicate. He requested to have an opportunity of knowing that and if the Vice-Chancellor says 'no', then it is no problem but just because it is not mentioned in the agenda papers. He thought that it would be better discussed if the House is informed as to how the Syndicate has, in fact, hijacked the office of the Vice-Chancellor also. If they have to discuss this item, he would like to know because the only explanation which has been given is that the Colleges are to advertise the post twice or thrice if 2+2+1 years is carried on. The Vice-Chancellor must be remembering that the original proposal which was mooted, it was only for one year. He was a member of that Committee. People might be saying anything. It was the Vice-Chancellor who was also of the considered opinion that let them not take into consideration the individuals, let them keep the interests of the institutions in mind that the good institutions affiliated with Panjab University are not allowed to go berserk. So, to keep those institutions growing if such a decision needs to be taken, the Vice-Chancellor, let them take. But the Vice-Chancellor had said that they do not know whether they could take it or not. So, it was at that time that he had told that though it is not prevalent in Panjab University but it is already prevalent in Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University. In fact, he was assigned the duty to bring some papers in support of what he was saying. So, it was he who brought the papers which Principal Mahajan was referring to the notification of Guru Nanak Dev University. But there, it was one year. So, the Committee recommended for one year only and whatever has been pointed out by so many friends of his, it was specifically passed that this re-

employment could be considered only in the same College where from that Principal is retiring. But as a question has rightly been put by some members, that may be the core point is not as on today, the core point is not whether to go beyond 60 years or not, the core point is that how in the last 3½ years, this decision of the Syndicate or Senate which was taken in its true spirit has been exploited by some of the Colleges and some of the individuals. So, the Senate has to take into account that how to stop the exploitation of such things. How it has been exploited from one to two years, then it has come in the shape of two to three years. He has been given to understand, but not sure that the Principals who are continuing on re-employment of extension, are continuing even without interview, even without advertising the post also. This is a new information, that why the people do not apply in the aided Colleges, it is because as per the Government instructions, they are given only the basic salary, i.e., Rs.37,400/-. Obviously, nobody would come. A very nice proposal has come that the solution could be to direct those aided Colleges to pay the salary as is being paid to a regular Principal in a grant-in-aid College. It is a very good idea. But are they not supposed to consider at the same time that is not it within their purview to direct any College that they would have to pay so much salary. If the College has to pay that much salary only, then why they would not like to continue with the already tested person at the cost of foregoing the grant which is coming from the Government, they would like to continue with the tested person. But at the same time, the Syndicate was of the view that it should not be exploited. So, the advertisement should be issued every year. These points were well taken into consideration while taking this decision that the advertisement is to be given well in advance and not that the day the Principal is retiring, the advertisement is issued. It has also been rightly pointed out that how come the self-financing Colleges or unaided Colleges are employing the Principals unless and until they are not getting the eligible persons. How somebody who is retiring from one College is being considered by another College to be suitable but some other eligible candidate who has appeared in that College is not being considered suitable while the case in both the cases is that they have not tested any of the teachers. A very pertinent question has been raised about the suitability. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra has really appreciated the fact that the University basically is meant to see the suitability. Of course, eligibility is the basic criteria but the suitability has to be seen. If permitted, he would like to share with the House of course without naming anybody that there was a candidate for the post of Principal in a girls College, he was very well qualified and eligible. But on the date of the interview, the person went for the interview fully drunk. It was in a girls College and affiliated to Panjab University. What do they expect what the Selection Committee could have done, it found the person not suitable. So, sometimes the discretion of rendering somebody as suitable has also been used discreetly. So, they have to be very sure that the panel sent by the University after having discussions with the Management takes the best decision in the best interest of the institution. But at the same time they should not forget that the suitability is secondary. He has brought into the notice of the Vice-Chancellor that there is a case where in two Colleges of the same Management, one applicant has been rendered ineligible, not suitable, but the next month the same candidate is rendered eligible by having at least 2 members from the University to be the same. If they are to exploit suitability for the vested interest, then nobody could stop them. If they are capable of exploiting the word eligibility, then suitability could also be exploited. If they are conscious and clear and are answerable to the society and to the Vice-Chancellor who has put somebody as his nominee and who put somebody as expert, if they feel answerable to the Vice-Chancellor, they probably would not do such things. But they do only because they know that they are the final body and nobody could question them because the Vice-Chancellor says that he could not go into the microscopic details and some persons are taking freedom of it. Some of the members tried to say that the case is sub-judice. If the case was sub-

judice, was it not discussed at the last meeting of the Senate when it was decided that a special meeting would be held to discuss this issue only. It was decided that it was not sub-judice. He had earlier also told that in the name of the Court, he got easily afraid. So, the moment somebody says sub-judice, he was in to minds whether to speak or not because he did not want to face the contempt of court proceedings. In this University only before the Vice-Chancellor came, there is a column in the applicant form again for the post of Principal that is there any legal case pending against him or legal proceedings pending in the court of law and the candidate writes 'no'. A member of the Selection Committee, where he was also present and of course Panjab University has its own limits, says that it is a wrong statement as there is a case pending in the court and how this candidate could be selected on the basis of concealment of the facts. He requested that member if he had any proof about the proceedings pending in the court against the candidate and he was told that the candidate has filed a case against somebody. So, obviously if the decision goes against the candidate, the legal proceedings are pending against the person. So, they need to very clearly spell out the rules, qualifications, the circumstances and also, as he remembers that it was specifically mentioned in the decision of the Syndicate that the University is to ensure that this rule of re-employment is not exploited by any College by paying lesser salary underhand. So the part of the decision was for the extension on the last salary drawn. If the Colleges are exploiting and not following the norms, they need to take further steps to ensure that anything wrong is not done. But had the item been to review the decision of 2014 from 60 years to 65 or 63 or 62 years, then of course he would have given his opinion on that also. But, unfortunately he convinced himself that the case which is pending in the court is only about from 60 years to 65 years, the rule which the University has passed while the item for consideration before the Senate is whether they have to change it from 2+2+1 years to 3+2 years. The Vice-Chancellor has given his opinion. Let any member of the Senate stand up and say what is the explainable reason for changing it from 2+2+1 years to 3+2 years and that too at a particular time not given reasonable opportunity to apply mind also as Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he had also singed but he was under some different impression. If this kind of practice starts prevailing, probably they are not going to do anything in the interest of the University, forget about the affiliated Colleges. In the light of that, his request is only to take the decision about 2+2+1 years should be continued or it should be continued to 3+2 years and the second part is that if any item is to be discussed about the validity of the rule of extension or re-employment, then that item has to be brought as a specific item because what is happening is that the item is 'A' and the decision is 'B'. An item is 'A' and under that item the issue 'C' is being discussed and the resolved part relates to 'A'. He wanted to be assured by the Vice-Chancellor that he is not misunderstanding him. He is open to correction also if he has said anything wrong.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that technically the situation is that the item says that the proposal of such and such be approved. The rules are made by the Syndicate and it is the final authority for making the rules. If the rule is made by the Syndicate and the Senate may have the inherent authority to look at everything but normally the rule once framed by the Syndicate is finished at its level. It came here would be just that it may be considered by the Senate about the desirability of the rule. Technically, they have only to look at this and in that case if they feel that the Syndicate decision is wrong, then they could ask the Syndicate to review it but they could not overthrow it because the Syndicate has the authority to make the rule and the Senate did not want this rule and the best thing for the Syndicate was to review it and not to remove the rule. But when the item came, it became a discussion of the general situation of extension and the philosophy of extension and so on. There are also valid reasons. In social situation, there is nothing completely true or false because so many factors are

involved whether there should be re-employment or not. When in the Central Universities the retirement age is 65 years, then naturally they were at a disadvantage as their people would retire at 60 years and the people of Central University would have 5 years and they would be left with those people whom nobody wants. So, there was compulsion also to make sure that those people do not leave and are not taken in by other people who are looking for them. At that stage, might be rightly or wrongly, various solutions were found like 5 years' extension or so and also the fact that now the creativity period is much longer and the people beyond 60 years are more active. The idea was that they have the people who are able to contribute, want to make contribution, they could not lose them and should make use of them and attracting the people at younger age also. If a person goes to a Central University and gets selected where the retirement age is 65 years, why such a person would come to Panjab University when he/she is losing 5 years straightaway. So, under those circumstances, many solutions were found. Some might be good, some might not be. With experience, there could be modifications. If the Syndicate has the authority to make the rules which are not in contradiction with the regulations, etc., he suggested that they might also think of the teachers in the Colleges whether they are able to extend their tenure also by some test of competence or so. But he did not know whether they have the authority or not. They could look into the rules and whether this idea of making use of people who are reaching the age of 60 years could be extended to the teachers or not. When it comes to the Principals, according to him, the UGC is very unrealistic about API score. The API is very different for a Principal which is required from a research scholar. As he understands that some people get the score of 400 points by very dubious means and this is encouraging people to do bad things by putting in these kinds of restrictions. The UGC should be more realistic. When there is an interaction with the UGC, it could be made aware to understand the situation and not to make the rules which lead to this situation. He agreed with Professor Meenakshi Malhotra that they should make it possible for eligible people to apply and for that if they have the authority, they could insist that the person selected would get the same salary that of a regular Principal and it should be a part of the advertisement and the eligible candidates could be ensured that they get the same salary as a regular Principal gets. That would probably enable the Colleges to have more young people to apply. At the same time, the word 'suitable' is not a bad word as pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal that a person might be eligible but he/she might not be suitable. For an institution, many of them are eligible to become Vice-Chancellor but how many of them could become Vice-Chancellor. It is the Search or the Appointment Committee which has to see the suitability. Professor B.S. Ghuman is not the only person who was eligible but he was the suitable one by whatever was the criteria or discretion adopted by the Search Committee because they could not codify everything and the points could not be given for suitability. Eventually, it is the responsibility of the people who have been given the responsibility to select a person to honestly see who is the most suitable person and there is no way of making that objective for giving the points. So, the suitability should be there.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor as to what is the date of that letter which he had earlier requested to which the Vice-Chancellor did not respond. Then Shri Ashok Goyal said that his assumption has come true that the Vice-Chancellor did not want to share even the most pertinent information also with the House and what is the harm in telling the date of the letter and how it has come. This is something unfortunate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they permit he would just take a minute or two to comprehend something which they could have just in two or three sentences. The

age should be increased from 60 years to 65 years. The Government of India did it in the circumstances which are entirely different with the context that they are doing it. The age enhancement from 60 years to 65 years was allowed for the central institutions in the background of the burden of central institutions be enhanced for the students by having implementation of OBC quota in the central institutions. There was a sudden shortage of teachers to handle that number of students. Hence, an ad hoc solution was imposed that the age should become from 60 years to 65 years. Since the age of retirement has enhanced globally and later on they found a justification for it and also the fact that in many central institutions like PGIMER, AIIMS and so on people enter into service above the age of 35 years. When the Government prepares the salary scales, it is very difficult to have a dividing line, so the age of 65 years became a norm for the UGC when a given Pay Commission recommendations came. Everybody wanted to implement it but since Education is a State Subject and the States have certain freedom. In that background, in some States it is implemented while not in others. Panjab University is a very unique institution, an Inter State Body Corporate and has its own difficulties. As of today during the last 5-10 years, the Central Government has accepted that the Panjab University is a national institution and they have committed to give the grant at least to pay the salary of the campus teachers and 1.1 times of teachers for the non teaching staff. So, when they passed a regulation that it should be made 60 years to 65 years and sent to the Ministry of Human Resource Development and UGC, this was to apply across the entire University, affiliated Colleges and so on. According to him, there is no voice of any kind that they withdraw the recommendation that has been sent to the Central Government which is pending its attention. Is he correct to assume that there is no recommendation that is contrary to that? They could come back after lunch and if they have opinions different from it, they could discuss. So, this is one point. Now, how to see that the Colleges are not deprived of right kind of leadership to run an organization. There are many large Colleges affiliated to the University whose number typically is the same as the students in the campus. There are about 15,000 students in the campus and there are Colleges which have students' strength of about 10,000. There are large Colleges which also require a good leadership to run them as entities. So, no College Principal should be paid or offered salary of Rs.37,400/-. According to him, there is a near consensus that no College Principal should be offered a salary of RS.37,400/-. If a College advertises the position of a Principal Professor, the Colleges should be told in no uncertain terms that they have to pay the full salary. If they have to pay the full salary, then Associate Professors or Professors who are eligible, their salaries have to be protected. If the College did not intend to protect the salary of a College teacher, then they should appoint or recommend the senior most Associate Professor of the College to take the charge as officiating Principal and they should be paid the full salary.

Dr. Chaman Lal said that first of all he would like to compliment the House as well as the Chair and to say that in the last one year this is one of the best meetings he has attended for the reason that everybody has spoken with reason and without passion and impersonally. That is the most important thing. At one time he had made a negative comment because of their own Senators were speaking not to make it a Parliament and Assembly. Now he would like to say in positive sense that their Parliament and Assemblies should learn from that kind of meeting as to how the discussions are to be conducted. He would also like to point out about what the Vice-Chancellor has told and to add some more things which have been spoken in detail. He would also like to talk where the problems are likely to arise. He would like to add one or more points which have not been discussed. In private colleges' the retirement age of teachers is 60 years and in Govt. colleges it is 58 years. Perhaps Punjab Govt. has extended the age of retirement by 2 more years in the pattern of 1+1. Re-employment,

is always a problem. He would like to talk on facts. Barring Delhi University and Jawaharlal Nehru University and some other universities, but in all the other universities in India, the retirement age of teachers is largely 60 years. There was re-employment of 3+2 after the age of 60 years, but it was just like extension without any salary cut and without any pension cut. After that Chadha Committee was formed and it enhanced the age of retirement for teachers as 65 years and it was done this for all the University teachers and all colleges teachers and not for Central Universities alone. In fact Chadha Committee had said that UGC might not release the grant to the States unless and until they accept they accept the condition of retirement age at the age of 65 years for all teachers.. Somehow, because of political pressures UGC and MHRD backed out from that and this resulted into solving one problem and creating another. Later, the cases were filed in the Courts, but there also no uniform decision was taken. The outcome of the Court cases was different, perhaps these cases were taken up by different Benches. So one problem which was being faced for a long time was that all colleges and universities all over India should have same conditions for retirement age, pay scales and service conditions and Chadha Committee had ensured that. Professor Chadha himself availed these benefits because the retirement age of the Vice-Chancellors' in the Central Universities was 65 and he has to retire at the age of 65 years only having 3 and half year term, not for five year term. Later on he became the Vice-Chancellor of South Asian University. But, he recommended the retirement age of Vice-Chancellor as 70 years. Professor Bambah has also stated that age is no factor. The President Mugabe of Zambia was keen to contest another election at the age of 94 years, Shri Morarji Desai was Prime Minister at the age of 82 years, Punjabi University first Vice-Chancellor Bhai Jodh Singh became the Vice-Chancellor at the age of 82 years in 1962 he was ready for another term at the age 85, though he could not get another term. He lived up to the age of 99 years and till then he was in a very good state of mind. Let him come to the basic point. There is gap between principles and practice. He talks of two principles. First constitutional principle is that there must be no discrimination. No discrimination is the constitutional principle. They could impose that principle on age, sex, gender and services. In services they cannot discriminate and its follow up principle is equality before law. Everybody is equal before law. Education is a sector and universities, colleges and school are part of it. So, the service conditions should be uniform for all the teachers of universities and colleges and schools and there should be no discrimination between Centre and State and a State and the Centre. There may be any number of Committees formed for this purpose, but their recommendations should be uniform and these should be also implemented uniformly. As per the Chadha Committee recommendations, the age of retirement should have been 65 years, but it should be for all teachers. Here, he would like to talk about another complication. In the Central Universities, after the age of 65 years, they also re-employ a teacher till 70 years of age. When reemployment is done, immediately, there comes ifs and buts and the Universities start imposing their own conditions. In Jawaharlal Nehru University, they have imposed the conditions that if they have completed 10 years in JNU, only then they could be considered for reemployment. He said that he served there for 7 years only, but he was eligible in other Universities, so he was invited by the Central University of Punjab, Bathinda. He was of the opinion that as Principal there should be no re-employment. They can fix any date for re-employment of a Principal, but there should not be discrimination. He further said that the age of 65 years is fine but it should be applicable to both University and College teachers. The resentment is felt only when there is discrimination. He is happy to see today that most of the time has been devoted to discuss the issue of colleges. Their college colleagues have brought so many things to fore and at least these have been brought on record. The things brought out by Shri H.S. Dua are correct as he has the opportunity to go to a college where he saw that it is a rotten system. He saw in a B.Ed.

College that people were appointed Professors in the age of 35-40. The teachers who have taught them, they could not become Professors in the University. They say that here in the B.Ed. College, a person having 8 years of service becomes Professor and after 8 years, he becomes Principal of the College. The college which he had visited, the Principal was being given a salary of Rs. 50,000/- only, meaning thereby that all kinds of variations they could find in college. Somewhere, the salary is Rs. 37,400/-. Somewhere it 50,000/- or 1.0 lac or at other places it is 2 lacs. So, the whole system became rotten because of varied and discriminatory conditions. He said that API has rather destroyed the good education system. The intention behind it was that the teachers should engage themselves in research, conduct more seminars, publish more papers etc., but this system lacks the sense of realism. There are different conditions both for college and University teachers. If they ask the college teachers to go for seminar all the times, it is wrong because their focus should be on teaching. As has been said that they should write text book, there is no doubt that writing of good text book is not a bad thing. But the practices which are fraudulent today those are not good. They used to set up their own magazine for publishing the papers as there is no magazine to publish the papers. This practice is being followed by the college teachers as well as the University teachers. The things in the languages subjects are more worse. This practice is prevalent in whole of India and also in China. He said China and Hindustan are the totally rotten systems. They just need to give rupees one thousand to get a paper published, but such papers have no quality. This mechanical API, instead of improving the things have spoiled them. Earlier, the people used to study because of their interest in the subject, but now it has become their compulsion. One cannot get the desired results if something is done under compulsion, rather they should motivate the person. He said that now the UGC has been imposing conditions on the teachers to remain in the department from 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. Why they should sit till 5.00 p.m. The teachers used to sit in the library till 9.00 p.m. The UGC also ask the research students and teachers to mark their attendance, but in the JNU, there was no such system. The teachers study all the 24 hours whereas the UGC is making them to work like an office. He said, to his mind, it is making the education system much rotten than what it was earlier. He has no solution of it, but he could suggest one thing that this Senate should pass a resolution that the service conditions of all the 4-5 Universities of the State should be uniform and that resolution should sent to the Chief Minister Punjab with a request to call the meeting of the State Council of Higher Education. The issue of uniform service conditions of all the Universities of the State which also include the appointment of college teachers and Principals should be discussed. There should not be any variations of service conditions of thee different State Universities. Further, the discrimination which has been done to the Colleges should be stopped. In the University, no teacher could hold any administrative position after 60 years of age, but this is opposite in the colleges. In the colleges, teachers are not given extension and after giving the extension to the Principal, he holds all administrative positions. So, he said that they should give extension to the college teachers also. Earlier the Principals were given extension for indefinite period, but after that it was fixed for five year. Now when the term is fixed for 5 years, they started changing the conditions after every five years. They do not give charge to a senior Associate Professor on the ground that he does not possesses 400 API score. But he informed that the Principals to who the extension is given they also do not have 400 API score and there are 90% such Principals. He asked then why the Associate Professors are victimized. He suggested if there are Associate Professors having 300 or 350 API score, then they should appoint the Associate Professor having 350 API score by giving relaxation. So, it means that there is utmost need to rationalize all these things. Every society has its own contribution. Shri Satya Pal Jain ji has said that the Supreme Court Judges retire at the age of 65 years, but he would like to tell that after 65 years of they

are the persons who are appointed as Chairman of National Human Rights Commission and Tribunals for five years. Some of them are also appointed Governors of States. So they should think about the basic cause of this issue which is discrimination. There should be no discrimination within one kind of services. The service conditions of their education system should be uniform. He informed that in France, there is no retirement for teacher and it is his sweet will whether he would like to continue or not. So, they should think about all these things and see as to how these could be solved so that there could not be any heartburning or discrimination in the people. If there is provision of extension for all the teachers, there could not be any heartburning.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are back to the situation that, how to see that the college teachers and Principals have the same opportunities as far as service beyond the age of 60 years is concerned. They agree that while the 7th Pay Commission comes and notification happens, they use that as an occasion to insist that if Panjab University is a National Institution, so it should not be discriminated when it comes to other centrally funded institutions. So, whatever is there in other centrally funded institutions, it is in that spirit that they had, before his arrival, a resolution had gone, that it should be made 70 years and they should actively pursue it. They did not persuade it in the last year in view of the other difficulties which they were facing. Now those difficulties have receded. They are recognized as a National Institutions. The Centre has accepted that they are committed to pay the salaries of their teachers though they have to take their permission to enhance their number. But they have agreed to pay for their salaries and those teachers who have retired. In the last three years, they have sent them a number i.e. 27 teachers. They have agreed and permitted them to recruitment these teachers. The 27 re-employed teachers who have retired in last three years, they have just received a communication 2 or 3 days ago saying that they can fill up those positions.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether they have allowed to fill up those posts from their own funds or they would provide the funds.

The Vice Chancellor said that they were paying those salaries out of the budget which is allocated to them. For the last three years many teachers have retired and they were paying salaries out of the allocation to them. So, out of whatever allocation that they have been given, they can start filling up of these 27 positions in a casual way and see whether they can manage their budget. It is very difficult to say how the budgets go. At the moment they have permitted them. So, at least they could look at those 27 positions wherever they are and in a gradual way, they can fill it up. A DUI Committee can look it up as to what a gradual way they should fill it. At least, they have agreed that the number of teachers would not decrease. They are not permitting them to add more, but they have given a signal that it should not be less than 1300. The people who have retired in the last three years they sent them the number and they have agreed and allowed them to fill the posts. They have allowed to fill the post of Dean College Development Council and three Deputy Registrars.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested to bring this as a proper item in the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said okay, but at the moment he is just sharing it with them. They have to mention the minimum qualification etc. for giving the advertisement.

It was requested by some member that Item C-1 should be resolved and they should go ahead.

The Vice Chancellor said that is what they are trying to do. Now the other suggestion is, can the management employ the retiring teachers also? That is a tricky thing. The grant-in-aid positions, the money comes in from an external agency. So, if they employ them, then if the Chandigarh Administration or the Government of Punjab do not agree to pay for those positions to the continuing employment, the management would be in a difficult situation. So, at the moment he does not know, how to make it uniform. He requested the members if somebody has a solution as he could not extract out anything from the discussion so far.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that to his mind, they have perhaps taken a decision earlier also because even the re-employment of Principals is, keeping in view a special kind of exigency where the people are not available.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that that is what they have discussed. In order to enhance that availability they had discussed it.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had decided about the teachers also, but it was said that there is no dearth of availability of teachers in different subject. The other idea was that there are some subjects where there is the shortage. But the leverage which has been given to the managements as per the decision of the University that if the management wants, it means they are ready to pay from their own funds. So, it was decided in 2014 also that let they should include the college teachers also. Now there are two situations, first situation is that there are no applicants or if there are applicants, they are not eligible or if they are eligible, they are not suitable. Unless this condition is met, the second situation does not arise. Thereafter, it is for the management to see whether they want to retain some teacher by giving re-employment beyond 60 years by giving salary from their own funds. If they are ready, where is the problem? He was reading the discussion of the Syndicate, one of the members said it would not apply to teachers because it would completely bar the entry of the young people. If the teacher is not available, only then they are saying that then they could continue with the retired teachers. How they would bar the entry of the younger generation. If they are giving re-employment to some teachers at the cost of young teachers who are available for appointment, then, of course this logic seems to be correct. So, this was discussed in 2014 also that nowhere it was said that teachers should be excluded.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it is very good that the Vice Chancellor is thinking about the faculty, but there is one post of Principal in a College, perhaps the management is paying them. But if they take on an average it comes to 15 posts of teachers and 40-42 teachers have to be paid upto the age of 65 years, no management would be ready to pay them because they would not getting grant for them from any quarter. In DAV College, there are 42 post of grant-in-aid, no college would be able to pay the salary. So, this is not possible.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she has been listening to the colleagues since morning and it is very informative and educative for her. What she feels that the deviate from the real item and it concern the extension to the Principals in a situation where no candidate is suitable for the post. There are two terms which are very crucial here i.e. eligibility and suitability and which very complicated and tricky also. There is a catch in both of these. There are two levels at which they can discuss and they normally discuss at a theoretical level. Some of the practical problems have also been listed, specially by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and other colleagues also. For instance, the issue of eligibility. They know that the eligibility is twisted, not only suitability, eligibility is also twisted, in practical situation. Suitability is absolutely subjective and even

Professor Bambah has said that there are no parameters by which suitability can be measured. So, the problem is with their own approach, pick and choose, favoritism. They want to favour a particular candidate against the other. But it is a fact that lot of teachers are in a queue who are waiting to be designated as Principal. Now in such a situation, what happens actually is, it may be in a hypothetical situation, but then it is worth assassinate viewing it. For instance, one Principal is going to retire, already an assessment is made who is the next probable candidate and this candidate is going to be eligible, whether he has 400 API points, whether he is Ph.D. Now they it is to be seen how this has to be scuttled. Because the person who is already in the seat, of course, controls the situation, is powerful, in the situation of authority and, therefore, it becomes very difficult, first to get eligible candidate and then it become so easy to declare him or her as not suitable. This happens not merely in the case of Principals, but in the case of teachers also. Many a times, when the advertisement is done, now for the last 3-4 years, she has not been going to the colleges for obvious reasons, but prior to that she has been and at the time of interviews, the private and unaided colleges would give such type of advertisement which is not visible in the newspapers and this is done deliberately. The whole thing is done in a very intended manner so that the suitable candidate may not come for interview. There are so many practices which affect not only the salary, but the location of the college, the incentives which are given to him or her. So, therefore, there is a whole lot of exercise which is undertaken that no candidate who is eligible approaches and, therefore, no suitable candidate is there and the management is free to give extension for the Principal. So, it is that which they have to see.

The Vice Chancellor said that other than what they discussed before going for lunch, there is no further thing that they can adopt at the moment.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that as far as the extension is considered, they are trying to give extension to the Principals presuming that suitable people are not available. But as far as his experience goes that any administrator on day one is not suitable. Mostly when he tries to implement the things, he gets the support of the people around him, then only he becomes suitable. If they are eligible, then one thing is that people prefer them. The second thing is, are they really putting the advertisement on regular basis to see whether there are candidates coming up. They give them for three years and then the management would sit for 2 ½ years that nobody is eligible, but that is not the way. The third thing is that as soon as they give extension to any such person, though he is not against any person, but a kind of reaction mechanism will always start in the colleges. He had been in colleges for 7 years, after clearing his PPSC examination as topper of Physics, but he has seen that this kind of reaction goes and this reaction actually affects the working of the institute. So, he is strongly against giving extension to a Principal. If there are eligible person and they should give them the chance. Let they should not talk about 65 or 70 because that will never end. In capitalistic work he could not think of 'Ram Raj' coming up where the management would give them the money. All those things are not going to come. Let they should be realistic. They should say that it is the last day and the next person has to come, whether he is officiating or selected one. Let the education come back as this area is losing the efficacy of education because of all these things.

Shri Raghbir Dayal wanted to know about the resolve part this item.

The Vice Chancellor said that the resolve is that the management when they give an advertisement, they have to explicitly say that full salary would be paid.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that this is not the issue. The issue whether they have to appoint on the pattern of 2+2+1 or on the pattern of 3+2.

The Vice Chancellor said at the moment, let it go to the Syndicate in the background of this discussion.

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested that if it is to go back to the Syndicate as per his (Vice Chancellor) verdict, then they should withdraw the notification which has been issued. If the notification has been issued already, then there is not point of discussing it in the Syndicate. He further said that whatever the Vice Chancellor has said, it is okay, let the Syndicate decide, in the meanwhile, the notification be withdrawn. If it is not done, then what they have to discuss. When some other members also started speaking, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is talking to the Chair and it is he (Vice Chancellor) who has proposed that the Syndicate should decide it and the Syndicate meeting has been scheduled for 25th of February, 2018. They accept what the Vice Chancellor has said. It would not be so that the Principal would continue. If it is not to be done, there is no point of discussing it in the Syndicate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that to his mind the status quo should stay.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stay as several members started speaking together.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is no point in discussing this in the Syndicate when the term of the Principal is already increased and further said, then do not discuss it in the Syndicate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that as stated by Professor R.P. Bambah that as far as this is a rule, the previous Syndicate has ruled this way and would continue till the Syndicate changes it.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that it is nowhere written in the Calendar that the Senate cannot change the decision of the Syndicate. The Senate is fully equipped to change the Syndicate decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate can send the decision back to the Syndicate for reconsideration.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that it is also true. Senate can also change the decision taken by Syndicate. Nothing bars the Senate to improve the decision of the Syndicate and they can set aside the decision of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that no decision has been set aside and there is no resolution to say that the decision of the Syndicate is set aside. Nobody has proposed this.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that previously they have done it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not taking any item for consideration to this effect now.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that they should tell the resolve part and take the sense of the House.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that previously also if the Syndicate has taken a decision, it might have been sent back, but it has not been set aside.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Syndicate has taken a decision which has already been implemented and in the light of the discussion that took place today, if they take it back to the Syndicate, the Syndicate would see to it, but the decision already taken would stand and that cannot be reversed. He said that the Syndicate can discuss again it in the light of the discussion that took place here. But it cannot happen that the decision of the Syndicate has become redundant and the decision would stand.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that the Senate is above the Syndicate and asked why this issue is being brought to the Senate again and again.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate has value, but it has nowhere in the Senate to override the decision of the Syndicate. He said let him propose, do they override the decision of the Syndicate relating to this issue. Some of the members were in its favour whereas several members were against it. So, the Vice Chancellor announced that more people are in this favour that the Syndicate decision should stand.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they would say openly that they could take it back to the Syndicate where they can take any decision.

Shri H.S. Dua requested that they should get counted the number of members who are for and against the proposal of the Vice Chancellor.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that the power of making rules is with the Syndicate and the rules normally do not come to the Senate. The Syndicate had made a rule and that rule at the moment is valid one. The Senate has also the responsibility to make sure that right spirit is maintained. In that spirit, they have discussed this matter very calmly and in a very nice atmosphere with different points of view. The general impression that one gets is that this decision of the Syndicate needs review. If they reverse it that means insulting the Syndicate and also it will be against the rules of the University. What they have discussed is that they should send it back to the Syndicate with the discussion and with a request that they may review the decision. Once they review, it is their responsibility to either accept or not to accept the decision. If they review the decision and say that this decision be changed, then the matter would finish. If they proceed with the same decision, then they have to look into the matter whether they have the authority to reverse the decision or not. At this stage, they should not reverse the decision. They should send it back to the Syndicate, ask them to review it, once they review it, if they reverse the decision, matter finished. If they do not reverse the decision and the Senate still feels that the decision is wrong, they would look into the possibility as to how to deal with the situation.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said whatever he (Vice Chancellor) take the decision, but his fundamental question to the Vice Chancellor as Chairman of the Senate is that whether the Senate can set aside the decision of the Syndicate or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not inclined to reply this question.

Shri Raghbir Dyal again asked the same question whether the Senate, the Supreme body, can set aside the decision of the Syndicate or not and requested that it should be replied for information of the members.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Professor R.P. Bambah has just now told about it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it was the personal opinion of Professor R.P. Bambah.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this scheme was introduced from the Syndicate of 2014 and it has never been placed before the Senate and that scheme is running for the last four years. Then how they can set aside this scheme by bringing an item to the Senate. Only the Syndicate can review it, otherwise nothing could be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it is wrong to say that this decision of the Syndicate was never brought to the Senate. This decision was taken in the meeting of the Syndicate in May 2014 and in May 2014 itself, the item has come to the Senate and even today the status of the item is that the Senate has deferred the item whereas Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma says that it has never come to the Senate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is going on and it was never rejected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, so what, if it is going on and do not say it has never come to the Senate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when earlier there had been an issue and the votes were cast to decide the issue, then it was said that no decision could be taken with the brute majority of votes, then how today they have taken the decision to decide the issue with votes.. Now there is double standard.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that what was the need to do all these things.

Shri H.S. Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur said that they have done like this in the December meeting also, they have their vested interest and it is their plan. They are getting it done deliberately.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that a good discussion has taken place and in the light of this discussion the Syndicate can see to it again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that so far the Chair has not replied as to under what circumstances this proposal was approved by the Syndicate and contrary to it he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) says that good discussion has held and in spite of their asking again and again, there is no reply.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that at that time the Syndicate has approved it.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if the system of 2+2+1 has failed.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that this is a fear factor as the eligible candidates are now available.

Shri H.S. Dua while pointing towards the Chair said that he (Vice Chancellor) should help them by going to this level.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that this is a fear factor. They have been sitting here since morning and now they say to send it back to the Syndicate.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that they (Principals) want to have three years as the eligible candidates has now becoming available.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the sense of the House is against it and requested to hold voting on the issue. If it is in their favour, then they should be given the extension and they do not bother for that. Earlier also, he (Vice Chancellor) used to ask the members to raise their hands to decide an issue and respected the members.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they can resort to voting, but it should be made a rule that as and when some decision needed to be taken, it would be taken through voting.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that when they would cast the voting, it would come out, what the people say outside and what they say when they are in the House.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the members cannot speak openly, then they could hold the secret voting, or they should request the members to raise their hands, they have no objection to it. On being asked by some members to pass the item, he said how it could be passed like this, when the item has been placed before the Senate. He further said that they could even ask the members to raise their hands to decide whether the issue is to be referred it back to the Syndicate or it has to be rejected.

Shri H.S. Dua said that they have already given time to discuss this issue. The December meeting was not needed to be adjourned, but because he (Vice Chancellor) had said so they agreed to it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there are two issues, i.e. either they refer it back to the Syndicate or they should reject it. For that they should see the sense of the house and they have no objection to it. He has always respected the number game, but he (Vice Chancellor) cannot force the decision upon them. It is his (Vice Chancellor) discretion or his prerogative, whether he would like to get the issue decided by voting or secret voting or by raising of hands by the members.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he would request all his colleagues to maintain the spirit in which they have held the discussion. He requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to give him some time to speak. He proposed that, this Senate reiterates its decision that age of retirement or whatever conditions are of University teachers, same conditions will apply to college teachers whether it is reemployment or extension. If the University teachers have a 3+2 reemployment system, same will be applicable to college teachers to which the Vice Chancellor said that University teachers do not have reemployment in the form of 3+2. Continuing, he said that whatever conditions are there for University teachers, same conditions would apply to college teachers. He further proposed that the Senate resolution should be sent to the UGC, Chief Minister, Punjab or to the Administrator, U.T. Chandigarh for calling the Higher Education Policy meeting immediately to settle that all the four Universities should have a kind of uniform policy as Punjabi University has one policy, Guru Nanak Dev University has another policy and the Punjab University has another policy. The colleges are same in Punjab. So, they have to come to a uniform policy as to what would be the service conditions of teachers as well as Principals. So, with this, what they can say is that let the 3+2, but the old Syndicate decision of 2+2+1, let it continue till the next meeting so that review could be done as Professor Bambah has suggested and he actually support the view points of Professor Bambah. The review can be made sometime in goodwill in peculiar circumstances and if that spirit prevails in Syndicate and if the Syndicate reiterates its decision of 3+2, as suggested by Professor Bambah, it can again be reviewed.

Shri H.S. Dua asked as to why they would like to send it back to the Syndicate. They are listing the voice of the House and they knew what the Senate wants, in spite of knowing all this, why they say that this item should be sent back to Syndicate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said now there are two things which could be done. Either they should conduct the voting to send it back to the Syndicate or to reject it.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Professor Bambah has very rightly said to send it back to the Syndicate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said as far as he knows the University calendar, he can say that the Senate can override the decision of the Syndicate.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the issue relates to 2+2+1 and 3+2 system to which Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the question is whether to reject this or not.

Professor R.P. Bambah read out the relevant portion from the P.U. Act which states, "the Syndicate may make such rules, not in consistent with the provisions of this Act and the Regulations, as they deem necessary for carrying on the executive government of the University as specified in sub-section (1)". On being asked by Shri H.S. Dua, Professor Bambah explained that this means that the Syndicate would make the rules consistent with the Act and Regulations.

Dr. K.K. Sharma, Shri H.S. Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur said that the regulations are for retirement at the age of 60 years. Thus the extension being given is also inconsistent of the regulations.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said in case they are not to take any decision impartially, then he will go and requested to record his dissent.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate had earlier recommended that the retirement age in this University would be made 65 years. By showing the P.U. Cal. Volume-1, he said that this book was written at some time.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said it was in the case of University teachers to which the Vice Chancellor said that it was for all. Shri Raghbir Dayal further said that it was not for college Principals.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that the Government has not accepted. They have not notified the acceptance of those regulations to the University. But the Government of India has been made aware, particularly, during the last three years as to where they are spending money, who is the teacher on regular service, who are the teachers getting re-employment service. List has been submitted to Government of India on regular teachers and re-employed teachers etc. So, the Government is not unaware of the fact that the reemployment scheme is operative in this University and the re-employment scheme has been changed from 3 to 5 years. So, Government is not unaware about these things. So in the case of University teachers they have the re-employment scheme going upto 65 years, even then one can argue that Centre has never approved those regulations, so all University teachers should have been long retired at the age of 60 years. This University should have never operated any re-employment scheme, but they can look at the history of the University, reemployment

scheme of one or the other have gone on for a very very long time. So, the Syndicate has not done anything notionally inconsistent with the Act. If 2+2+1 was there and if they change it to 3+2, if the Syndicate was empowered to first suggest 2+2+1, then the Syndicate is also empowered to suggest 3+2. But today after a long discussion, they found that a the scheme of 2+2+1 or whatever is operative, there are some practices that are happening which amount to not letting eligible people applied for the Principal's position because they would be paid a salary of Rs. 37400/- and no allowances etc. This is driving away many of the eligible candidates of this. So, now after a four and half hour discussion, the resolve was that they address this situation and not eligible candidates should not be prevented from applying. So, they are going to write to the management of every college that the sense of the Governing Body is that when they advertise for the post of Principal, be conscious that they have to pay full salary and not Rs. 37400/-. If they would give Rs. 37400/-, the sense of the Governing Body is that such Principals would not be given approval at all. They would be given the option that if they do not want to do this, they can take a recourse that they would give charge to the senior most Associate Professor. But, there might come one problem because he would not be considered as a regular Principal and thus he would not participate in the University voting system. This is a new situation and this is a challenge before the Syndicate, the Government of the University to as to what change to be brought in that when somebody is given an acting charge, how to enable him that he/she has voting rights and that is the challenge before them. This is the situation that they must address.

Shri H.S.Dua said that there could not be any problem as that person is already a teacher to which the Vice Chancellor said that he would like to cast his vote from the Principals Constituency.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they (Management) promise to pay the full salary, then they will always get candidates. But the problem arises when they do not want to pay full salary on the pretext that the Punjab Government would give only Rs. 37400/- on that grant-in-aid position. But if they are giving extension to the Principal, the Punjab Government would not even give them Rs. 37400/-. If they do not take Rs. 37400/- from the Government and are ready to give full salary to the Principal from their own funds, then why are they feeling why of paying them the full salary. Rs. 37400/- would come from the Government and the rest of the amount would be paid by the management.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the salary of Rs. 37400/- should not be acceptable to them. The Government give Rs. 21600/- to a teacher and the Chandigarh administration has started giving 15600/- to a teacher.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already got it passed from the Syndicate that no teacher under the grant-in-aid post in Chandigarh Administration would be given Rs. 15600/- when they are giving Rs. 50,000/- to their contract teachers. If they do so, according to his personal opinion, the University should not give approval to such teachers. He has also told this to the Education Secretary also.

On a point of order, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that whatever the Vice-Chancellor is saying regarding the Assistant Professor, it is right. But the problem is that the approval of about 70 Assistant Professors of 4-5 reputed Colleges of Chandigarh is pending in the University. In the advertisement issued for the Assistant Professor, it is written that the qualifications would be as per Union Territory/UGC/University. The U.T. Administration says that it would pay a salary of Rs.15,600/-.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the U.T. Administration is paying a salary of Rs.50,000/- to the contractual teachers.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is right that the contractual teachers are being paid a salary of Rs.50,000/-. He had raised an issue in the meeting held in March on which the Vice-Chancellor had assigned a duty to Dr. Dalip Kumar to talk to the Secretary and the DPI, U.T. The U.T. Administration has adopted the notification of Punjab Government in toto. It could not be a case that different salaries are to be paid to different categories like teachers, police personnel and doctors. The notification of the Punjab Government adopted by the U.T. Administration covers all the categories of employees. Now, the office is holding the approvals of the teachers due to which the teachers are suffering. It is not a simple issue and they have to resolve this issue. He appreciated the spirit of the Vice-Chancellor that since the contractual teachers are being paid a salary of Rs.50,000/-, the other teachers should also get the same. If the U.T. is not paying that much salary, at least the University should grant the approval of teachers which are pending with it. What is the fault of the teachers in it? There are about 70 teachers of Chandigarh whose cases are pending for approval for the last one year.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that if they are adopting a model for the Principals that a salary of Rs.37,400/- be paid and the rest of the salary be paid by the Managements. Similarly, in the case of Assistant Professor also, they could ask the Colleges to pay the salary of Rs.15,600/- and the rest be paid by the Managements.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with it. Just because they are getting full salary, they could not have a situation that a new person is given a salary of Rs.15,600/-.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the extension in employment has an implication of financial burden on the University especially in the case of University teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, there is no burden.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if it is not a burden, then let these teachers teach free and fresh appointments be made.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that in the Government Colleges also there are about 60 teachers who are getting a salary of Rs.50,000/- and are NET qualified. The Supreme Court has granted a stay and their services could not be dispensed with. He requested that such teachers be also granted the approval as those teachers are NET qualified and these teachers are also saying that it is their right as they are working for the last 14 years and are drawing a salary of more than Rs.50,000/-.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that there are about 150 such Assistant Professors in the U.T. also.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the University should write to these 5 Colleges that if they could not pay the full salary, they should hand over these Colleges to the University. Then they could see how these Colleges pay full salary to the teachers. None of the Colleges is running in losses as they are paying salaries of Rs.2 lacs.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the members are just talking about the Colleges but in the University there are hundreds of such teachers who are a

burden on the University. But nobody is focusing on that. There are 27 persons above the age of 65 years and the permission has been granted in their case. He enquired whether the MHRD has granted the permission to the University to fill up 27 posts of teachers in place of those persons who have crossed the age of 65 years. He said that then they should relieve all such persons and the permission could be granted to fill up those posts also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that by relieving all such persons, the output of the University in terms of providing teaching to the students who have joined them in preference to the others, that quality of teaching could not be compromised.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it means that they are not producing quality.

The Vice-Chancellor said that filling up the posts is not a week's matter, it takes about a year to complete the process.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they could fill up the posts in piecemeal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they would have to take permission for each of the post to be filled up.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Vice-Chancellor must remember that the re-employed teachers are even taking the classes as guest faculty.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that all that practice has been stopped.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that this has been stopped only after it was pointed out.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that let them focus on the issue and not divert the discussion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members themselves are not accepting their responsibility as the Syndicates are elected by them. But the members did not want to respect the Syndicate that they themselves have constructed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they could discuss the decision of the Syndicate and if that decision is good, they could accept and if not good, they could reject the same.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Item C-1 is brought to the Senate because there is a proposal in the Syndicate. But why is it being brought to the Senate, only for discussion for 4 hours with no result.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a result. If there is not 100% satisfaction, then they could not say that there is no result. Everything has been recorded before they went for lunch. The sense of the House is that they had usefully spent 4 hours. Now they are saying that they have not usefully spent 4 hours. He could not stop the members from speaking whatever they wanted. But whatever has been recorded is record. They went for lunch with a sense that they have usefully spent 4 hours and each one of them has been educated by listening to each other.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the result of the 4 hours discussion should not be changed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that whatever has been discussed in the House, the true spirit of that has come out. The spirit which the members wanted to communicate, convince and convey has been properly received by the Vice-Chancellor. But now the Vice-Chancellor is saying that the matter be taken to the Syndicate. The Syndicate has already taken a decision.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that whoever has talked on the issue, no one is in its favour. Even then the matter is being referred back to the Syndicate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is not known as to why the matter is being referred back to the Syndicate deliberately.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the question under consideration is change of rule. Are they sticking to the rule which the Syndicate has proposed or they are going to change it? It is not the question of salary, that is just a corollary from it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate could only change whatever has been sent by it to the Senate. Let it go back to the Syndicate and what is the problem in it.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether the Senate could not change the rule.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not giving any such ruling.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is saying that it is only Syndicate which could change the rule which it has made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate has sent the matter. The past practice is that wherever this has to be done, it goes back to the Syndicate. Professor R.P. Bambah, a veteran of this University from Lahore to Chandigarh has told and reminded that what this is. If they did not want to respect and adhere to what they had been doing for so long.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor R.P. Bambah started with that the Senate has inherent power to undo what has been done by the Syndicate. But thereafter he said that it would be better if they send the matter back to the Syndicate for reconsideration or for reviewing the decision keeping in view the desirability of the Senate as has been discussed today. He (Professor Bambah) has nowhere said that the Senate does not have the power, he simply says that the Syndicate should not be insulted and let it be sent to the Syndicate and if the Syndicate still reiterates then the matter should come to the Senate and the Senate is free to take the decision whatever it wanted. He had requested why this extension of 2+2+1 years has been changed to 3+2 years. The letter does not say anything except that the advertisement is to be given twice. The letter is written a day earlier and taken to the Syndicate as current item the next day and it is approved. The Vice-Chancellor in his own wisdom did not prefer to explain the background under which this decision has been taken. But everybody understands and majority of the people are of the view that whatever the rule was, 2+2+1, that should remain. But another proposal is to review this and change of rule should also go to Syndicate. Of course, as per the suggestion made by Professor Bambah, it would come back to the Senate in the month of March. Those very friends today who are, in the name of numbers, opposing that why voting be got done, he would show it in the Syndicate that those would ask for raising the hands. The irony of the situation is that whosoever is eligible is not suitable and whosoever is suitable is not eligible. What is available is not suitable and what is suitable is not

available. At the same time, what Professor Bambah has said that let it be referred back to the Syndicate for taking a decision keeping in view the discussion in the Senate only with one thing in mind that let this Senate not insult the Syndicate which is a rule making body in spite of the fact that this Senate has inherent power to undo what has been done by the Syndicate. The Vice-Chancellor could simply say that accepting this proposal, he prefer to take it back to the Syndicate for getting it reviewed in the next meeting with an assurance that in the March meeting of the Senate, this item would come again with whatever the Syndicate does so that the impression which is there in the minds of the friends that a year would go by in it. Everyone wanted to know what would be the effect. That is why he is asking at what stage it was done that it be changed from 2 years to 3 years. Till date nothing such has happened that the rule is changed and a line is inserted that those who those who have completed 2 years, they should be allowed to continue for the 3rd year without interview and advertisement. A rule which is coming into existence today, could it be applicable retrospectively. A person who was appointed for 2 years, could he be allowed to go for another year that too without advertisement and interview. Even if it is to be changed from 2+2+1 to 3+2, it would be applicable only to those who would be appointed after the date of the decision of the Syndicate or after the notification as per the decision of the Syndicate and not to those who have already been appointed for 2 years and who have already completed 2 years. He is not keeping anybody in mind. Otherwise why he is saying so, if it could be 3+2 or why it could not be 3+2 or 2+3. It could be easy either 3+2 or 2+3. But no, it has been decided keeping in view some particular person. Had the intention been only to divide the 5 years period in two parts, then it would have been 3+2 or 2+3 as the case may be and those who have been appointed for 3 years or 2 years or as the case is, they would be allowed to continue for 2 or 3 years without interview and advertisement. He appreciated it but did not know why the Vice-Chancellor instead of defending his own opinion, is trying to defend those who in fact forced the item to be brought as current item in the agenda. The Vice-Chancellor, he is told and repeating, said that it would create problem. The rule of 2+2+1 has not failed and there is no opportunity of explaining even that why they are saying except that it has to be advertised twice. When the proposal for 1 year was there, then it was said that one the one hand they are saying that they are supposed to pay full salary of Rs.1.5 lacs or Rs.2 lacs or whatever it is and on the same ground they are saying that the College is not in a position to spend money for advertisement and holding the interview. He reminded the Vice-Chancellor, to be transparent he had also suggested in 2015 when Shri Jarnail Singh had written a letter against this, Prof. Grover (Vice-Chancellor) had made a statement that he would ensure that if a Principal of any affiliated College was retiring in the next 6 months, that information would be displayed on the website of the University. It was also said that it is for the information of the members that the post is going to be advertised shortly so that the prospective applicants could get enough time to prepare themselves for submitting the applications. But nothing has been done. Rather every time it is being diluted. But this has come for the first time that those who have been selected on the basis of interview are being given another year without interview. So, it is only in that light, he is not suggesting that the decision should be taken here only as he is not that rigid and is equally receptive to what Professor Bambah had suggested, they have to convey to the House that the intention is not to favor anybody. The intention is not to play with the sentiments or opinion of the members but to keep the sanctity and the dignity of the Syndicate intact and the inherent power of the Senate also. Heavens are not going to fall if the decision could not be taken by the Senate in the month of January, it could be taken in another two months or so.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that if the Syndicate reverses it, then there is no need to place the matter before the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that since the Syndicate is competent and takes a decision, then there is no need to place the matter before the Senate.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the way the extension is being given, it appears that the College teachers have been defeated on the issue and he excruciatingly said that instead of giving the extension on the pattern of 2+2+1 years, it could be given for 5 years in one go.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this decision was taken by an earlier Syndicate and since now the new Syndicate has been formed, it should consider the matter in view of the spirit of the discussion held in the Senate and whatever decision is taken by the Syndicate, it could be made applicable.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Shri Ashok Goyal has explained in detail what Professor Bambah had suggested. Therefore, the sentiments of the members should also be taken into consideration. The way the item is being placed by the Vice-Chancellor, it is a projected agenda. Even before coming to the meeting, he knew as to what would happen. The same was also known even during the previous meetings and he could also tell as to what would happen in the meeting of March. As the Vice-Chancellor had given the members to articulate on the issue, but he thinks that at the end he has to take the decision and accordingly the Vice-Chancellor has given a proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Harpreet Singh Dua not to indulge in unnecessary insinuation against as he as the Vice-Chancellor of this University has very limited options.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he respects the Vice-Chancellor but it is not the way to conduct the meeting the way it is being conducted.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting saying that he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) has no respect for the office of the Vice-Chancellor and the Senate also does not seem to have the respect (as there is no restraint on an erring member by other).

When the meeting resumed, the Vice-Chancellor conveyed his comprehension of retirement age as regards the teachers of this University. The retirement age of the University teachers as at present continues to be 60 years even though the matter is in the Court and the Court is considering the matter. While it is considering, the re-employment scheme which is a contractual scheme employing teachers on a contract for a period of 5 years, that is an add-on to the re-employment scheme. That is why one-day break was being given. The re-employment scheme of the University was not in continuation of 60+5 years, that is why there was a one-day break every year. The Court is right now looking into the thing whether the age could be enhanced to 65 years. That is the reason why the people are on re-employment on a stay that one day break is not being given because there is a possibility of High Court taking a decision in favour of the teachers that the retirement would be enhanced from 60 years to 65 years.

On a point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is wrong to say so at this stage.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that enhancing the retirement age from 60 years to 65 years at the moment is sub-judice. In the background of this, the earlier scheme that retirement age is 60 years and this 5 years re-employment is an add-on as contractual teacher. According to him, that re-employment scheme is not inconsistent with the Act. He had some doubt but he had tried to look back as to what it is. Re-employment scheme of the University is not inconsistent with the Act. Whatever the Syndicate has done whether it is 2+2+1 years or 3+2 years, that is again in that spirit. It is a kind of contractual. According to him, that was also consistent with the Act. The Syndicate has made certain rules and he was not the originator of that rule. He personally did not move that rule. All things that come to him, come from somebody unless there is something that he thinks that the Syndicate has to deal with it. The construct of the University is such that the Vice-Chancellor has a very limited role. It is the Senate which appoints the Syndicate in a very complicated way and so on and so forth. So, no Vice-Chancellor of this University, given the construct of the governing of the University, has any role in constructing the Syndicate year after year. So, one should restrain oneself by attributing motive to a given Vice-Chancellor because the Vice-Chancellor has a very limited freedom. He has never brought the matter that the Principals should be given the extension. He has read it that the Principals are being given extension even before he took over as Vice-Chancellor. There is a lot of factual information that it is being followed in other universities of Punjab. This is something which is not his brainchild. The members could say that extending the re-employment from 63 years to 65 years is the brainchild of the current Vice-Chancellor but rest of the things are not his brainchild. This thing has been continuing since long. The Syndicates of this University have been taking initiatives and what the Vice-Chancellor has to do. He has to respect what the Syndicate has been doing. The Vice-Chancellor could in a very limited way influence what the Syndicate wants to do. The Syndicate does the things. He could cite many examples when he proposes a thing on his own looking at something, the Syndicate overturns that. Several Syndicates have turned many things which the Vice-Chancellor might have proposed without consulting the Syndicate members. Typically, he has not been consulting the Syndicate members while preparing the agenda. He is not having any pre-meeting with any of the Syndicate members. He is even not having post-meeting with the Syndicate members. He has tried to keep himself as far away from the way the construct of the Syndicate is as is humanly possible for him. The members perhaps know how the Syndicate dynamics work and probably the members know how an item would move on to a path which has obstacles here and there. But that does not mean that a motive ought to be assigned to him that he is doing this thing to favour. In that spirit he appealed to the members to respect their own past that the Syndicate decides the things and whatever needs to come to the Senate, it comes and whatever needs to come to the Senate is typically not committed. If inadvertently something happens, that is a different story. But if the Syndicate passes something which is the spirit and if it is not inconsistent with the provisions of the Act and the Regulations, then it becomes a rule. The Syndicate could make the changes in the rules. But in the Panjab University system as the Syndicate happens every year, so sometimes these things get changed more frequently than they ought to be. Otherwise if a rule is made in the year 2014 and should have lasted for 4-5 years but that has not happened. At various stages, it has been changed. First of all, how it came in 2014 is not known as an agenda item. Sometimes the issue is discussed and in that background something happens and then it is continuously being changed. He has not done. It is the Syndicate which has done it. The Syndicate and Senate have their own dynamics. It might not be a healthy dynamics but this is a dynamics for which they could not hold the present or the previous Vice-Chancellors responsible because this dynamics commenced long before this University had a first full time Vice-Chancellor. The first full time Vice-Chancellor came in the year 1938. But the

dynamics of the Syndicate has commenced from 1904. He said that somebody may say that he is giving swirling lecture, but this is but this is what the reality is. So, let the matter go back to the Syndicate. Syndicate should respect what has transpired in the last 5-6 hours. Few things have got proposed, but how they have to be communicated to the College Management, that also must have to be put in a very concrete way so that Syndicate's ruling is conveyed to them. In the meanwhile, something should be done and conveyed to U.T. Administration, in particular to the Punjab Government, that it is okay to saying the civil servants that they should be given basic salary for the first three years. But the government cannot remove IPS Officers or PCS Officers, because they have come by a process. But when it comes to a college management, it can play with this game of paying low salary, not continuing for months and there is no guarantee. They suffer for low salary for first three years and this is continuing. Even, today he is not sure whether the Punjab Government would give full salary to the 1925 positions permitted to be recruited in the colleges of Punjab. He asked, is there anybody who can say that he is getting full salary? He asked from the Punjab Government whether they would give full salary or not, but he could not get a satisfactory answer from the Punjab Government. So he feels very disturbed and anguished that the large number of teachers who are Ph.D., they are being paid salary which is so low that it is extremely demeaning to have that salary. That is even lower than the D.C.rate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is very sorry to say that even a Peon working on regular basis is getting double or triple salary than these teachers. This is the kind of state of affairs.

The Vice Chancellor said that C.M., Punjab, Education Minister, Punjab, D.P.I., Chief Justice is the member of this House. This House has a great prestige.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he would not like to name any person, but as stated earlier by some member that someone has taken money from him for getting something done, that is why the Officials do not come to the meetings of Syndicate as well as the Senate. He requested the Vice Chancellor to pursue these officers so that they should come to attend the meetings of Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has requested them many a times, but all in vein.

Shri Ashok Goyal said what stops the University, like if a college has strength of ninety teachers, maybe there are only thirty grant-in-aid teachers, how do they ensure salary for the remaining sixty teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that those sixty teachers should not take excuse from this that the Punjab Government is saying that they would be given a salary of 15600/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that neither it should be given, nor they are giving, but, what he is saying is that as to how the University is ensuring the payment of enough salary to the remaining sixty teachers. How the University is concerned whether the college is getting salary from the Government or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to take hard decisions. The salary that the colleges have to pay out of their own earning, if they are not paying that salary, then they should take strictest action against host colleges.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the 1925 posts does not belong only to Panjab University but those posts relate to all the Universities. Secondly, these 1925 posts also included the posts of non-teaching staff. He further said, lest they should assume that if there are 300 aided posts in the aided colleges affiliated to Panjab University, then at least, there are 2000 unaided posts. In the name of this that the Punjab Government is giving less salary to the aided posts or the U.T. Government has adopted this pattern, the managements of the colleges on that basis has decreased the salary of the remaining 80-90% staff. This is the problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is what he is asking that instead of telling those people appointed against grant-in-aid posts, instead of telling the colleges that they do not know how much funds they are getting from the government, but if somebody is to be appointed in an affiliated college of Panjab University, he has to be given the full salary. Instead of ensuring full salary to those to whom the Punjab Government is giving 25600/- and U.T. is giving 15600/-, they are not concerned where from the money they getting. They are only concerned with college while giving affiliation and inspection that they are to give full salary. Instead of ensuring that, what Shri Prabhjit Singh has said that the remaining 60 posts have also getting started less salary. That means it is a complete loose control of the University. They are not bound by what the government has said to them.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to have an informal meeting amongst themselves and bring a concrete resolution to the Syndicate. They should go as Senators of the University and lobby with the D.P.I. If they are protectors of education in this region, impress upon the Education Minister of Punjab, D.P.I. (Colleges) Punjab, Education Secretary, Punjab. They should impress upon the Governor and Administrator of U.T. that this is the state of affairs. This city produces nothing, other than the human resource and the quality of human resources is going to deteriorate and its consequences would come to fore after 15-20 years when the importance of product of this region will reduce in the national life, when they will produce students who are taught by teachers who are not being paid properly, who would not be of the same quality as the kind of teachers that they have 20 years in this city. They will know the consequences afterwards. So, why they have shown so much of concern in this hall, outside this hall, before they meet next, he requested them to go and meet all of them.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, suppose they do not agree.

The Vice Chancellor said that suppose they do not agree, they can disaffiliate all these colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, how? They only have the control on the colleges whether they are the government colleges or others.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the colleges the you would disaffiliate, the society would wake up.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he would like to bring their notice that he, as a unionist had tried in some colleges and asked them that if they cannot give full salary, then they should be given salary by giving them at least 50% dearness allowance and they started it. But their leaders say by going there that when the government is giving Rs. 21600/- to them, then why they do not give Rs. 21600/-. He said that he can give example of it and he could prove this. Those people are sitting here. There is a

very big college of his friend. The leaders who are sitting here, they went to that college along with him. He said it again and again to the inspection Committee that they will not giving full salary to the teachers, but in spite of that the affiliation committee has given approval to them. Shri H.S. Dua also knows that the college is situated in his area. This college is one of the worst six colleges. Earlier, they were giving sixty thousand to a teachers, but when the governments started giving them 21600/-, they also started 21600/-. He tried his best not to grant the affiliation to that college, but his colleagues granted affiliation. He said that they are getting such things done themselves.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that she has personally witnessed a college. She got a telephone on 7th (January) that that two college teachers have been dismissed whereas one of the teachers went to get his father checked at the hospital after having leave from the college. He was informed about his dismissal through email at 5.00 p.m., otherwise, before that there was no notice at all. They were suddenly dismissed. She go the telephone at about 2.00 p.m. She than rang the Vice Chancellor as well as the Dean College Development Council. She was really thankful for the quick action and a committee consisting of the herself, Shri Sharma ji and Dr. Grover. They went to the college. It was so unfortunate that the teachers were not given salary for seven months. The teachers requested the Principal to give their but the Principal did not apprise the management about it. Rather, the Principal said that perhaps the letter might have been sent to his other office. The manager made them some complaints about the senior teachers, but the name of these two teachers did not figure anywhere. On being asked by Shri Jarnail Singh that she should disclose the name of the college, she said it is DIPS College of Education, Tanda. They questioned the Manager that he did not mention anywhere the name of those two teachers and why they were dismissed. The Manager said that because they were soft targets as they were on probation.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that as told by Dr. Neeru Malik, the Principal who is working there was appointed there without interview, which was also endorsed by Dr. Neeru Malik.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a Committee had visited the college and the college was instructed to give salary to the teachers before Diwali.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu asked whether the Committee has removed the Principal who was working there without interview.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it was not an Inspection Committee and they have to see the salary part. He also said that whatever is being done by the college, it is quite wrong so strict action should be taken against it.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that there was something much insulting than this. There are male and female faculty members. They (College persons) said that the teachers take their meals in the same dish and they do not know what is going on between them and they do not take classes and there is no system for teaching. Then the Committee cross checked with the students also who told them that the teachers took all the classes and adjustment is made even if a teacher is on leave. The teachers who were favouring the Principal, they also said that the classes were conducted there. Apart from this, the students were on internship in a school. The Punjab Government had closed the schools for two days due to fog. Those students did not come to the college as those students were on four months internship programme. Those students were fined Rs. 100/- per day per student. The students were asked to come to the college by

15th and thereafter the Principal called the student till 23rd, and delivered the letters regarding imposing of fine to the students. They put together the letters sent by the college and the complaints of the teachers. If some old student comes to take his D.M.C., he is asked to first pay the old fee, even if he belongs to the reserved category, only then he would be given the D.M.C. The present students were also asked that they could pay the fee in installments. There is no fee for reserved category students. But now they have enforced upon the students that if they have to appear in the Ist Semester, then they will have to pay the fee. Every day and every minute is insulting for these teachers. The students are asked as to why to wish these teachers. They insult the teachers by saying that they have passed the examinations by copying, they have fake degrees, they do not know how to teach etc. They have been insulted number of times in front of students. The college teachers have gifted two dinner sets to the college, but the Peons have been instructed that these teachers should not use even a spoon of this dinner set, nobody would wish them and nobody would serve them anything. They are not allowed to enter in the library, computer room, canteen and they are not allowed to interact with any of the person. The most painful thing was that they did not have interaction with the Management. It was the Manager who was deciding each and everything. When the team told him that with this their college could be disaffiliated. He said that it would not make much difference, they would drag the matter for two and a half year without any problem. She said that she asked the Manager to give in writing about his consent to disaffiliate the college as it would not make any difference to them, but then he said he was just talking. So, they have so casual attitude towards the University. They say, if the University disaffiliates them, they have the option to go to NCTE and Court.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is very serious issue and he suggested that immediately a team should be formed and total inspection of the college should be done. Students could be shifted from there. The whole record of the college should taken into custody. All the things regarding P.F., payment to the teachers, appointment of Principal as stated by Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, salary of the Principal, Form No. 16 should be checked so that a pressure could be built on the college.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that Mr. Sharma was with her on the visit. The Manager in the College said that he would not take back the person. But since the Management has other Colleges also, he could be adjusted somewhere else. It seemed to be an ego problem of the Manager that if the person is taken back, it would be hurting the ego. Regarding the female teacher, they called on her to interact with her. But she said that since he is having some medical problem, she has gone to consult the doctor. It seemed that she was somewhat disturbed. Thereafter, when the Manager arrived, he said that he had gone to Zira to lay the foundation stone of a school and it took him three hours to reach back. But during the discussion, it came out and the Manager told that the teacher has benefitted as she has got a school near her hometown. Then she (Dr. Malik) told the Manager that since the lady teacher is a Ph.D. holder and if she has been adjusted in a school, how she has been benefitted. It got cross checked that there was something wrong as the lady teacher was saying that at that particular time she was consulting the doctor. On the one hand the Manager said that he was in Zira while on the other hand he said that how the lady teacher could pick up their phone at 11.30 a.m. as she had come to attend a meeting with him to feel sorry. If a person who is dependent on salary is not being paid the salary for about 7 months, how the person could survive. Since the teacher was about to be engaged, that relation has also broken as now that person is unemployed. The person is so ashamed that he could not face his family members and that is why he daily comes from home just to visit the College.

Dr. Gurmit Singh said that serious action should be taken.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he along with Dr. Shaminder Singh and Dr. Harjodh Singh had visited a B.Ed. College. He had pointed out in his report that such is not case with a particular College, but this problem is prevalent in many of the Colleges also as has been pointed out by Dr. Neeru Malik. He had recommended for the formation of a Committee in which the teachers from the Colleges be included. He recommended the name of Dr. Neeru Malik for that Committee and a few of the Principals and a thorough enquiry of the B.Ed. Colleges including other Colleges be got conducted. He suggested that two such Committees be formed and strict action should be taken and the Colleges be disaffiliated for at least 10 years so that the Colleges could know how to behave with the teachers.

Dr. Neeru Malik requested that those two teachers who have been removed by the College should be allowed to rejoin.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the male teacher who has been relieved by the College is a gold medalist in inter-University Bhangra competition and is a judge for international level competition. His work and conduct is very good.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the teacher had gone to Punjabi University, Patiala with him as a judge for the competition. He is a talented person but he has removed from the service.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that during the last year, 40 admissions were made in that College out of which 31 were made with the efforts made by that teacher. This year 42 admissions were made out of which the credit for 22 admissions goes to that teacher.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the students are asked by such Colleges to deposit their certificates with them. When the examinations are to be held the students are asked to deposit the fee and say that when their scholarship would be released by the Government, the same would be refunded to them. At the time of making admissions, such Colleges visit the houses of the prospective students and running the Colleges by marketing to taken in students as is done by commercial establishments. It is not an issue of a single College but of so many Colleges. He suggested that there is a need to conduct an enquiry by forming a Committee.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that even the Principal has recommended the name of the teacher for evaluation, superintendence and invigilation duty. In spite of having been assigned the duty by the University, they have not been relieved. In spite of these teachers being senior, junior staff was put on examination duty. Apart from that she had written her mobile number on the notice board so that if any student faced any problem, they could contact her. After about two days, she got a call from one of the students.

Shri Raghbir Dyal intervened to say that they should move on to Item C-1.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that whatever is being discussed is a part of Item C-1 as this issue pertains to the College teachers. He had also raised this issue many a times that the teachers are paid a very less salary and even out of that, some part is taken back. He had requested many times to fill up the post of Dean College Development Council as the person is handling the charge of two posts and is not able to do justice with the job and focus on the issue of the Colleges.

Shri Raghbir Dyal while agreeing with Dr. Neeru Malik said that they should take strict action against the College.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is a violation of rights of a person as some part of the salary is taken back. What it amounts to?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that a Committee should be formed to visit all the Colleges for periodical inspection.

Dr. Neeru Malik requested that strict action should be taken against this College and these two teachers should be allowed to join.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that all the Senators be assigned the duty to inspect the Colleges and further suggested that each Senator should visit at least one College.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he is ready to cooperate in this matter. He pointed out that no action is being taken against the Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that during the last more than a year he has observed that no action is being taken by the University against the Colleges and they have become a toothless body. In the Syndicate also he has been raising the issue of the College teachers. There are different types of problems in the Colleges such as non-payment of full salary, humiliation, discrimination, etc. Leave aside following up the rules and regulations, even the Colleges did not care to supply the information regarding the Principals asked for by the University. They have also asked for the information by 27th September 2017 regarding provident fund, gratuity, leave encashment, earned leave, etc. but from the data so far provided to the members revealed that 87 Colleges have provided the information regarding the issue of Principals but so far he did not know whether the information provided is correct or not which could be ascertained only after scrutiny. There are 106 such Colleges which have not provided the information so far. As regards the provident fund and gratuity, about 51 Colleges have provided the information. There are 149 such Colleges which have not provided the any information so far. One the one hand they are talking about bringing gigantic changes but on the other hand it has been observed that the Colleges are not even responding to the communications of the University. Then how could they expect such Colleges to follow the rules and regulations. So, they could very well guess as to what type of violations are being committed by the Colleges. As long as they do not take any strict action nothing seems to happen and the level of education would deteriorate. Teachers are the most vulnerable and soft target and whosoever wanted, could hit them. Before the notification of 4th amendment by the UGC, most of the teachers had got their research papers published as per requirement and he is thankful to the Vice-Chancellor that a letter in this regard has been issued by the University.

Shri Raghbir Dyal intervened to say that he is leaving for Muktsar and his dissent be recorded on Item C-1.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to when the meeting is going to be over as sometimes a time limit is imposed while not at another time.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he could provide the proofs regarding two of the Colleges. He fully agreed with what Dr. Neeru Malik had pointed out. He also agreed with whatever Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu was saying.

Senate Proceedings dated 21st January/17th February 2018

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the letter earlier issued by the University has been withdrawn due to which the teachers are suffering.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that whatever Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu is saying is that the Syndicate had taken a decision which was withdrawn even after an hour.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the decision of the Syndicate is not being respected by the University and the decisions of the University are not being respected by the Colleges. So, it is not understandable as to why no decision is being respected. He proposed that they should send their resentment about non-attending of meetings by the DPI (Colleges) and DHE to the Punjab Government and U.T. Administration. If these officers attend the meetings, half of the issues would get resolved. He suggested that the House should send a resolution to the Punjab Government and U.T. Administration requesting them to direct these officers to attend the meetings.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter related to Item C-1 be referred back to the Syndicate and whatever the Syndicate decides, it would come back as an information item to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur enquired as to why it would come as only for information. Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is only one time measure otherwise the item was for consideration.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if there is no unanimity in the Syndicate, then let it come for consideration to the Senate. However, if there is some unanimous decision, then it could come as an information item.

This was endorsed by some members.

The Vice-Chancellor then adjourned the meeting at this stage.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about the next date on which this adjourned meeting would be held.

At the end before the dispersal of the members, it was decided that the next meeting would be held on 17th February, 2018.

RESOLVED: That the proposal of certain Syndics with regard to change in rule for extension/re-employment of Principals of aided/unaided Colleges, be referred back to the Syndicate for re-consideration in the light of the discussion that took place in the Senate.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That in case there is a unanimous decision, the item be placed before the Senate for information. However, if there is no unanimity in the Syndicate on the issue, the matter be placed before the Senate for consideration.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on **Saturday, 17th February 2018** at **10.30 a.m.** in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Amit Joshi
3. Shri Ashok Goyal
4. Ms. Anu Chatrath
5. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
6. Dr. Ameer Sultana
7. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
8. Professor B.S. Ghuman
9. Dr. B.C. Josan
10. Professor Chaman Lal
11. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
12. Shri Deepak Kaushik
13. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
14. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
15. Dr. Gurmit Singh
16. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
17. Shri H.S. Dua
18. Dr. Harjodh Singh
19. Dr. Harsh Batra
20. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
21. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
22. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
23. Professor J.K. Goswamy
24. Dr. Jagdish Chander
25. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
26. Dr. K.K. Sharma
27. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
28. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
29. Dr. N.R. Sharma
30. Professor Navdeep Goyal
31. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
32. Shri Naresh Gaur
33. Dr. Parveen Goyal
34. Shri Prabhjit Singh
35. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
36. Professor Pam Rajput
37. Professor Rajat Sandhir
38. Professor Ronki Ram
39. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
40. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
41. Professor R.P. Bambah
42. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
43. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
44. Shri Rashpal Malhotra

45. Dr. S.K. Sharma
46. Dr. S. S. Sangha
47. Dr. Subhash Sharma
48. Shri Sandeep Singh
49. Dr. Surinder Kaur
50. Shri Satya Pal Jain
51. Professor Shelly Walia
52. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
53. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
54. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
55. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
56. Shri Varinder Singh
57. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

29. Dr. Ajay Ranga
30. Dr. Amod Gupta
31. Professor Anita Kaushal
32. Dr. Baljinder Singh
33. Shri Amanpreet Singh
34. Dr. Amar Singh
35. Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary, Education Minister, Punjab
36. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
37. Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu
38. Professor Deepak Pental
39. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
40. Dr. Dalip Kumar
41. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
42. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
43. Justice Harbans Lal
44. Shri Harjit Singh, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
45. Shri Jarnail Singh
46. Smt. Kirron Kher
47. Dr. Neeru Malik
48. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra
49. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
50. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
51. Shri Parimal Rai
52. Shri Parmod Kumar
53. Shri Punam Suri
54. Shri Raghbir Dyal
55. Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal
56. Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, D.H.E., Punjab
57. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
58. Shri Sanjay Tandon
59. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
60. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
61. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
62. Shri Sandeep Kumar
63. Shri V.K. Sibal

While welcoming the members, the Vice Chancellor said that this is the resumed meeting of the Senate as they could not complete the agenda in the last meeting. So, this is the continued meeting of the Senate where they commenced considering the items of interest to the Colleges and they had added one additional item during the last sitting. They could not proceed on the first few items in the last meeting and hoped that today they would be able to finish agenda. In the last meeting they had finished only Item No. C-.1 and now they would consider Item C-2.

I. The **Item C-2 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-2. To evaluate the list of Inspection Committees appointed to visit the various Colleges from 2013 onward till 2017 with regard to grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this Item relates to evaluation of list of Inspection Committees appointed to visit various colleges. They are well aware that one of the essential responsibilities of the Senate is to see that the colleges affiliated to the University provide high quality education. So, the high quality education desires that the University plays its regulatory role in terms of having periodic visits to the affiliated colleges to see that the colleges' infrastructures continues to remain adequate, appropriate faculty is there for the newer courses which the colleges keep asking. They are really serving the purpose for which the new courses are being added for the needs of the students who have to, after their graduation, compete in the open market with the graduates and postgraduates coming from the other universities. So, the University is expected to play its regulatory role all the time. There were some issues and apprehension about people who are appointed on the Inspection Committees and that some biases are creeping in with the result that the University's role as a regulatory authority is not getting attended to in a manner that it ought to. So, the data was asked which has been made available to all of them. This is just a piece of data. This data could be viewed vis-à-vis similar data over the last 20 to 25 years. If he puts it in this way that if it is an issue with the given Vice Chancellor, typically, the Panjab University's Vice Chancellors have served two terms, barring one exception. So, over a period of five years at a time, one could view this thing and see whether a newer pattern has evolved which is unsatisfactory over whatever. So, that is why that this item is there to evaluate the list of Inspection Committees appointed to visit various colleges from 2013 to 2017. So, this is a piece of data and if they have evaluated, they could share their observation or comment or suggest some lacunae and point out some suggestions which could be implemented during his remaining term or in his successor's term as an when it would commence. So, this item is open and all the data are with them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested to take up the issue relating to Selection Committees together with this item. He said that he is saying so because the data is very huge and the problem is the same. As the Vice Chancellor has himself said that some people have said there is some bias. So, whatever is bias in the Inspection Committee, same bias is there in the Selection Committees.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is his (Professor Keshav Malhotra) observation.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has not given any observation. It is he (Vice Chancellor) who has said that some people have said that there some bias. If some bias has come out, then they could discuss both the Inspection and Selection Committees.

The Vice Chancellor said that it his observation and there is no conclusion. This is his (Professor Keshav Malhotra) personal conclusion that there is a bias.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have come here to discuss and not to point out who is wrong. They have to improve the system so that the mistakes which have occurred now, whether these have occurred automatically or these have been committed intentionally may not occur.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is his (Professor Keshav Malhotra) observation that the mistakes have occurred or done. This is one man's observation. It is not the conclusion of the House.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if they take some corrective measures only then they could go ahead.

The Vice Chancellor asked him to suggest those corrective steps. He said that did he not say that if there is such a things, then suggest the corrective steps.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said either these are Inspection Committees or Selection Committees, but to his mind, the solution for both of them is the same. The corrective steps which he (Vice Chancellor) would take for the Inspection Committees, the same steps would be taken for the Selection Committees. There was no need to send such a huge data, everybody was aware of it, but this would authenticate the things. But even then they say, whatever has happened, let it be, but they should improve it and make the changes for future.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he has not gone through this item very deeply, but he can say cursory that these issues come up not only in this place, but in all institutions including Supreme Court of India where four judges have challenged the Chief Justice of India's roster. The Chief Justice of India took a little wise decision to publicize all the Justices as per their qualification and expertise and that they would be put in such and such roster. Likewise, what can be done in their case also is that there are 90 odd members in their Senate and the Inspection Committees go to so many colleges. There should be a kind of roster and that roster should be in personal objective, either it could be alphabetically or on the basis of expertise. There should be a formula for it. A Committee can be formed which might give suggestions for Inspection Committees as to what kind of roster among the Senate Members should be followed.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan wanted to know if there is any criteria written in the P.U. Calendar to depute the duties or it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor. If it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor, then no question arises.

Professor Chaman Lal said, question arises as the Chief Justice of India has also been asked that even if it was his prerogative, it did not mean that he could do subjectively.

Continuing, Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if there is any criteria written in the Calendar to depute a person, they must follow that. If it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor or the Dean College Development Council and if he deposes the persons, then they cannot challenge it.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they are not challenging the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. R.K. Sharma said that he has gone through the data from which it is clear that at one time, one might have been given more duties and on the other day someone else might have been given more duties. He has checked the data. Deputing on inspection duties depends from person to person.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is no criteria whether at one time someone was deputed more times and at another time someone else has been given more duties.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if there is any rule or regulation in the Calendar for deputing the persons on inspection duties, they should follow it, but if it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor, then the Vice Chancellor can depute anyone.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they are not saying that it is not a prerogative of the Vice Chancellor, but the duties should be given equally to all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, he thinks that Principal Mahajan is right as he is referring to the Calendar and he is sure that he must have gone through the provision in the Calendar where it is written that it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor. He would like to go through the provision where it is written that it is the prerogative of the Vice-Chancellor, if there is no such provision then how they are following the Calendar? It is, in fact, the Regulatory Body, the Governing Body may be the Syndicate and the Senate, in his opinion, who have got the authority to inspect the colleges. That is what he knows. Now if some power has been delegated to the Vice Chancellor to appoint Inspection Committees, the authority which has delegated such powers has every right to discuss it to bring every kind of improvement to ensure that there is transparency in inspection and selections committees in affiliated colleges and in all other affairs of the University as has been pointed out by some of his friends in the Senate in the earlier meetings.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the discussion on the issue has started in a very a very right mode. As Principal Mahajan has said that there is provision in the Calendar. So they have seen also that in many other respects conventions are also there. Professor Chaman Lal has said that there are conventions, not in their democracy, but in the older democracies. So, now this is the issue of Inspection and Selection Committees. It is one thing to say that something has gone wrong. The other thing is that the system needs certain more inputs so that it should be more transparent. While pointing out that it is their wrong at this stage or at other stage, because wrong vis-à-vis what. This should be there also. Wrong vis-à-vis what, because prerogative was not used properly. When it was not used properly. The question was not this. The question is that if there is such provision for the Inspection Committees and the Selection Committees, now they have to see, how this could be improved. It is one thing to put the system at the better place. The other thing that they are going to question somewhere, during this period, the data says that from 2013 to 2017, so, they have to find how the duties were given during this whole period. So, if there is procedural lapse in fixing the duties and there was some sort of digression from the given mode of functioning in the governance system, then probably, one can say that there was a lacuna. But if after so many years they found some lacuna in the system, it should be changed. It is a matter of discussion. So, there is no question of counterviews. So, let us see, how it is possible. Secondly, they also know that the appointments and Inspections are also important matters. They have to ensure that when the appointments are made, they see that the inspections and appointments are not similar things. When the appointments are made, the criteria is different, but when the Inspection Committees are made, thought the criteria is same, but they have to see

who is going to inspect the college. They should see that there should be proper representation and more transparency, there should be more roster clarification, there is nothing bad in that, but this is not the way to say at this stage that there was something wrong. This was not the view of the House.

Shri Tarlochan Singh said that they are having discussion and giving their views on the issue. Whatever Committees are constituted either by the Vice Chancellor or these are elected by them, but the responsibility rests with those people who go there. They are not ready to accept it, though the fault lies with them, but they blame others. They may adopt any system, but they cannot hold election of a Committee here in the House. The House could just give views and authorize the Vice Chancellor. This is happening in all Universities. So, who so ever person is appointed, they are the person who go there. So, the mistakes are on their part and the they held responsible someone else for that. Let us be fair themselves and to the system. So, whosoever is appointed, he should abide by certain principles. He could not understand as to what decision has to be taken. The decision is that they should improve themselves. The people who go there, they should have some fear of God that they have to do something good.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they should come up with some suggestive measures. They have discussed about the Committee. The Committees have already visited the colleges and given their view. So, now they should discuss the measures to be adopted.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he would like to talk on a point which a bit beyond the subject. The agenda for the day is to evaluate the list of Inspection Committees. Whatever he has seen in the agenda is to evaluate the Committees which have been made and to see what is wrong and what is right in these Committee. To his mind, it is a very important subject as more than 110 pages have to attach to make the agenda item. He wanted to know what do the Inspection Committee evaluate when they visit the colleges? What is their role? What is the scope of work they perform? He further said that they have been observing that the expenditure of the University is increasing and resources are less. They should also see as to how much is spent on the inspections and what measures could be taken to reduce this expenditure. He does not know as to how much amount is spent on the inspection committees, but if possible, they should think to reduce it. They should also see as to what work the Committee do as this is more important to evaluate the work, then the evaluation of the list. The people have moved this item and so to his mind, there must be valid reasons for that as well. They should see as to what the Committees do in the colleges and how much useful they are. They used to talk that there is 'Inspector Raj' in the Country. He expressed the apprehension, perhaps, had it not become an extension to it?

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that from the data it could be viewed how the duties has been assigned. One thing has come out from this data that whosoever had been the Dean at that time may be Professor Naval Kishore or anyone else, sent his favourites to many places whereas the others were denied such duties. He said that minor deviation is tolerable, but the whole system cannot be altered. He suggested that there is need to look into it and for the purpose a Committee could be constituted so that proper Committees could be constituted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about Inspection Committees, there are certain guidelines which issued by the UGC in 2010. If they look at the Inspection Committees which were being constituted earlier, at that time, generally, the

Chairman of the Inspection Committee was a Senate member. But if they look at the guidelines, the guidelines clearly say that the Chairman of the Inspection Committee will be a subject expert and who will be a Professor. Accordingly, the decision was taken by the University sometimes between 2010 and 2013. The Inspection Committees are proposed by the Dean College Development Council. They have taken care that this provision is adhered to and he believed that the inspection Committees are being constituted accordingly.

Shri H.S. Dua said that he would like to start from where Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji has finished his view point. The item which has come on the agenda, some of the Fellows have given in writing that all the Inspection and Selection Committees which were made in the last some years, be circulated to all the Senate members. From the discussion, he could understand that the discussion is focused only on the point that someone has been sent many times to a place and the other for less times. Perhaps, the way they have sent in writing, it has not been felt in that spirit. The document which has been provided to them, it shows that under what education policy in the last six years, how the colleges under the Panjab University have been run. It was not their motive to discuss the item in such a way. But, even if they see this data, there are many persons who have done more than seventy inspection and selection in the last four years. He said that it has been requested time and again that the Inspection Committee reports should be discussed in this House. He would like to inform that they are running BCA Course under the self-financing scheme. But from the last three years the Government has provided teachers against the aided posts. He asked whether the BCA Course would fall under the category of aided course or the unaided course. Further, when the teachers are made available by the government against aided posts, whether the fee being charged from the students would as per the aided course or unaided course. Now, suppose they send an Inspection Committee to a college. It is mentioned in the Calendar as to how the committee is to be formed and on what basis the affiliation is to be granted. When they read the report of the Inspection Committees, they come to know that they have brought the B.Com. course at the stage of closing it. He asked, do they have only one type of B.Com. in the country? He informed that there are several types of B.Com courses under different specialization. Why they cannot introduce such courses in their colleges. After doing B.Com. at student is unable to decide what he should do after completing his B.Com. They should start different specialized courses of B.Com. such as tax, income tax, cost etc. The Inspection Committees should see that if they have given B.Com. course with tax specialization in one college, they should give income tax in the other college and so on, so that a candidate could be able to decide where he would like make his career. This would also help him to take up some other work to earn some money to pay his fee and also to build up his career. He wanted to know that since 2013, the fee structure which is charged from them, has it been defined anywhere? The policy with which the colleges are run, is there any need to change it? It is a part of their inspections and he is just talking about that. If there is an education college and they open another education colleges near it, it would bring the colleges at the verge of closer.

The Vice Chancellor said that this did not pertain to evaluation of Inspection Committees and that this is not a zero hour. He (Shri H.S. Dua) has to stick to certain domain of the discussion. There are lot of things which are wrong with the college education, with the higher education, with the highest form of education in the country. So, he should stick to the item. They can spend months together and the seven items of this agenda would not be over.

Shri H.S. Dua said that rather he (Vice Chancellor) is taking them away from the agenda by saying so.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not doing so, but he (Shri H.S. Dua) is taking the matter far beyond the agenda. The Vice Chancellor requested him to stick to the agenda.

Shri H.S. Dua said he (Vice Chancellor) is feeling bad perhaps he is not saying what the Vice Chancellor is saying and he is only talking on the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not talking on the agenda and requested him to conclude.

Shri H.S. Dua asked the Vice Chancellor as to what he should talk. He has to talk about the colleges for which he has given in writing.

The Vice Chancellor requested him to conclude if he has nothing to add the agenda. Whatever, he (H.S. Dua) is talking, does not pertain to the agenda.

Shri H.S. Dua asked if it does not pertain to the agenda, then for what the Inspection Committees are sent to the Colleges. The Inspection Committee is sent to a college to decide as to which course are to be given to a college.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not the item under consideration and requested him to conclude. He said that he (Shri H.S. Dua) is not sticking to the agenda and just trying to digress the things and requested him to sit.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he would speak briefly on two points. One is the need for inspection. The Vice Chancellor has rightly emphasized that inspection of Colleges is the essential duty of the University to perform under the guidance of the Senate and other governing bodies. If it costs money, then money is well spent. He does not think that the reason for economizing on the expenditure in any way should inhibit the process of inspection which has to go on. Second question is regarding guidelines i.e. as to how the Inspection Committees are to be constituted. It is clear from the practice that has been followed and he is sure that it is in accordance with the provisions of the Calendar. The Vice Chancellor appoints the Inspection Committees, but his discretion is not unfettered. As stated by Professor Chaman Lal, the Chief Justice is also not an unfettered authority as the roster had been challenged. So, it is not unfettered as Professor Navdeep Goyal drew the attention to some UGC guidelines. He does not see any further refinement of those guidelines. The guidelines are very clear about as to what kind of persons should be its Chairpersons or its members. Within those guidelines, the Vice Chancellor has the discretion and unless there are some allegations which are not heard, he does not think that there is any need to make any change. Those who want to change this and refine those guidelines; they should come up with an idea. But so far he has not heard any idea for a change or further refinement of those guidelines. Why are they talking about it? There is no need to appoint a Committee because unless they give specific mandate to that committee and if the committee is appointed in a vacuum, it would come back and the same controversy would start again. He felt that there is no need to change. They have to make sure that these guidelines are adhered to. If there is need to refinement, he would like to hear those solutions which he did not hear so far.

The Vice Chancellor said that when he assumed the office of the Vice Chancellor, Professor Naval Kishore, a University Professor, was the Dean College Development Council and was also a member of the Senate and Syndicate. Typically, he used to receive suggestions from him and then he occasionally changed the name/s here and there. He got suggestions from the given D.C.D.C. and he personally treated the office of the D.C.D.C. as if he is performing the job on behalf of the Vice Chancellor and he rarely interfered to what the D.C.D.C. suggested. His (Prof. Naval Kishore) term ended, he was given extension for some time. Then they advertised the position of Dean College Development Council and that was not yet concluded. They appointed the Controller of Examinations, was asked to perform the duties of the D.C.D.C. as an additional charge. So, whatever the previous D.C.D.C. was doing, the present D.C.D.C. is also doing by sending him the list and he (Vice Chancellor) is following the same dictum. Occasionally, he makes some changes, but by and large, whatever input he gets, he used to endorse it. So, this is what the system is in place. This is not a system that he has devised. He believed that he followed whatever his predecessors were doing. He has not added or subtracted anything to it. This is what is in place at the moment. If this power was given to the Vice Chancellor at some stage, or delegated to the Vice Chancellor and it is the responsibility of the Governing Body because this University did not have 1904 Act which governs them, it did not have full time Vice Chancellor at that time. The pre-independent India had only one full time Vice Chancellor for a period of two terms, three years terms and that is from 1938 to 1944. So, it was the Governing Body which was performing this duty. In independent India, at some stage, it might have been delegated to the Vice Chancellor because a number of colleges were expanding and distributed everywhere. So, the office of the Dean College Development Council must had been created. He does not think the office of the D.C.D.C. was there. It was created much later. So, the things have been evolving and in that evolution process, they are here today that the office of the D.C.D.C. is there in all the Universities of the country.

Shri H.S. Dua asked whether the Inspection Committees have been constituted by him (Vice Chancellor) or by the Dean College Development Council.

Professor Keshav Malhotra wanted to know as to who appoints the Vice Chancellor's nominee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the names are suggested by the Dean College Development Council and he merely okayed it. He has not evolved these procedures.

Professor Keshav Malhotra informed that earlier it was practice that the name of the Vice Chancellor's nominee was kept blank and this power was with the Vice Chancellor.

Shri H.S. Dua said that if the Dean College Development Council is proposing the names and putting the same person in those Committees again and again, the Vice Chancellor should see to it. He said that if seventy Inspection Committees have been sent, one name is put in fifty Committees.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to substantiate it with an analysis of the data.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are 90 Senators and asked who appoints the Vice Chancellor's nominee.

Senate Proceedings dated 21st January/17th February 2018

Shri H.S. Dua asked that when they appoint Vice Chancellor's nominee, they should see what they are doing.

The Vice Chancellor said that data is with them and they should see to it.

Shri H.S. Dua said that this data should have been from the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever raw data was available with him, he has given that data and he is not analyzing that data. They are the Governing Body, the data is with them and they should analyze it and enlighten all the other members also.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if one did not like to own the onus, it is the best way to pass on the buck on the Governing Body.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri H.S. Dua wanted to say something, but the Vice Chancellor asked them to sit down as he has to conduct the discussion in some orderly manner.

Shri H.S. Dua requested to constitute a Committee to look into the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra wanted to know as to who appoints the Vice Chancellor's nominee.

Shri H.S. Dua said that as and when they like to talk about the present issues, he (Vice Chancellor) always says, allow him to conduct the meeting but he (Vice Chancellor) himself talks about the Act of 1904. They are not allowed to speak on the present college issues. They did not come here just to listen to him only. He should also listen to them who has got put the item in the agenda. At least they should be asked as to why this item was got included in the agenda and why they are asking for the data of two years. What was the need to ask for this data? While showing a document, he said that there are a total of sixty inspection committees, out of which the name of one person figures in forty committees. He asked, what for? Have you given them a master franchise?

Shri Naresh Gaur said that one person went in fifty Committees and the other in seventy seven Inspection Committees. Where are the other ninety Senate members?

A pandemonium prevailed as both Shri H.S. Dua and Shri Naresh Guar started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has to conduct the meeting in an orderly manner but if they do not conclude, then he will adjourn the meeting. When Shri H.S. Dua and Shri Naresh Guar did not stop, the Vice Chancellor adjourned the meeting and left the Senate Hall.

After some time, the Vice Chancellor joined the meeting and requested Professor Shelley Walia to speak.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the agenda item says that they have to evaluate the list of Inspection Committees. The list of Inspection Committees has direct repercussions on the quality of the inspection also. He has two points in his mind. When this item has come up i.e. the list of Inspection Committees to evaluate, there must have been some grievance among certain people who have not been appointed on

these Committees like many others. To his mind, the solution is that when this type of Committee is constituted, the Vice Chancellor should ensure that no person is repeated. He should ensure that if there is an Inspection Committee in the discipline of English, there are many senior Professors sitting there in the English Department, then not only two or three repeated umpteen times, but all should get chance to go. To his mind, the matter is very simple. They need to ensure that the people who go are serious in their inspection. They need to ensure that no lenient view is taken because he thinks that there is too much of leniency. The people who go for inspections they generally give a positive report. When they look at the reports, he found these very shoddy. Since, he had been on the Syndicate three-four times, he noted that the reports are not prepared in that meticulously to ensure that this particular college is not to be given recognition or is to be given recognition. They take very very lenient view on it. So, there should be no objectivity, no leniency and it should be ensured that the people who are sent are senior people and serious in their approach. It should not that one or two people, as has been pointed out, should be sent. He has prepared a data and he is shocked to know that there is this grievances. The agenda item is to evaluate the list. He is also talking about in terms of the evaluation and the role of the Inspection Committees which is also important. If they look at the list, let it be ensured by the Vice Chancellor and Dean College Development Council that the name of one person is not repeated. There are seven other persons in the Department of Chemistry who can be sent. He does not know why they cannot ensure this. He has pointed it out in 2011 when he was as member of the Syndicate. They cannot work this out if they do have the roster for every discipline. For instance, if they need to send an Inspection Committee to DAV College Chandigarh, they should have a roster showing that such and such person has already been sent and that he is not to be sent again. All people are some kind of academic worth. He thinks that the discussion is not really taking them to some kind of solution. The solution is to prepare a roster which should be strictly followed and the Vice Chancellor should ensure that they are following the roster.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that enough has been said. His point is basically about the constitution of the Committee and the quality of inspection. These are two main issues. As regards the constitution of the Committee, the Vice Chancellor gets a list of people, pick out names from that list or endorse that list, but somewhere the people are getting repeated which is their genuine grievance which people feel. One part is being left out and the second part is to ensure the fairness of the Committee. A system should exist where neither the college nor the University knows who is to be the Chairperson of the Committee in a way that he cannot be influenced and the quality has to be ensured. So, a roster of the willing Senate members could be prepared. He expected that out of 90 Senators, 50 might be willing to go for inspections. So, those fifty members plus any other names of eminent persons could be added to the lists. One of these people would Chair the Committee or Vice Chancellor's nominee whatever they call it. Now-a-days, they have enough information technology. If they feed a list of the fifty willing Senate members plus the other twenty person added to the list in the computer, the computer would throw up a name every time that this person would be the Chairperson of the next Committee which is going to conduct the inspection at a College. In this way neither the Vice Chancellor nor anybody will have objection to it. As regards the experts, as far as possible, it should be ensured that no expert is repeated. This would provide a chance to the new experts unless a particular person did a shoddy job last time without an application of mind and that Committee endorse certain recommendation. In that case the Vice Chancellor could record reasons in writing and do away with such experts. He can also repeat an expert, but he repeats that particular expert, he must record in writing why that person be repeated. Is he the only person available in the University of that particular subject who knows that. There

should be record in writing for all this. So, the roster, non-repetition till they come again in a computerized manner, he thinks is the best solution to ensure both the grievances of the people here as well as the quality of the inspection.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is glad that this issue has been taken up today because it is a very serious issue. It relates to the transparency and the quality of inspection that they had in the different colleges. In the beginning it was endorsed by Dr. R.K. Mahajan that it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor as per the Calendar. The Vice Chancellor being the Head of the Institution has the prerogative in most of the things that are done. But there is always theory and practice. In theory this prerogative would be there, but practically, many of the times, this authority is delegated because the Vice Chancellor practically cannot do everything. So, this authority is delegated to some other officials who actually do the job. So, practically speaking, they have to look at the practical aspect of this as to how the Committees are appointed and who are the people who play role in it. Is only the Dean College Development Council and the Vice Chancellor or even the colleges where the Committees have to go. Whether such colleges have a role to play? Can these colleges also dictate terms with the University authorities. They need to go to these questions also. Secondly, prerogative implies a question of discretion and discretion always has to be used discretely, it cannot be used rampantly and with great responsibility. She agreed with Professor Chaman Lal, Professor Shelley Walia and many other colleagues, even Shri Varinder Singh, when he said that justice has to be shown. It is not sufficient to give justice, it has be shown to be given also. The data shows that a few teachers and Senators have repeatedly been deputed on these Inspections Committees. She understands that the Vice Chancellor just endorses with some minor modifications but the moment some complaint comes to him, the moment somebody points a finger, it becomes his responsibility as Vice Chancellor now has to sit at the steering wheel and see that things are done properly. As long as the system goes, adequately, it is fine. Reacting to Professor Ronki Ram ji when he said that systems are made by them and systems are made for their convenience and fairness, she said that the systems are run by the individual and she is a person who believes that individuals make the difference. With the change of individual, the system changes. System are dead and it is they who fill life in the system. Therefore, it is not possible to take refuge in the system. Whenever they are answerable to something, they take refuge that it is the system which is pathetic. She said 'no' she is not prepared to take this argument. She has raised this issue two-three times in the Senate, in the current Senate as well as in the previous Senate also. She said that there should be a roster because there are senior teachers who say that they have been serving the University for the last 25-30 years, but they have never been sent for inspection and he (Vice Chancellor) said 'no' he will not do it and the system would run as it has been. This has been his response. She again re-iterated that this is such an issue which is very very crucial for the image of their University. These news go to the media and people look at them with suspicion. Therefore, she again reiterated that there has to be a roster which should be followed religiously and if they have lost that sense of objectivity, then the machines would be better than them. It should be left to the computers to dig out the names. The computers would be more objective than they are. She also talked about Shri Tarlochan Singh ji who has mentioned about self-introspection. She said that she is absolutely agree with him. It is their responsibility when they go to inspection, it is their moral responsibility to see to it that he is doing his job religiously, objectively and without any prejudice. There are two issues. What do the members do as part of the Committee and appointment of the Committees. As far as the appointment of the committees, this has to be dealt with at different levels. As far as the role of the Committee members is concerned as to what do they do. If they look at what the Committees have done, it

would vary from one Committee to the other. There has to be some standardization and if some particular committee says that this college needs to be disaffiliated, collect those reports, what has happened to those reports. All reports are changed, no college is disaffiliated. She said that she has given such reports long back. For the last four five years she has not been on any Committee. Prior to that she gave certain reports where she wrote that this specific college be disaffiliated, but it was never disaffiliated. What happened to those reports? Why she should go to the inspections then? Does he want some specific kind of reports? For that the system wants specific kinds of persons to go in that Inspection Committee. Therefore, Shri Pawan Bansal has also said as to what is the role of an Inspection Committee. They are yet to define the role of Inspection Committee. It is very important that in the appointment of the Inspection Committee and visit of the Inspection Committee, it is the college that rules the roost. Everything is open whereas the college should not know, who is coming, when they are coming. There are two categories of colleges, one, which are at prime locations i.e. colleges in Chandigarh, Ludhiana and so on. The other are the colleges which are located at remote places such as Ferozpur, Fazilka, Malout, where Professor Rajesh Gill, Shelley Walia and other can be sent because these are punishment postings. This should also be looked into. If they have to analyze the data, analyze it in the light of this. If there are punishment postings, there also exist punishment inspections and the people are picked up accordingly. One feels tired for a long time after visiting these places. Therefore, the Vice Chancellor has the veto power to decide on the reports of the Inspection Committees. She also has some instances wherein Special Committee gave one report and the Vice Chancellor negated it with his veto power. What is value of the Inspection Committee which has worked objectively. It gave that report which was not required by the system. Whose system is this? Is it her system or their system? Do not use the refuse, do not use the alibi of the system. They are the system and the system is dead. It is made of objects. They are human and they fill life in it and if it is ruined, they are responsible who have made it. Finally, a very important question that arises is, why after all the experience of being a part of Inspection Committee is so attractive that everybody wants to go.

The Vice Chancellor said that they will continue and let him respond to something. The Universities as they commenced by the British in India. The members intervened and Vice Chancellor asked as to why they were laughing and said they could laugh and anything could be laughed at.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that has the Vice Chancellor got prerogative to say anything. He said that the Vice Chancellor is in the habit of telling the history and nothing else and nothing is connected with the agenda. He further said that let the Vice Chancellor bear with the members of the Senate, they are also equally interested parties in welfare of the University as the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether the Vice-Chancellor could justify.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will not justify but they shall have to listen to him.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that first of all the Vice Chancellor would have to listen to the sentiments of the House, what they want to say for which they are waiting for the last ten years. He said that whatever has been written in the Inspection Reports by them, after that a Pocha (Clean up) Committee goes and says that everything is okay. He said that this is a corruption and who has got the power to send another committee.

The Vice Chancellor said they he was not permitting him to say. The Vice Chancellor added that the first task assigned to the Universities of India was to regulate colleges and the Universities as they see today, they did not exist for a very-very long time, the job of the governing bodies of the Universities was to regulate colleges, that is why this notion of Inspection Committees, notion of seeing whether a college which is making application to the University, that college and its management, has within their resources the ability to run a college. So this was the first job assigned to the governing bodies of the Universities. So Senate having this responsibility, the Senate giving this responsibility to a smaller body like Syndicate to evolve because education once, it was expanding and the applications for starting newer colleges and doing all these things were being continuously made. It was in that background that the governance, the government notion of Syndicate was evolved and the Syndicate had the responsibility to do this on behalf of the governing bodies of the University. So, this is how it all started. Now even today, the Inspection Committee goes, something comes back to the Registrar and it is placed before the Syndicate and it is the Syndicate which does this. He said that the Vice Chancellor's role is here, first of all, as they have been told via history, that a full time Vice Chancellor came into place very much late into the system. So this was the job being done by the governing body by its entire own wisdom. This evolution of things has today put the system in the sense that there is a Vice Chancellor, a full time Vice Chancellor, there is an office of DCDC and now who is performing this task, although algorithm is not written there, but the algorithms have evolved that the DCDCs could help the Vice Chancellor to construct these Inspection Committees. The Inspection Committee would go, what they will have to do is very well written in the Calendar and since they are all members of the Senate, they are expected to have read that Calendar and they can see themselves that it has been written in the Calendar that whatever the Inspection Committee is supposed to do, the Inspection Committee is supposed to do a lot many things whatever the honourbale members of the Senate said that Inspection Committees are supposed to do this or that and many of them do not do their job with that degree of sincerity, that degree of honesty that they ought to do. But the output of that eventually comes to the Syndicate. So, Syndicate should be a repository. The Syndicate of this University changes every twelve months. Syndicate was supposed to change twelve months in most Universities which were a part of Indian Universities Act 1904. He continued saying that the Syndicate was a repository of how this process is evolving and what things have been recorded in the Syndicate. When the people say that the Syndicates of this University have not done their job properly, and they say, for the last ten years and half of that his term as a Vice Chancellor and other half is of his predecessor also, so it must had been recorded in the proceedings of the Syndicate, he suggested that some of the members should look at the minutes of the Syndicate meetings uploaded on the University website, whether they can find this notion recorded that the Inspection Committees have not done their job properly or Vice Chancellor has at any time, overruled what the Inspection Committees have done and that the Vice Chancellor has done something to do a white-wash. The report came something else, the Vice Chancellor has done something as a person. If a given Syndicate did not act on the recommendation of the Syndicate in a certain manner, where is the role of the Vice Chancellor in this, it should be recorded in the minutes of the Syndicate meeting which are uploaded on the University website and they should contain all and the accusations which have been levelled by a few members and if they are correct, then they must get substantiated by the minutes of the Syndicate meetings. He said that somebody should need to go and look at these things before they accept that this is the sense of the House that the reports of the Inspection Committees have not done their job properly and the Syndicate has just closed its eyes on it and this is not just this Syndicate, how many people have acted as Syndicate members and if they do not have the data, that data is available because that data stands filed in the petition

which is there in the Court and the data over last fifteen or twenty years as to who was the member of the Syndicate for the last twenty years.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to in which connection the data was there in the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is in connection with the governance reforms. And all that whatever has been in the Court, the copies of that have been given to the members of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if the Court had asked for the governance reforms report.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no governance reforms report.

Shri Ashok Goyal made a query if the governance reform report has been filed in the COURT, the Senate should have the knowledge of it.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has already been told. He said that he as the Vice Chancellor had been asked by the court to respond to public interest litigation which has been put in the Court on its own. It has two things, one is the financial well-being of the University and the other is the governance reforms. The governance reforms for which NAAC had stated that there should be governance reforms and whatever letter he received from the Court that he had to comment on the issues relating to this thing. In response to this, he submitted the documents to the Court and the copies of that document have been distributed by email to everyone. If it is not given, he can give it to all.

The members voiced that it was not the point.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was sticking to the things. It is the Syndicate which receives all the reports and if certain things have not been done on behalf of the University, the responsibility for that rests with the Syndicate as a governing body. Now the Syndicate as a body is a dynamic thing as it changes every twelve months. So if somebody has not done the job, it has not got done on behalf of this evolving body. Now what are the issues that the Colleges are lacking, the colleges lack the way, India has evolved over last twenty five years, the colleges are in a great difficulty. He said that they want more and more enrolment in the colleges, for that the grant in aid Colleges cannot get any teachers and even the government colleges are not getting any teachers. All the newer courses for which they could entice students to enrol, for that lot of infrastructure has to be created. So when colleges apply for a course, infrastructure is not there in place but they let those courses started. That was what Professor Shelley Walia was hinting at. He said that the infrastructure does not exist, things do not exist and they continuously keep giving these courses to the Colleges so that they can have an enrolment. Now the problem is that the colleges do not pay the salaries, infrastructure is not in place, so what should be the verdict of the Inspection Committees. No courses should be given. So if no course is to be given to colleges not adhering to the UGC regulations, then the recommendation is that those colleges should be disaffiliated from the University and the situation today is so bleak that if they follow these things very-very rigorously, seventy five percent of the affiliated colleges, not only of this University, but almost in all Universities in India, would be closed down.

On the members voicing to come to the agenda item, the Vice Chancellor said that he is just coming to that point. He said that he had spent last two days in

attending the meetings of the representatives of the Chiefs of the State Higher Education Councils of all the States and Union Territories of India. For two days, they were there and he has no hesitation in telling them that the report from all across India is that the higher education sector, particularly the college sector of the Universities in India is in dire state. The college sectors are no longer viable in terms of strict adherence to the guidelines of the UGC that they should have that many features, they should pay this much of a salary and there is no support of the State to the colleges, the only State's support to the college in India, are through the instrument of RUSA. He said that RUSA has very little money to offer and the amount of money that the RUSA is offering to States is so tiny that all State's support to college sector of India has almost disappeared. The colleges are supposed to be nearly self sustaining systems and in the nearly self sustaining system and adherence to the UGC guidelines means that most of the colleges of India are not financially viable at all. He said that they all could talk 'idealism' that they should close down this, they should close down that, if those strict guidelines are applied, even to the Universities of India, half of the University departments would also be closed down. So the higher education of India, whether it is ordinary colleges, whether it is education colleges, whether it is professional colleges, or the centres of advance studies that have special assistance programmes and so on, none of them today are able to function as far as the strict adherence to the UGC guidelines is concerned. The higher education in the country is in really pathetic state. So they can discuss it, it is not an issue of a person or another person. The system is in deep crisis.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that there are two issues which have been raised and he (Vice Chancellor) has kindly responded to that. This piece of information would have gone deeper into the psyche of all of them. He said that one of their colleagues has said that a certain person has been repeated seventy times. He said that the answer to that would be that he (Vice Chancellor) would look into it as to why such a person has been repeated a number of times. The second is the criterion. He said that he thinks that even the authority given to the particular head of the organization does have some criteria. If the Vice Chancellor has some criterion, he would like to request him to take into confidence the members to look that these are the criterions which are followed by him and that is how he appointed the person. But one point which should have been dealt with grace is that why a person should be repeated seventy times. He said that actually what the Vice Chancellor had said is very important. He meant to say that even any institution howsoever smaller it may be, what has been said may be a reality. He said that what has been suggested by the colleagues about the criteria as to why a person is sent for seventy times should be looked into. The third point is about the Veto. If the Vice Chancellor finds that something he has to do in the interest of the institution, he could use a Veto but it should be done in such a way that it does not create another similar situation for the Vice Chancellor need to answer. He requested his friends that they should keep in mind the dignity of the Vice Chancellor. He requested them to address the Chair while speaking as they all are the teachers. He pointed out the ways of addressing the Chair and only after exhausting one way, they should move to the next item.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that first of all he offers apologies. He said that whatever the Vice Chancellor has said that he (Vice Chancellor) is not directly involved in the system. The information is sent to him by the DCDC or by other departments, he is the live witness to that the involvement of the Vice Chancellor is very much there. He should not mind it, he is telling it in the House. He said that he is placing the things with facts and he would not like to name that College. He said that when he became the member of Senate in 2012 and in the meeting of April 2013, he had raised the issue in that meeting that as to what was the criterion to send the people for the Selection

Committees and the Inspection Committees. Immediately after one week, he was sent in one of the college as member of the Selection Committee and after that he was sent in two colleges for inspection. He said that as per the inspection, the college system was not as per parameters. The teachers were not appointed as per the norms and he had not approved of it. He said that when he went to the second college along with Professor Lilu Ram and Dr. Gurpreet Kaur, and he himself was the Chairman of the Inspection Committee of that college. He said that when he returned after conducting inspection, there came an anonymous complaint in the University and that anonymous complaint was also marked to him. He said that he requested that Vice Chancellor that the same committee be restored to look into the matter because he did not want to go to that college alone, and the Vice-Chancellor kind heartedly restored the same committee. When the Inspection Committee was restored and he contacted the concerned college to provide some documents, but on one pretext or the other, nothing was provided to him. He said that he has the record and he has preserved it as might be of use at any time. He said that he is saying with full responsibility that he had sent at least ten emails to the Vice Chancellor, the then Registrar and the then DCDC to ask as to what is to be done or should be done in the case of that college. He further said that he wanted to tell what the complaint of that college was. The teachers working in that college, one colleague had complained that eight Professors were not actually working there and they were not on the rolls of the college. He said that he requested the Vice Chancellor when he was in Ludhiana that what was happening was totally wrong to which the Vice-Chancellor had said that he had no role in this. He further said that again he requested the Vice Chancellor that they should do something as there was a huge fraud in it. He said that ultimately, whatever has been said by many colleagues before him, that there goes an Inspection Committee followed by Pocha (Clean up) Committee. He said that he wanted to tell all the seniors who were heading towards ending the issue of Inspection Committees. He said that another Senator was sent and the Committee was revoked and the issue was bundled. He questioned as to what message this episode conveyed. He said that message came to fore that who had given the complaint, they issued a letter to him and in response to that letter the reply came that there is no such person and it be filed. He said that he told to the Vice Chancellor that he is the live evidence to that thing that there was a bank account of eight persons in State Bank of Patiala and the accounts which have been shown in the list, does not exist in the Bank. He said that ultimately that Inspection Committee report was filed and college was given affiliation. He said that Vice Chancellor should tell to the House that he had not told to him about the matter. The persons who are favourite to the Vice Chancellor, they are time and again sent. Now it is 2018, after 2013 he has not been sent to any Inspection Committee till 2018 because he did not suit to the Vice Chancellor. He said that Shri Sandeep was saying that he was churning the water, he has not been sent to any College and he is not an object of neglect, he had won the elections and he happened to be the Director of the State Bank of Patiala for three years. He said that he wanted to tell the House that whatever has been spoken by him was right. If he were telling a lie, the House can punish him and if he is saying right, the House should take note of it. He wanted his queries to be answered.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not respond.

On this, a din prevailed.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that he does have deep respect for the Chair and he has always stood by the Vice Chancellor. He further said that in case there is any truth in what Shri Gaur is saying, it should be corrected. The Vice Chancellor has done a lot for this University. He said that it pains him when such type of grievances come to fore and if this colleague (Shri Naresh Gaur) loses his cool, obviously he must be hurt. The

Vice-Chancellor is like a father of the University, it is his duty to nurture the grievances, this is his request to the Vice Chancellor. His request to the members is that whatever they have to say, it should be said in a proper decorum. If the Vice Chancellor does not want to reply, then they would see that something was done because he is with the principle of governance which is good for all. It may be the Vice Chancellor or it may be anybody else, he can assure them that they should see that the right thing will prevail at the right time. He requested the Vice Chancellor that if he wants to tell Shri Gaur privately, he can do so and if he is wrong, tell him that he is wrong and this is how things go from bad to worse, year after year.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if he is proved wrong, he would resign from the Senate.

Shri Rashpal Malhorta said that if the Vice Chancellor does not want to give reply at this time, he requested him to take note of what Shri Gaur was saying.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the Inspection Committee reports are the repositories of the Syndicate. Now it is 2018 after 2013, he (Shri Gaur) has been the member of the Syndicate and if the Syndicate have not taken a call on the report that he has filed, in what way the Vice Chancellor is responsible for that.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor would have to tell to the House that what Shri Gaur claims, whether those emails of Shri Gaur were ever placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would have to give him an Item for consideration of the Syndicate. He receives so many emails and he cannot place all the email before the Syndicate. No Vice Chancellor can make place all the emails which are received.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it was not an ordinary email.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was connected with the Inspection Report.

The Vice Chancellor again said that the Inspection Report is the repository of the Syndicate. He further said that he would have to look into the file, he could not ad hoc answer to accusation which is made just like that.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that then the Vice-Chancellor should deny that he did not know and what Shri Gaur is saying is not true.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not remember everything that the members tell him.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Vice-Chancellor knows about the history of 1857 but did not remember a thing of the year 2013.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the point is that what is the agenda item. The agenda item is the Inspection Committee Reports and not individual cases.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it was not the question of individual case. It is connected with the education of the Children and their employment as well. The Vice Chancellor is the custodian of this University, he cannot say that he does not deal with such matters.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is custodian and presiding over the University for only a small transient time.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he has told the Vice-Chancellor about an incident of his duration only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so many things are told to him.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Vice-Chancellor did not take into account such an important issue.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur said that this has happened during Vice Chancellor's tenure, the fake teachers have been there in the colleges and the Vice Chancellor's averment that this was not an important one.

The Vice Chancellor said that fake teachers are not only in one college, the fake teachers are in numerous colleges of the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that then action should be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not take the action, but the Senate could take the action.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Gaur said that it means that the Vice Chancellor did know that there are fake teachers in the colleges and even then affiliation is being granted.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not giving the affiliation, it is the Syndicate which is giving the affiliation.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that why Shri Naresh Gaur was not sent for inspection.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it is because he did not suit the Vice-Chancellor. He said that he is the elected representative.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Vice-Chancellor) is not an elected representative and let the elected representatives run this University.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra requested Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur to calm down.

Professor Ronki Ram said that while the letter has been written to the Vice Chancellor, why the same has not been given to the Syndicate by Shri Naresh Gaur. The Syndicate should have been made aware of it. He further said that if people from the University commit some mistakes while being in the Inspection Committees, they should be punished. He said that whatever wrong has been done by the colleges, the colleges should be made liable for that and no Inspection Committee has been punished. It could not be a case that the Inspection Committee could do whatever these wanted and become Inspectors.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that the question of some members is that a person visits a College 70 times, let the Vice-Chancellor look into it.

The Vice Chancellor said that since he also happened to be a teacher in Panjab University for a period of three years, it should be understood by the colleagues that

there are no guidelines of any kind that only the Senators would go in the Inspection Committees. Here the matter has been raised that the University Professors too should go. Currently, there are ninety Senators in Panjab University and every person is a member of four Faculties, which multiplied by four comes to three sixty. The person is only one. It means 90 are Senators and 240 or 250 are Professors.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they know very well whatever the Vice Chancellor said but they wanted the reply to the issue raised. He said that the Vice Chancellor should reply whatever Shri Naresh Gaur has said was correct or not.

Professor Ronki Ram said that till now all the cases including the case of Shri Gaur, the colleges from where the complaints have poured in. A larger Committee should be constituted to enquire into the complaints of misbehaviour received from the Colleges about Inspection Committees for the last ten years.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that this is not the issue as raised by Professor Ronki Ram. Firstly, the issue raised by him should be addressed and rest of all could be taken up later on.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be understood that the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate are repository of whatever had happened on behalf of the Inspection Committees because minutes of the Syndicate meeting, agenda papers of the Syndicate meeting, where paper are annexed with the Inspection Committee reports, some of the times the matters are not for consideration, reports with information are for ratification item, whatever it is, somebody needs to look at how the Syndicates of this University have performed over last 10 years. It should be repository in that all those papers, look at it where the Syndicate has overlooked the weaknesses pointed out by the Inspection Committees, all that is repository there. He said that just by picking one case, he cannot answer without having the data because without the files having with him, he said that he cannot do the things in the way that unless one answered a particular thing, they would not do so. If this is the view of the Senate that unless he answered to Mr. Naresh Gaur, they would not conduct any business. They would not carry on anything. He is just presiding over the meeting. He said that 90 Senators are there and it has now been told that 250 Professors be added to it. The total becomes 340, and now if the roster is to be prepared, then for how many the roster will be. This is not to be decided by him but the decision is to be taken by the governing body that they should bring this as an Item for consideration and give him an item for consideration, the Syndicate is meeting on 24th and he would put it in the supplementary agenda in the meeting of Syndicate of 24. He said that give him an item and let the Syndicate appoint a sub-committee to deal with the matter in future. They have to have procedures and process in place.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether the Vice-Chancellor had had received a phone and an e-mail.

The Vice Chancellor said that they cannot force him to answer and if the Senators are thinking that he is not giving the answer and abdicating his responsibility, let the Senate can take a call on its own and let this item be presided over by Professor Bambah. He further said that this was not the way to run the University.

Some of the members requested the Vice-Chancellor not to leave the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not answer to that question.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if a member of the Senate speaks in such a tone, he feels hurt. The Vice Chancellor has made serious allegations against the functioning of the Syndicate that why the Syndicate did not take any call on such an Inspection Report. Obviously he would ask whether the Vice Chancellor was sure that the Inspection Committee report which Mr. Naresh Gaur has been referring to, was he sure that it was ever placed before Syndicate. He said that why the Vice Chancellor was pointing finger on the functioning of the Syndicate.

Dr. R.K Mahajan said that so far as his knowledge is concerned, the Inspection Committee Reports are again reviewed by some Committee of three or four members of the University which is decided by the Syndicate. Only then the permission is given to the colleges. They can ask the DCDC that a committee is formulated which decides these things and not the Vice Chancellor. Now the Syndicate appoints a Committee of three four members for affiliation every year, that Committee decides everything, not the Syndicate and not the Vice Chancellor. He said that one more suggestion is here from his side. Really, this is an Inspector Raj, this existed very much, he said that he is saying so because he himself has faced it being the Principal of a College. The Inspector Raj is there because when these Inspection people visit the colleges, they consider themselves as superior ones.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur while pointing to the statement of Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that there is no link of what he is saying. It appears that he is blaming the House.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the objection of Dr. Mahajan is that he has two Punjabi teachers and even then MA course is going on.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not allowing this and Dr. Sandhu being the Principal of a constituent college of the Panjab University should not behave like this.

A din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is no conclusion.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that he wanted to suggest the conclusion. Recently the Guru Nanak Dev University has adopted a very good method that for affiliations, they have uploaded on the website that the Management and the Principal of the College after complying with the prescribed conditions, only after that shall apply for the affiliation. He further said that in their colleges, when the Committees go and the conditions are found not fulfilled, how then the affiliations are granted. He said that in the first instance, all the formalities should be got completed, only 1-2 members could go for inspection for grant of affiliation.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu he and Professor Dhillon happened to go to the college of Principal Mahajan and put a condition to appoint teachers, but they he has not appointed the teacher of History nor of Punjabi but he is blaming the others.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that his record file could be checked. He had advertised the post but no one eligible could be found.

When Dr. R.K. Mahajan, Principal I.S. Sandhu and a few other members continued to speak together, the Vice Chancellor requested them to sit down else he would give the platform to Professor Bambah who has been a Vice Chancellor, has been here and has seen this University from 1947 onward.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they want to address the questions to the Vice Chancellor as he is handling the University and he has to respond.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Sandhu to refrain from using such language being the Principal of a Constituent College of this University.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Principal Mahajan is blaming the House. He further stated that he is saying humbly that their colleagues are blaming the House and also that the Committee members who go to the Colleges start considering themselves to be superior ones. He and Dr. Dhillon, the Ex-Chairman of the Board, went to the College and Principal Mahajan urged them not to put any condition of the teachers' appointment. But the college has not till now fulfilled the condition imposed by them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not permit these things. They are a 90-member House and the members say something with which large number of members disagree, but that does not mean that all those people would say, point of order, he wanted to say something or contradict. This was not the way the democratic functioning happens even in the Parliament. Members say all kind of things but other people listen and wait for their turn if they are to answer and if it is necessary to answer. This is not the way things function.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he has to make a request that the institutions work if there is no disorder in them. The Vice Chancellors are appointed and it is their responsibility to guide the University in the right direction with the help of the society, the Senate. The Senate has the authority which is to some extent delegated, if delegation is not done, the functioning could not be ensured. The authority of selection of the Inspection Committees is given to the Vice Chancellor to maintain confidentiality and nobody knows who is the member of the Selection Committee until it meets. If the confidentiality is out, it is not considered good. In the like manner, the Inspection Committees are formed, its confidentiality is also there. He said that on one side there happens to be a Inspector Raj and on the other, there remains facilitation. The responsibility of the University is not only to club but also facilitate it to help colleges develop. He said that as they now know that the colleges have problems, infrastructure is not there, funds are not there, not available. In that situation, one could say to close the Colleges and one could say that they help them to evolve with the help of the people who have the means. If it is seen from the other angle, the UGC has stopped all the appointments. There might be so many departments, which might be shut down as to be violative of the UGC regulations because the appointments are not taking place, the fractured postings are there, if seen from the UGC regulations, those all might have been closed. He further said that when the University was started, the Department of Mathematics was provided with two people. If they would have followed the UGC guidelines, they could not have started it. Some other departments were also set up in this way. If there happens to be mutual confidence, it is like advancement with the collaborative help. And if one says that they are the Inspectors and they can say anything to stop this or that. When the NAC accreditation are done, at that time they have to work together as teachers, as members of Senate, as members of University to get over them. He cited an example that suppose Government is not giving aid to the college, in that situation, what they should do. They would either take the help of the University or ask to close the College. Sometimes, it might be that the extreme violations or wrong things are there and there comes the situation to close down. He said that for every session, there happens to be a report, the report of Enquiry Committee and if there is further any enquiry, that report comes to the Vice Chancellor. To accept it or not to accept it, and take the right decision after accepting it, they could

do it. In the same way, there are Inspection Committee reports and it is not necessary that whatever it has asked for, would be complied. He said that taking the objective of the whole picture, by closure of the College, one more litigation would have to be faced because the college is not at fault. The Inspection Committee might have acted arbitrarily. The Syndicate and Senate perform their responsibility. The Vice Chancellor and the Senate are supposed to work together. It is not such that the Vice Chancellor should be made to stand as an accused. The Vice Chancellor is one of them. He is here for their help, for University progress. It should not be like asking him to do this or that. Leaving aside all these things, the need is to get united and let them all work together. He urged the members not to be furious by doing so the position becomes awkward. He further said that it is his request to all the members that some of the members should not speak in a shouting way but in a calm way. They all have to work together and not separately.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that first of all he would like to say something about Inspection Committees, the matter which is being discussed here, it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor who are the members to be appointed in the Inspection Committees for the colleges. The more important things here is that it is to be seen that the Committee has been doing right thing or not. To have check and balance over it, is equally necessary because on the selection issue, the Vice Chancellor keeps a different opinion, and all of them are the part of that system. There are about fifty percent elected representatives from different areas and they think that because they are elected representatives, and that is why they talk in a different way. He said that this should not be alike. If someone has been pin pointing, there should be the discussion to check it. He further said that it is his opinion that either one is going for 70 times or for 170 times, it is his duty to see who was giving him the better information and presenting a good report. If anyone is interested to go in Selection or Inspection voluntarily, a batch of such volunteers should be prepared and they should be given chance. For people residing in Chandigarh, it is very difficult to spare time to go for such committees. Nevertheless if one wishes to go, he must be sent. He further said that if any Inspection Committee pin points anything about any college, there needs to be a committee reconstituted and for that there should be a different system that the report should come to Senate, or Syndicate, and in which way it is to be reviewed. It should not be such that one colleague has been saying 'yes' to something and another has been saying 'no'. He said that all the Colleges do not fulfil all the conditions, there is no second opinion on it. The establishment of the Colleges is so necessary for the society and people of that region. He suggested that the Inspection Committee members should keep in mind that the teachers are not well paid and by this way, they are exploiting their own colleagues. He said that a strict check and balance should be made to be in place. If the teachers who are working there and are not being paid as per UGC norms, and violation is there, there is a need to have focus on these things. After that whether the students are being imparted properly or not, it needs to be taken into consideration. Just to say that he has not been given chance while the other one has been given, it is totally a wrong thinking. If one has been appointed as Vice Chancellor, it is his prerogative as to whom he is putting in the Committees, and if the selectee does the wrong, then only it should be pointed out. If a person who has been appointed for 70 times and if has done anything wrong even once, then the person could be punished.

Shri Varinder Singh said that what is being discussed here is that what is the desire of the Vice Chancellor and not the prerogative. It needs to be looked into which persons have been sent to which locations. He said that as has been stated by Dr. Randhawa that it is immaterial if one is appointed for 70 times, it is totally wrong because there are so many people in the University and each should be given chance

turn-wise. He said that it reflects the thought of the Vice Chancellor that the like minded people are sent to the Committees. He said that if it is true as has been stated by the Vice Chancellor that the list comes from the DCDC and even if the names comes from the DCDC, then the DCDC should see that all should be given a chance. He further said that another thing is that he has already told this in the Syndicate and the Senate that there are so many people who do not claim TA/DA. He said that he has been attending so many meeting and never claimed TA/DA. He urged the members should not claim TA/DA so that there is no burden on the University. He further stated that the interested person who want to go, without claiming any TA/DA and without any University expenditure, they should atleast be asked. Rather they should be given preference whenever any selection or inspection has to be there, they should be allowed to work. He suggested that first of all, a list of those who do not claim TA/DA should be prepared and they should be given priority over others. It will reduce the burden on the University on one hand, and on the other the allegation on the Vice Chancellor that this or that are sent time and again, that will be diminished. He said that the Vice Chancellor and his officers do not act and do not take help of others and the Vice Chancellor thinks that whatever he is doing, it is right. He said that the Vice Chancellor has taught its officer that the Senators are wrong, they are dacoit, they are vulture, whatever has been said by the Vice Chancellor and it is because of the image created, the whole of the atmosphere generated, the teachers of the University as well as the Senators feel the same. He said that they feel themselves as guilty because of him and it is so because the Vice Chancellor at every forum, whether it is in the meetings, or in informal sittings, has been using these words about the Senators that these people are dacoits, they are dirty people, they do politics and it is to make them separate from others, otherwise there is no problem for them if the things are done collectively and even if only one persons conducts all the enquiries. He said that the question here arises as to what is the wish or thought of the administration and the Vice Chancellor. He asked the Vice Chancellor if he has ever checked as to which person has been going where. Has he not checked what comes before him from the other offices? He said that the lists are prepared very much with his consent as to who would go in Inspection and who would go in Selection. Some selective people perform this task. He said that he had earlier told this in the Syndicate also.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that first of all he has to make a request that they are not only the ninety people but there are so many people in the background who have sent them here after electing them. So far as the expression of the views is concerned, all are seniors to them and here the fight is only that of opinions. He said that there is a proverb that a blind distributes the sweets to his dear ones time and again. The other thing that applies here that one should firstly trace his/her own faults. He said that all the Senator either the old ones or the new comers, the fight among them is of the nature that they go on inspections and go time and again. Here the matter of not of going, but the issue is that what do there. He said that recently an issue was raised in the Senate of the college and on that matter, today Dr. Neeru Malik has not come, what happened in a College that two persons were expelled and one of them was reappointed and an application was got written and one month salary was not paid. He said that alright, because she was a girl and got one month's salary deducted and also she apologised but the college was not ready to take back the other boy. Because the victim said that he is not at fault and did not get ready to offer apology, and he was not given reappointment. He further said that Prof. Bambah has rightly pointed out that they should have a positive approach. Many a things cannot be completed by the colleges and it is because of the pity conditions of the governments. He said that all here know that after 1996, no Lecturers have been recruited in the Colleges but this does not mean that all those could be got closed down. The point is that as to in which way they

can improve the system. He said that he has to make a request to the Vice Chancellor that he should not leave the meeting because the things would continue to happen in the manner, as it is, because on his resuming the Chair after five minutes, the atmosphere regains again. He further said that if the members express their views, the Vice Chancellor should respond as that by this time, he has no answer, this would be responded in the next meeting. He said that he would like to appeal to his fellow colleagues that one should not be forced at the gunpoint, that this or that should be done immediately. He stated that whatever has been stated by the Vice-Chancellor, these might be right and one feels hurt when the voice comes from the inner. He said that the decorum of the House should be maintained. They have joined the House after contesting the election and with the motive that something new would be done but here nothings seems to be changeable. The burning issues have never been discussed and he said that he wanted to request that in the semester system, the students should be given golden chance, because just only for want of one paper, the students are not getting their degrees completed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this item relates to Inspection Committees and it consists of two parts. One part relates to the constitution of Inspection Committee and the other part relates to their report. The data which has been provided reveals that if not hundred percent, but ninety-nine percent persons who went for inspections were the educationists. In this House more than fifty percent persons are non-teachers and they have been serving on very good posts, such Ambassador I.S. Chadha ji, Shri Tarlochan Singh ji, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi ji and many more who could contribute more. As regards the Chancellor's nominee, all the Senate members are equal whether they are teachers or non-teachers or the retired teachers because after retirement the retired teachers are also non-teachers. As per the Calendar, they cannot contest election from the teaching faculty. They are sending such teachers, but on the other they do not send some members for inspection. As the issue of repetition of members, no doubt, it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor, but if a D.H.E. (U.T.) or D.P.I. (Punjab) could control the teachers, the Vice Chancellor's nominee who is not a teacher could do well. He is also aware as to how much land and how many teachers are required by a college. I feel disappointed to listen when the Vice Chancellor says that there are fake teachers in the colleges. He requested to tell them if there is such a college. If the Vice Chancellor cannot close that college, they will do it. If they have to compromise, they should compromise at least on some parameter. They can compromise with the teachers' salary or not making the teachers available, but as far as the issue of fake appointments is concerned, it is the question of reputation of the University, at least he could not agree on it. Secondly, where the new courses which have been given, it is the duty of the Inspection Committee to tell as to what is there in the colleges and what is required. But in most of the Inspection Committee reports, it is written that the affiliation be granted subject to such and such conditions. But this is not the duty of the Inspection Committee. It is to be decided by the Syndicate or the Senate. The Inspection Committee has to only tell whether the college has adequate staff or the other infrastructure required. The Vice Chancellor can see all the reports. It is not for the Inspection Committee to grant affiliation of a course. He said that they do not send the Dean College Development Council for any inspection which is a very old precedent. The reason for this is that he has to deal with the report. Similarly, no members of the Syndicate should be sent for inspections because they have also to deal with it. They have to see whether the report of the Committee for grant of affiliation of a course is right or wrong. He is saying so because he is a member of the Syndicate and they have to deal with that report. If someone who gives the report takes a decision on it, it is not fair. He said he would not like say much, he is not a Professor nor he would become a Professor and no politics is involved in it, but when the question of reputation

of the University comes, it pinches them. People ask them about it and they are answerable to so many people.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he would like to say that they should also see what was being done in the past as the allegations regarding preference being given to certain persons on the inspections were being levelled during the earlier term of the Senate. It is true that it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor, but if this concern has arisen, it is also legitimate and the earlier concern was also legitimate. The preference given to certain earlier or now, both are wrong. They should devise such a mechanism that the people should feel that it is fair play and nothing should seem to be wrong. The conditions imposed by the Inspection Committees, most of the colleges did not fulfil those conditions. He has raised this issue in the earlier meetings of the Senate. He further said that there is column of retiral benefits where Rs. 1940/- would be deducted and for that a separate account would be opened, but nothing has been done in that regard. The issue regarding provident fund was raised in the earlier meetings and the University authorities has said that inspections would be done and this would be checked, but the colleges are flouting the rules of the University. The provident fund of anyone is not deducted properly. He belongs to an SGPC College and in all the SGPC managed colleges, the University norms are being flouted. They hold a meeting with their Director to discuss the issue of provident fund. The provident fund in the University is deducted at the rate of 10%, but in his college the provident funds was being deducted at the rate of 12%. It is written in the Calendar that if the percentage of deduction is more, it could not be reduced. In his college the provident fund is deducted at the rate of 10% on basic salary. The Director said that since the D.P.I. office gives on deducts on 10% provident fund, so they cannot deduct more than 10%. Though theirs is a separate case and they fighting for it, but in SGPC colleges and in maximum of unaided and aided colleges, the provident fund is deducted at the rate of 10% of the basic. He had also talked about as to why they are giving new courses to those colleges who do not fulfil their conditions. He mentioned about the SDP College, Ludhiana where the casual leave is not given in spite of it being a prerogative of the teachers. Duty leave is also not given to them. A teacher is forced to take earned leave. He said that they do not check these things. They forced the Principal who then resigned, but university granted B.A B.Ed. course in that college. Everybody knows that the B.A. B.Ed. course is a profit making course. He further said for instance, that if a College is given the computer course, the Inspection Committee puts the conditions for having 6-7 teachers, but in some other influential college the condition of only 1-2 teachers is imposed. Why it is so? They should evolve such a mechanism where it is clearly specified that if a course is to be started, there would be such and such conditions. Why it is not being done. They have completely failed in this endeavour. They may call themselves a Governing Body, but the people laugh at them when they tell them that they are the Governing Body. They have approved a salary of Rs. 21600/- to a teacher, but they could get it checked, in maximum of unaided colleges, teachers are not given full salary. People voted them with the faith that they will do something for them. But type of Governing Body they are, if they are not able to do anything for the teachers. The issue of change of leave was also raised. The leave is changed at mid-day and the message in the colleges is received at 3.00 p.m. Till that time all the students leave the college, how they could be informed. These are very legitimate concerns which need to be taken care of. The issue of provident fund is very serious and it should also be kept in mind.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the proforma for inspection committees need major changes, because whatever Shri Jagdeep Kumar pointed out or as some other people have been saying that the requirements should first be completed. The

inspection should be conducted only if the college has completed all the requirements regarding infrastructure and appointment of faculty etc. There should be only one column where it should be clearly stated whether the affiliation is to be given or not to be given. Therefore, they need to work lot on this. There are more issues when they talk about the proforma as such. It is written in the Calendar as to what is to be checked. The Senate members who deal here with all these problems, they might have some knowledge as to what is to be checked. As per the UGC guidelines a condition has been imposed which have been adopted after 2013 that the subject expert who is not below the rank of Professor will only be the Chairman of the Committee. Though a subject expert could be anyone, but it is implied that only that person could be appointed as such who is expert of that subject, but he should not be below the rank of Professor will be the Vice Chancellor's nominee. This is what the UGC guidelines say. He further said that a copy of the Calendar provision would not go to every Committee, so the problems remains there. If they see further to it, when they receive reports from the committees, they found a lot of variation in the reports of different committees. The inspection committees impose different conditions in the same cases. He, therefore, suggested that they have to bring uniformity in the system and prepare clear guidelines which should be sent to the inspection committees as to what is to be checked. If they do it, the things could be in a better position in future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if some members deviates a bit from the agenda item, he (Vice Chancellor) leaves the meeting and if some persons speak whatever they like, the he (Vice Chancellor) says, let him conclude. He said let they talk from today with having such kind of discrimination amongst the members of the Senate. All members of the Senate should be treated at par while conducting the meeting, this is his humble request to him. Secondly, he (Vice Chancellor) must keep in mind howsoever difference of opinion anybody may be having, everybody is interested in the welfare of the University. The Vice Chancellor is not the only one in his capacity as Presiding Officer of the Senate who is concerned about the University and all others. He agrees with Shri Varinder Singh who says that on every platform, the Vice Chancellor does not lose any opportunity of criticising the Senate of Panjab University as a whole. He was watching the latest interview which he (Vice Chancellor) has given to a Television Channel in Canada, only, he thinks, less than a fortnight ago, he does not want to tell the house as he thinks that most of the people must have got it. He (Vice Chancellor) should do his introspection as to what he has said about the members of the Senate. What he has said about those members of the Senate who have been there in the Senate for than 10 years, for more than 20 years or so on. If he (Vice Chancellor) still feels that he believes in this democratic body of the University, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has all his doubts. This democratic body of Panjab University which is named, Senate, and 15 elected members of the Syndicate is strictly in accordance with the Panjab University Act and nobody has any right to at least challenge the provisions of the Act. Yes, he has every right to suggest that this should be done and for that also only with the concerned authorities, other than giving bad name to the Senators at public fora. They have been requesting earlier also, but he has no hesitation in saying that probably there is no effect on the mind of the Vice Chancellor. He is completely determined that there are some people whom he has been naming as 'mafia' they are part of the 'mafia'. He has questioned him (Vice Chancellor) in one of the meetings of the Senate that he would like to know from the Vice Chancellor that according to him who are those members 4, 5, 10 who in fact are 'mafia' and are controlling the Senate. Another allegation which has been made in the interview is that there are some people who have captured the constituency like this as if they are for the whole life to continue in the Senate. He simply says that in a democratic system if they go by what the Vice Chancellor says, then no Member of Parliament, no Member of Legislature, no Punch or

Sarpanch can continue in a democratic set up for more than ten years as has been suggested by Mr. Vice Chancellor in that interview. There are M.Ps who have been continuing as such for the last 40 years also, M.L.A. also. So, what cannot be cured must be endured in a democratic set up. As, sometimes he (Vice Chancellor) also says that it is a democratic body and they have to take the decision with majority. At many times even when illegal decisions are taken in the name of majority, he says, this is the opinion of the House and he would go with the majority. Even the Parliament also, even if unanimously they take any decision which is contrary to law they are not authorised to take that decision. They have every right to amend the law, but they have no right to violate it. Coming to this to evaluate the list, the agenda is only about evaluating the list, meaning thereby that for a very long time, some of the Senate members have been raising objections as to why only a particular set of persons is being included in all the Selection Committees and Inspection Committees. With great effort, not once, he thinks that number of times it was raised in the meetings of the Senate and Syndicate to which, sometimes the Vice Chancellor said that he will not reply as he has done today, sometimes he said that this is the Vice Chancellor's prerogative which happened in the last to last meeting when Professor Shelley Walia had raised the question. With great effort, the Vice Chancellor very kindly agreed to supply the list of Inspection Committees to the Senate and, of course, the list of the Selection Committees was not sent. It was then pointed out to the Vice Chancellor that the list of Selection Committees is not here. He was kind enough to include the list of Selection Committees also. At that time also, the Vice Chancellor knew it very well what is the grievances of members who are raising it and what is the idea of getting the list of Inspection Committees and Selection Committees. He appreciated the Vice Chancellor that being a Scientist and Researcher he is excellently tabulating the information not only of the last four or five years as has been displayed today, he is an expert of tabulating the information starting from 1882 also. And so much so he must appreciate that he got, of course, with ninety percent efforts of his own. He got an excel sheet prepared to find out as to in the last ten years who were the people who have been there continuously on the Syndicate and who are the people who have there on the Senate for the last so many years. The Vice Chancellor has stated today that this information has been shared with the Court also. Though he has not read in the newspapers that the Court was interested as a Public Interest Litigation about the governance reforms also, of course, what he (Vice Chancellor) is saying, must be right, but he would like to go through that. Because as reported in the media, it was only about the financial condition of the Panjab University since the vice Chancellor has made the statement that in January 2017, the University was going to close. That is how a *suo moto* notice was taken by the Court. Now keeping in view the sentiments of those members who kept on demanding from time to time in the name of discrimination and pick and choose policy of the authorities, he would not name the Vice Chancellor, of the authorities, of the mechanism through which the Selection and Inspection Committees are formed. Keeping view those sentiments it would have been much appropriate, had the Vice Chancellor instructed its office to make an excel sheet to that how many members have been repeated time and again in the Inspection Committees and how the same has been done in the Selection Committees. But to his surprise the Vice Chancellor in this House is saying that he has given them the data and it for them to interpret, it is for them to analyze it, probably, because as he has told them once earlier also, but he does not know whether the House remembers it or not. If they do not want to help anybody for a favour which he come to seek from him (Vice Chancellor), he should tell him to give everything in writing to enable him to take action. Fifty percent of the people would not turn up because they do not know how to put it in black and white on a paper in writing and fifty percent, that is what he (Vice Chancellor) says that he has given them the data and it for them to analyze it. Anyway, without naming anybody, it is for the information of

the Vice Chancellor, he is sure that since he has not analyzed the data, it might not be in his knowledge. There is one person who has gone in fifty selection Committees and the same person, it cannot mere a coincidence, goes in 25 Inspection Committees. Another person who has gone in fifty one Selection Committees and it cannot be mere coincidence that he goes in Twenty Inspection Committees. Then there is another person goes in thirty five Selection Committees and it cannot be mere coincidence that the same person has gone in fifty Inspection Committees. He would only like to read the three names, besides a person who is an expert only in going for the Selections of the Principals, but since he is not to name as they are also equally honourable members of the Senate. He has all respect for them, but he just wanted to know, is there any black list prepared by the Dean College Development Council or the Vice Chancellor or at any other end where it has been noted that these people under any circumstances who are members of the Senate are not to be sent in any of the Selection Committees or the Inspection Committees. If they see the chart, it looks so, he wished it would be wrong. As Shri Naresh Gaur pointed out that in 2013 when he raised a hue and cry that why he was not sent in any of the Committees. He says immediately thereafter he was sent in one Selection Committee and in two Inspection Committees. Now, since the issue is being raised by Shri Harpreet Dua ji in the last 2-3 meetings, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) got a message from him last week that today he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) feels that he has become a member of the Senate and Syndicate because he has been put in one Selection Committee and one Inspection Committee which means that those who are able to manage to get their names included in the Selection Committees and Inspection Committees by sitting on the head of the Vice Chancellor or the Dean College Development Council or wherever the lists are prepared, his name is appearing again and again and those who do not want to come and request, their names are disappearing and slowly they start feeling that they are no more the members of the Senate. As far as the proposal which has been given by Shri Prabhjit Singh, he really appreciates it. He had been saying in the past that why, at all, members of the Syndicate should be a members of the Inspection Committees. So much so, in fact, it is the Senate which is the authority to consider the inspection report after the recommendations of the Syndicate. But, their rule is there. There is rule in Volume-III in the Calendar that maximum members of Senate should be sent as part of the Inspection Committees. So, he would not say that Senate members should not be sent because the rule is there. Unless and until the rule is amended, of course, they can think of it and take the right decision. Now, what he says that he is the member of the Inspection Committee also and he is the Judge of the report submitted by him as member of the Syndicate. This has also been referred to one of the honourable members that to his knowledge, a committee of 4-5 persons is made. The Syndicate in its wisdom, for the last 3-4 years, is forming a sub-committee to consider the inspection reports submitted by various Inspection Committees on behalf of the Syndicate. That Committee used to be made for that particular year, like it is for 2018-19, the people have already started applying and the inspections have already started taking place, the reports are already being submitted. But, he would like to share with the House that such a Committee was made in 2017, with 2017 to consider the cases of 2017-18. To his surprise, which was never happening earlier, in the month of January, 2017, the earlier Committee which was supposed to look into the cases of 2016-17 was replaced by a new Committee because the Committee which was functioning in 2016-17, probably, did not suit some of those who had some interest. It was shared by the Syndicate in January 2017 and that Committee started looking into those cases also which pertain to 2016-17 and January 2018 has gone, February 2018 is going to end, the same committee is continuing to look into the cases of 2017-18 and 2018-19 also. So, in spite of the fact that there is no intention on the part of the Vice Chancellor to send any such message which is going across in the minds of some members, it

automatically is bound to go and if some issue is raised here in the Senate or in the Syndicate, it is only with the expectations from the Vice Chancellor to look into if any such discriminatory attitude on the part of the university is being shown and that to by the members of the Governing Body, they need to look into it and if he feels that it is purely a mistaken feeling, alright, but if he (Vice Chancellor) says that some improvement needs to be made, those improvement can be made. When the Vice Chancellor requested him to conclude, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a meeting exclusively convened to deal with the college related issues and the Vice Chancellor had said in that meeting that anybody having any grievance or if he wants to point out anything, it is not a normal meeting for which the Vice Chancellor should say to conclude the meeting. Continuing, he said that if somebody does not want to speak more than two minutes that means he is satisfied, what he (Shri Ashok Goyal) says. He wanted to tell him (Vice Chancellor) that he is not the only Vice Chancellor when this issue has been raised. He was discussing it with Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma that for the last three decades this has been happening and this has been the ill will in the mind of some at some time, so do not take it as if it is only against this Vice Chancellor. But every time the decision is taken that they must be transparent, they must try to ensure a system whereby all the members of the Senate are given equal representation. But the moment, the Vice Chancellor changes the same very people who had been crying for transparency and who had been crying for some mechanism, they start saying if it could happen in the time of the earlier Vice Chancellor, why the same thing should not happen at the time of this Vice Chancellor. What he want to request is that whenever any such issue is raised, instead of saying that let they look into the last ten years, let they look into last fourteen years, no, let they should look into the grievances which are being raised as on date and see what can be done instead of crying to dig out those things to which they have no solution, except one thing that if it could happen in the past, what is the wrong if it is happening today also. Because he believes in one thing that everybody has the right to be wiser any day every day and daily if they have committed some mistakes yesterday that do not debar them from getting wiser today. He (Vice Chancellor) leaves the House by getting irritated When Professor Bambah or Shri (Rashpal) Malhotra, have to intervene thinking as if some people are speaking in loud voice, some people are not able to follow the decorum, he would like to request him (Vice Chancellor) through both of those seniors who have every right, not only to instruct them, but to dictate them also He would like to request him also to keep his calm intact as Presiding Officer of the Senate and also to be neutral to the whole House instead of telling people that he would not allow to speak and some people even if they are speaking without permission are allowed to speak. Now what he want to suggest is that a very pertinent question has been raised by Shri Naresh Gaur about a particular college to which he is ready to believe that the Vice Chancellor does not remember. If it has been discussed with him number of times and he is sure that he will remember and he could understand his difficulty if he is not in a position to share it in the open House. Why he is saying so because on one occasion, he had also given the message of Shri Naresh Gaur to him (Vice Chancellor) that he is very very upset about this issue and requested to please see to it. And the issue, if he remembers, there cannot be any issue more serious than what he (Shri Naresh Gaur) is referring to. He probably submitted the report with documentary evidence. For whatever reasons, he is not saying that he (Vice Chancellor) is not justified if he has tried to put it under the carpet. May there be so many reasons, but the seriousness of the issue is not diminished. In that, as far as he remembers, that report was never placed before the Senate, One, whatever follow up communications were sent by Shri Naresh Gaur is a communication between him (Shri Naresh Gaur and the Vice Chancellor, those were never placed before the Syndicate and no such approval was also granted to that college because as he understood that the college withdrew the application for which they had applied. So to

say that he (Vice Chancellor) has no business to talk about it unless and until he raises it in the Syndicate and he is reminding him that he was also a member of the Syndicate. Referring to Professor Ronki's suggestion that if the Vice Chancellor did not act he (Shri Naresh Gaur) should have brought the matter to the Syndicate. He just wants to ask him with folded hands, if he did not take Syndicate into confidence, if after getting fed up, after having no response for the last 3-4 years, is it a crime to bring it to the notice of the Senate and that too in a meeting which is specifically called for discussing the college related issues. With these things in mind, let him tell that as a Senate under his Chairmanship, let them take a decision, conscious decision that these people for all practical purpose are no good for the University Selection Committees and Inspection Committees, they will not send them and these are the people who are suitable. So, while making such lists, let them pass a speaking order as to why these people are not suitable and why these people are only suitable so that they should know what they are doing, so that the Dean College Development Council should know why he is doing this, so that the Vice Chancellor also knows that what he is doing. Whatever has happened, has happened, but, in future he thinks that they can take a decision to ensure that transparency is there. It will not help the present Vice Chancellor. It will not help the Vice Chancellor for next three years starting from July, 2018, they wish he is the Vice Chancellor, it will help others also who would succeed him in future. This is what he wanted to say.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that the hour is late. Much of what he wanted to say that opportune moment, probably, it might be no longer relevant, but he would want to make just one or two points. They now have a procedure in place. It might not be ideal, but there is a procedure. They have Inspection Committees and by the way before he heard today's debate, he thought inspection was a duty, now it seems to him, it is a privilege. Anyway, to be more serious, there is a procedure, inspection reports come, they go to the Syndicate, then the Syndicate whatever view wishes to take and makes that recommendation to the Senate. If there are people who have gone on inspection and have felt afterwards that due consideration has not been given to what they recommended, there are ways for dealing with it. The University has procedures in place. He did not want to go into those details, but he wished to emphasize that it is the occasion for raising individual issues of that type and demanding on the spot reply is not one of those procedures which he would like to support. Yes, if there are legitimate grievances, there is a grievance committee, there are various methods. The method to do that is not to insist that they get an instant reply.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he would like reiterate what Shri Prabhjit Singh has said. He has sent in writing to the previous Vice Chancellor and he has never accepted any membership of that Committee. He had said that when there is a conflict of interest, the people should not go. Now let them should move forward. He was of the opinion that the University should devise a mechanism, that before sending a Committee for inspection, they should send the proforma to the College and ask them to fill it. The office should ask as to what are the points which have been mentioned by the earlier Committee, whether these are lacking, whether those have been taken care or not. New Committee should not be sent till those particular objections of the earlier Committee are met. If the new committee goes, as the college might send erroneous figures, the recommendations of the old Committee should be with the new committee, so that the new Committee could check, what were the recommendations of the old Committee, whether those have been met or not. He thinks that it would solve quite a number of problems, otherwise this whole thing will keep on going like this. Secondly, if there are cases where there are fake teachers, the University must take it seriously because this is a criminal issue. This is not an academic issue. If they have lesser

number of teachers, it is alright, but if there are fake teachers, the University should take a very serious note of it because it is bad reflection on the working of the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that Ambassador I.S. Chadha has talked that it on the spot reply cannot be given, but perhaps he has not listened to him carefully. He informed that he has sent eight emails, but he did not get any reply so far. He did not want to talk about this even today. He had waited for three-four years and he could even wait more. But when the Vice Chancellor said that he is not involved in this matter, then he has to say all this. He requested, please do not think that he is asking the reply at this time. He had sent eight emails in this regard to the Vice Chancellor, the then Registrar and the then Dean College Development Council. This is what he would like to tell him (Ambassador I.S. Chadha).

Principal S.S. Sangha while talking about the Inspection Committees said that there could be one or two percent such cases where the extreme step is taken. He informed that 5-6 years back, he visited some college at Moga and Malout. No Inspection Committee would like to disaffiliate a college until and unless there is extreme deficiency. In those colleges, there were no teachers, they did not pay salary properly to the teachers, no provident fund was deducted. Conditions were imposed on them, but knowingly they did not fulfil the conditions. His student was Principal there. They disaffiliated that college. But after that a new committee was formed. He requested that there are more such cases. These could be 2-3 in number. Such cases should be discussed in the Syndicate and new Inspection Committee should not be formed. Only then the problem could be solved.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu that he endorses the view point expressed by Professor Shelley Walia and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that there should not be much repetition in the appointment of members. Professor Rajesh Gill has said that it is very difficult to visit the colleges located at Fazilka or Abohar which are at far away places. He said that the persons belong to that area would be knowing much about that area. So if such a person is repeated for 4-5 times it is okay, but there should not much repetition. By doing so the Inspection Committee members would not have to travel more. As pointed out by Shri Prabhjit Singh, there is a provision in their Calendar that the college should first fulfil all the requirements i.e. faculty, infrastructure etc. necessary for the grant of a new course. Only then the Inspection Committee should visit the College. But this is not being done since a long time. Some of the members have said that either the Inspection Committee should refuse to grant affiliation or they should grant it. But in their proforma, there are three columns i.e. recommended, not recommended and conditionally recommended. The problem arises where they conditional recommend for grant of affiliation. It might be their compulsion. But as has been said Principal S.S.Sangha, the should refuse only in those colleges where it is totally clear that they do not deserve it. But when they grant affiliation conditionally, there arouses many problems. He does not know how they manage it and he would not like to say anything about anybody as he himself may be also one of those colleagues. Secondly, he does not have any ill will against Shri R.K. Mahajan and he would feel sorry if he has hurt his feelings. But he would like to point out which he has also pointed out in the Syndicate also that there are two colleges at Malout which he did not want to name. But if the members feel like, he could talk even by narrating their names Both the colleges have almost the same strength of students. In one college there is strength of about eight hundred students He had gone there in the Inspection Committee. There were already four teachers and he imposed a condition of three teachers. But on their request he put the condition to appoint at least two more

teachers. They are running M.A. Punjabi in their College along with the B.A courses. A junior most teacher of Punjabi from the DAV College, Abohar was called there. There were only two teachers of Punjabi. But here the person who is working honestly is suffering. He has to face the annoyance of the society. The private colleges want get more profit, but if more a condition is put to appoint more teachers, they would get less profit. They feel annoyed and ask them that in such and such college the strength is same. They could check the strength of both the colleges, he has said this by name in the Syndicate also. In one of the colleges postgraduate classes are running. Compulsory Punjab subject strength is almost the same. There is another college in District Muktsar. It is wrong to blame the whole House by saying that they become dictator when they go to the Colleges. He had put one condition instead of two..But even they say that they become dictators, it is wrong. It is on record that they had put only one condition instead of two. They did not want to close any college because their colleagues are working there and their children are studying, but they only want that these institutes should work with honesty. If they cannot not pay full salary, at least they should give sufficient amount. The managements should not only think to mint more money. Professor Navdeep Goyal has talked about the UGC guidelines. He has also read those, but it seems that some manipulation has been done. He informed that he went to one of the SGPC college as Vice Chancellor's nominee and his colleague was a subject expert in that Committee. It was a small self financing college He wrote in his report that three teachers to be appointed. So, they have to appoint regular teacher. But with this the Principal of the College as well as the management would get annoyed with him. But he thought that he had worked with full honesty. He further said that a Fellow is considered equivalent to that of a Professor. When a case for approval of appointment of University Assistant Professor, Associate Professors and Professor comes, it is approved by the Syndicate and Senate. In the Syndicate and Senate, all are not Professors, they are the Governing Body. He is Principal and equivalent to a Professor, so he has no problem. But the issue which is being brought time and again, it is not written anywhere that the Senator would not go for inspection or selection. If they are giving him TA/DA by considering him equivalent to a Professor for the last 30-40 years, it was manipulated at that time so that the teachers representatives or members from the graduate constituency could be ousted and so they cannot not become Vice Chancellor's nominee. If at all there is some conditions, it meant that if a person is not a member of the Governing Body, he should be a person of the rank of Professor and not an Assistant Professor or Associate Professor. The promotion of that person is approved by a person who is member of the Governing Body, though he is a teachers representatives, or non-teachers or an Assistant Professor or something else. It is a clear manipulation and it should be removed. It was done to oust their colleagues who are working as Assistant Professor or Associate Professor or retired teachers such as Professor S.K. Sharma. Those guidelines did not convey this meaning that only Professors would go. It is not there that if the Governing Body members are not Professor, they would not go.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when they talk of inspections, they wish that certain standard of excellence has to be maintained. It depends as to who is going for doing inspection. They all are of the view that there should be such mechanism for inspection where all of them should get a chance, it is a very good thing. But at the same time, in order to maintain the excellence of education, very strict rules have to be made. They have to have a check on it and see that if there is any lapse at the level of Inspection Committee, strict action would be needed to be taken. If they receive a report from a college about any ill treatment on the part of the Inspection Committee members, that should also be checked. All the complaints received from the colleges should got enquired into thoroughly by an independent Committee. If they receive any

complaint, either it is anonymous or otherwise against any person of the Committee that should be dealt with very seriously. If it is not done the image of the University would be maligned and it would be very bad for all of them. He would also like to say that if something unpleasant is said about the members of the Senate, it is also heard that very bad things have also been said about the Vice Chancellor. They have levelled allegations that he (VC) is a dacoit (*pen wale daku*), that he is a mad man. They have to think, how they have protect the image and standard of the Senate. If somebody wants that no one should not abuse him, then he has to restrain himself also for doing so. He should not even bring anything about his in his mind and always work with honesty. He said that some of their teachers went for inspections and their involvement was found, enquiries were held, video were also seen, what was happening in the colleges, how all these things are happening. If it is happening so, then they have to think about it and have an introspection. The Syndicate members should not go for inspection. If any Senate member is running a college, or even if he has a college, it is desired from him not to go for inspection in any college. It becomes his moral responsibility, otherwise the other colleges would raise a finger on him. When a person becomes a member of the Senate, irrespective of his education, he has a standard. Anybody could become Prime Minister of India, he could become a minister. But, where there are some UGC requirements, those needs to be fulfilled. The Senators have come through a process of election. If they expect that others should not slap him, it is possible if he should not have the intent to slap others.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that this matter should be resolved. They have been sitting since morning and the meeting adjourns again and again. To his mind there is one solution. If they can make online admission, online registration in different departments. Recently, one of their colleagues has said that there is a proforma, as per the UGC and as per their Calendar. If the respective colleges fill up the proforma and send it to the University, then what is the need for inspection. But if they receive a complaint, then they have a very good structure of Senate. There are 91 members from every field. Panjab University has 76 departments and every department has Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors. So, they can send a Committee to that college any time from amongst these persons to conduct surprise inspection. Further, an affidavit should be taken from those colleges where they grant affiliation for new courses to the effect that if any lapses are found during the inspection, then they would be fined and also the affiliation would be cancelled. So, by doing so, they could get a solution of the problem. This meeting is taking up the issue of evaluation of Inspection Committee lists. The inspections which have been done, those are done. Those persons know what had been the discrepancies. So, they should leave this point because no solution is going to be found as they are not going to punish him. Those who have gone many times and who have gone for less times, they have understood it. They should leave behind all these things now and think about the solution and make some proper system. He emphasized that they should first prepare the proform and it should be got filled online.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that he has been listening since morning. Many good things have been discussed. He would like to request the Vice Chancellor as also to the whole Senate that they should devise a consent proforma and have the consent of all the members of the Senate to know as to who are interested in going for inspections. Such a consent could be taken every year when the Syndicate is formed. He would like to tell one thing in the shape of a joke. In 2012, he became a member of the Inspection Committee and he got a letter also about this. For 2 ½ months he kept that letter with him and he kept on receiving phones from the college that as and when they would complete all the things, they would call him. The Principal of B.Ed. college was also with

him. When he rang him after 2 ½ months whether he should come or not, they told me that it would take at least a month and then they would inform. Then he shared this with some senior person. He told me not to go there and return the letter. He asked him, why? He said if he goes there, he would be in a trouble. He told me that when he would come back, in the midway he would found a packet in his car. Then he made up his mind for not going there. He does not know why it is so. He has made a suggestion. They should take the consent of all the members of the Senate at the time of formation of the Syndicate. There is no question of teacher or non-teacher. A non-teacher could be more wise than a teacher and the teachers are already wise.

Dr. Amit Joshi said he had been a subject expert recently in a Government College. This is not directly related to the agenda, but he just want to share what he has observed. When he visited PG-Government College for Girls, Sector-11. There was a letter on which the Committee was constituted. The letter was from Director Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh Administration. It was written on the letter that the 'Government College solicits affiliation for the following courses. There were four courses. You are requested to grant affiliation. Furthermore it is submitted that no financial or infrastructural support will be provided'. Still they were sent, what he does not know why? When the D.H.E. is writing a letter that he would not provide the faculty support or infrastructural support, he was of the opinion that it should have been resolved at the level of Registrar itself and the University does not grant affiliation on such ground. It is Panjab University and the affiliation for courses is not given like this. They should not at least give in writing. Okay, if they do not want to appoint someone, there are some unspoken, still they are putting it in writing and they are going there. Then what they are supposed to do Of course Professor Tiwari was also there as expert in Microbial Biotechnology, perhaps for microbiology course. They did not have even a single faculty member. He was surprised to see, last time also they demanded M.Sc. Course and the letter was there that they (D.H.E.) will not provide any faculty. In the absence of the faculty who will teach the course. They have their own mechanism. He does not understand how they are teaching the course and these specialized courses. Who is going to teach microbiology course when the D.P.I. or the D.H.E. are writing that they would not provide teachers and the University should grant them affiliation. What is this? Is this a joke? Secondly, there was a more surprising fact that they are running the course since 2002 without any permanent teacher and they said that they are having permanent affiliation for B.Sc. (Hons.School). Now a college which is not having a single University approved teacher and that too in Chandigarh, just at a stone's throw from the University is running a course without even a single approved teacher and that too for honours course and it is being granted permanent affiliation. He thinks that there is need to introspect, there is need to re-look into the mechanisms by which they grant affiliations. They should be very much subjective and very rational when they grant affiliations.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said to his mind his colleagues have raised all the issues. Some of his friends have said that the Chairman of the Committee feel more concerned as has been said by Shri Naresh Gaur. He thinks only Shri Naresh Gaur would not have gone there, there might some other members also. It was the collective responsibility of all the members. But the other members might not have been speaking. Some time back some Committees were formed to scrutinize the reports of the affiliation committees and some years ago he was also a member of that Committee. The problems which they are facing, these had been there in the past and these would also continue. They should evolve such type of mechanism where they could determine as to how much leverage could be given. Suppose, a Committee is formed and it identified 5-6 colleges and took the matter to the Syndicate. It was for the first time

that under Regulation-11, Chapter-VII (A) P.U. Cal. Vol. I, letters were issued to the college for their disaffiliation. There were five colleges which also included government colleges also. But, what was their fate. They again granted affiliation to those colleges. Now one of his colleagues has raised the issue relating to a Government College. They say that there should not say anything University Vs Government because they have to take from them finances and other support and so they did come in direct confrontation with them. Sometimes, it also happens that they have to grant affiliation to a colleges overnight whereas that college has not applied for affiliation, no inspection team had visited that college. Everybody knows about it. The colleges which were identified by them some years back, they were given notices under Regulation 11. Such colleges include some private colleges and some B.Ed. College. He thinks that all the committees are doing their work. The Committee do not just go there and work blindly. They do write the things with consensus of all. If some member of the Committee raises some objection, that should also be taken note of. Earlier very big Committees did visit the colleges, but then they said that there is no need of such bigger committees and only 2-3 person are sufficient. If there is a dissent by some member, that should be taken note of. As regards the proforma, there are three columns in it where only recommendation is made and that can be rejected in the Syndicate. But then pressures are exerted on them, which are also from within themselves. Managements put pressures. He has said this earlier also that let they try to categorise the colleges. There are some colleges who are chronic patients, they are completely diseased and they should disaffiliate such colleges. They had earlier taken some decisions, but they abandoned those decisions. There are some colleges who do not amend themselves in spite of requesting them again and again. They have the list of such colleges, but they are not doing anything and keeping silent. At the same time, there are some colleges who want to amend them. Some of them have compulsions as no regular appointments were made. Now the contract appointments are made. Further, they have different categories of colleges, some are self financing, grant-in-aid college, government colleges etc. How they could maintain parity. If they ask the private colleges to fulfil the conditions, they have to adopt the same yard stick for government colleges. What the government colleges are doing? Even the government colleges are not having the required number of teachers and infrastructure. The minimum pay structure on which they have agreed today, he has said this earlier also that let they should ensure that all colleges should at least give the basic structure of pay i.e. Rs. 21600/- per month. At that time people were talking about 15600/- also. They are not getting support from the regulatory body. UGC is saying something else, D.P.I. is saying something else, university is saying something else and the management are saying something else. But in all this they are suffering either they Principals or teachers or someone else. Whatever they say, neither the regulatory body nor the managements, nor the D.P.Is listen to it. He suggested that they should at least set a minimum standard which should be followed by everybody. It is the duty of the University. Some colleges are following it and the other not. So all evens and uneven are treated equally. If the affiliation is given, it is given to all. Why should they do that? He said that he had also suggested earlier to categorize the colleges in Category. They could be put in grade A, B, C and so on. Even the NAAC also do its assessment in as per the gradation. Suppose a college is following 80% of the conditions, if such a college is getting some leverage, let it do that. They are not to stop the spread of education as the education is for expansion. He informed that Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are giving some leverage to their colleges and those colleges are running. Financial and other problems are also there in their colleges, but they (Panjab University) are very fussy in the case of courses. They should see that the colleges which are meeting up the requirements, such persons should not be allowed affiliation for a new college. The government colleges who are not following the conditions, they are giving affiliations to

such colleges also. They stop affiliation one college and grant affiliation to another college on the same basis. They should set a parameter that if a college is fulfilling 80% of the conditions, regulatory bodies i.e. Syndicate and Senate should clear that case. If they fulfilling about 60% conditions, then they should be given a chance to comply with the conditions within 2-3 years. When they say that a college should first appoint the teachers, what that college would do if that course does not run. If a colleges completely ignores to fulfil the conditions, whose track record is bad, such a college should not be granted affiliation at all. Why do not they go for that? He said, to his mind, they have to implement the system strictly. But if they just go on discussing the issue, there could not be any solution. Such a system was running twenty years back, it is running today and it would run like this in future also if they do not implement it strictly. He was of the opinion that they should frame some rules.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that whatever Principal R.S. Jhanji has said, it is alright. But a college has opened recently and they have started B.S.c (Agriculture) and B.com. They say that the teachers should be given Rs. 21600/-. If the University has received a letter that there could not be person in the Selection Committee below the rank of Professor. But on the other hand they have brought the UGC grade down to Rs. 21600/-. This is wrong. Why they are allowing new colleges and saying to appoint less teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Panjab University has not accepted this argument of Rs. 21600/- salary.

Shri Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that University is giving approval to such colleges.

The Vice Chancellors said that he has not given any approval for paying Rs. 21600/-. The approval for paying Rs. 21600/- is given only to those grant-in-aid positions which the Punjab Government has said, and that which the Senate passed as one time exception.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said after that the case went to the High Court where it was quoted that the teacher are being paid Rs. 21600/-.

Shri Varinder Singh Gill said that the Vice Chancellor is having a list of 10-12 colleges and he can take action against those colleges, but only one college cannot be singled out. He further said that if action is to be taken, it should be taken against all. Politics is involved in it.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that the issue is to evaluate the list of Inspection Committees which visited the colleges from 2013 to 2017. This item has not gone to the Syndicate as per the agenda circulated. Generally, issues come to the Senate through the Syndicate, but this has not gone to that route. The people have raised many flaws, some may be there or some may not be there. Why can they not may a Committee. Let the committee, look into each and every point what the people have said and then decide Let it go to the Syndicate and then come back here. They have been debating for almost three hours and ultimately the same conclusion from where they started.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that their main purpose is to maintain quality in education. With a view to maintain quality in education, they send inspection committees. He was of the opinion that they should not give only degree, but they

should also give education. There is a provision in the Calendar to conduct periodical inspections. When they grant a course to a college, there should be periodical inspection. It may be possible that when the course was granted, the required teachers were there. But with the passage of time the teacher might have retired or left the job. There might be many such colleges today, where the courses are running without any teacher. When they talk of quality education, the equality would come only when the teachers are paid full salary and other benefits. It was decided in the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor had said that they call data from the colleges either it is a case of P.F, gratuity or provident fund. Till date, more than 50% colleges are such which have not provided this data. The last date for submission of data was 27th September, but even after the lapse of five months of the last date, the data was not sent by all the colleges. If this data is not provided, it means that there is something wrong at the bottom. If it is so, who will check it. Before granting affiliation to the colleges, they should check their financial status to ensure whether they could pay the salary to the appointed teachers at least for one year. But they are giving affiliation for the humiliation of teachers from where they cannot expect a good quality education. As per his knowledge, there are 97 unaided colleges, 67 aided colleges. The data which he collected, it is noticed that more than 50% colleges have not sent the data. The Inspection Committees which go to the Colleges knew it that proper P.F. is not being deducted, gratuity is not given in majority of the college and the earned leave is also not being encashed. In spite of that they are giving them new courses, granting them permanent affiliation. He suggested that they should not grant a new courses to such colleges who do not fulfil the requirements and are not giving proper pay. They should take all these aspects into consideration before granting a new course also and strict action should be taken against the defaulting colleges. Being custodian of the University, they should have to have a check on the colleges. Until and unless it is done, there could not be quality education and good teachers. Another issue was raised regarding UGC guidelines wherein it is said that Professor or its equivalent cadre person would go in the Selection Committee. As per their Calendar, a Fellow is equivalent to that of a Professor. But it is manipulated in other way that the Fellow is not a Professor and only the Professor could be the Chairman and so on. He was of the view that somewhere they are contradicting their own Calendar. The UGC regulation did not say that a teacher could be paid a salary of Rs. 21600/- The UGC says that a teacher should be given full scale, which, he thinks, is not given in any of the unaided colleges. He requested that they should take care of the problems of these teachers. Whatever had been done, that has gone but they should at least make a policy for future. They either prepare the roster or they should devise such a mechanism which should be fair, uniform and it should justify the affiliation.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that as a student of management he has learnt one thing that as and when they get a chance for Professorship or to head any institution, they should forget the past and one should not say that his predecessor was doing this and he is also doing that, then how he is wrong. One should see how he could strengthen the system and make it transparent so that there could be good image for him and for his institute in the society. He (Vice Chancellor) has made an effort towards this by providing the data, but according to him, the system had not been transparent so far. They wish that he (Vice Chancellor) should get another term. Still there is time to have an introspection to know where they were weak and where there was leakage in the system. They should think about as to where they could make improvements. He was of the opinion that he (Vice Chancellor) has the capacity and capability to change the system. He would like to tell that the committees are not the inspection committees, but these are advisory committees. Dr. R.K. Mahajan has just said that the Guru Nanak Dev University has used the technology for constituting

Inspection Committees. They are going to make digital India. By using the technology, they should be sent a form to fill and if they did not fulfil all the requirements, there is no need to send the Inspection Committee. So, if the Guru Nanak Dev University has adopted some model for constituting Inspection Committees by using computers, they should also study that system immediately. They should send the Inspection Committee only to those colleges who have fulfilled all the conditions. When they hold online admission, they tell the candidate that he is not eligible and so he could not appear in the interview. But here it is written 'approved' 'not approved' and then 'conditions'. Why conditions? There should be 'yes' or 'no'. It is possible only if they would ask them in advance to fill the proforma, then some Committee or dealing person would see whether they fulfil the requirements or not. If they do not fulfil the conditions, then they should not apply. Why they are bothering them? Another thing that one person is going for inspection seventy times. It is but natural that there would be heartburning. He would like to say that people have got undue benefit of your simplicity. Now, he has to improve the system. How that system could be improved. He said if a question paper could be set through computer by making a question bank, why this could not be done. This view has already been expressed by Shri Gurjot Malhi ji, Dr. Parveen Goyal and some other members. They should prepare a human resource bank of eligible persons for appointing Inspection Committee members. It should be left to the computer to generate the names of the persons for inspection committee. They could also put a limit that one person would not be repeated more than four times. He said that he had been Associate Dean College Development Council. Principals used to come to him to get the names of their persons included for the Inspection Committees. All this is tailor made. Nobody would even say that he (Vice Chancellor) had helped them, no one would come to him now. All have pointed a finger on him. Everybody has got his work done, but they have maligned their image and the image of the University and also the Senate. He requested that such things should now be stopped and think as to how the system could be strengthened and how it could be made transparent. It would bring grandeur for him as well as to the University and the Senate. He said that they should take the help of technology and the system should be transparent. The Panjab University is considered as a premier the University because its admission system is transparent. When they would reduce the involvement of humans, the system would get transparent. They can see that in railways the system is all transparent and so there is no problem in it. There is no human obligation. He, therefore, requested that the Senate should take some decision and constitute a Committee to look into it. He would like to tell that during the terms of Professor R.P. Bambah and Professor T.N. Kapoor, very senior persons were sent as Vice Chancellor's nominees, very eminent persons were sent as subject experts, such things are now missing. They have now not been able to take along all this human resource. Only some of the persons have got the benefit out of this. There are so many brilliant minds sitting in the Senate and they should make good use of them. It arouses a feeling of disappointment in their minds as to why they could contribute for the betterment of the University and why they are not getting attention. With these words, he would like to request all the members that today they should not only conclude the discussion but action should also be taken so that the people may remember in future that such a discussion had taken place in the Senate. The whole credit goes to the Vice Chancellor as he has provided the list of Inspection Committees.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that a very good discussion has taken place and he would not like to repeat all that. But he has the curiosity that this meeting may not only become a formality. Whatever outcome could come out, that should be summarised and implemented and checked properly. They should not become a toothless body. Whatever they would do, they should do it in a proper way. As stated by Principal R.S.

Jhanji that they should not come into confrontation with the government because they have to take help from them. The D.P.I. nominee is also sitting here and he would like to say that if the government says that a person is to retire at the age of 60 years, then it should not be dragged to 65 years. The D.P.I. nominee is sitting here and it should be asked from him.

Professor Chaman Lal said that in the beginning, he has given a very small observation by saying that this matter has not been studied completely. But the discussion which took place during the previous three hours has been very fruitful and most of the things about the root cause of this problem have come out of this discussion. Though they cannot do much in an institute while working in prevalent system, but some improvements could be done. He thinks that what Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji has said, they have not given much attention to that. He only went two times, once in a Selection Committee and once in Inspection Committee, but his experience has not been very good. He observed that corruption is rampant in the colleges. The whole education system has become a scandal, especially since the privatisation had started. Though privatisation was there earlier also, but the private colleges which have come up in the last 15-20 years, those have made the education system a business. Since when the education has become a business, the colleges lost the social agenda of educating the society. After that a malice has spread and all of them engulfed in it. He understands that the Vice Chancellor is also concerned about it that the teachers are not being paid full salary. Even now he (Vice Chancellor) has said that he will not give approval for those cases where the teachers would be paid salary of Rs. 21600/- p.m. The Vice Chancellor may give approval or not, but the reality is that the teachers are not paid even ten thousands salary. The signatures are got for Rs. 21600/- but some of the money is taken back from them. This practice is prevalent in 90% of the colleges. The MHRD and the UGC are primarily responsible for the rot in the education system, especially in the last three years. A mention has been made about the UGC rules in this House. He asked, where is the autonomy of the Universities? The college education has reached at the verge of ruining. Who is responsible for it. He does not say that all this happened only in the last three years, it had been running even before that, but during the last three years it has reached at its top. This problem has become a massive problem. Whatever he could understand in a limited sense from this discussion, all of them are not perfect. So, they should think as to how much improvement they could make in the system keeping in view their limits. He has 2-3 suggestions in his mind. One, perhaps it is the consensus of the House that they should constitute a Committee which should objective and dispassionate to consider various aspects. The committee should deliberate on it, how the committees have to be constituted. He would also like to say that many of the members including himself had said in the last meeting that they will not claim TA/DA. But since the TA/DA has to be paid by the Colleges, they compel a person to take TA/DA. The Inspection fee to the members is also given by the colleges. The University may take whatever fee it like to take from the colleges, it may be one lakh or two lakhs, but the teachers/members who go for inspection, must not accept even a single pie from the college. The colleges do give money to the inspection committee members, but he does not know how much amount is put in the envelope by the colleges. He also stated that he tried to refuse it, but the college people say that it is a rule and they have to show it in their audit statements. So, he said that to pay T.A./D.A. to the members is the responsibility of the University not of the College. There should be some necessary binding on the colleges which is not there at present. The college managements do not bother for the University and feel that they can manage everything. There is need to remove this psyche of the colleges. All of them, including the administrators and the Senators, are collaborators to it. If they have to improve this rot in the system, they

have to start from themselves. He said that the Committee to be formed should give its recommendations as to how the Inspection and Selection Committees should be formed, especially the criteria to be adopted should be very clear for appointing Senate members on these Committee. It is not an issue of teaching or non-teaching as Shri Ashok Goyal has cleared that even the teachers after retirement are non-teaching. But the capacity and the competence should be kept in mind and accordingly small Committee could be formed. A very good suggestion has been given that first of all the data be taken in digital format. Since sometimes, there could be corruption in the digital data also, therefore, the digital data needed to be verified. To verify this data instead of sending a Committee of many members, the Dean College Development Council or any other officials of the University could visit the College and verify the data. They could not stop the privatisation of the education. He could differ with the Vice-Chancellor on so many counts but is admirer of the Vice-Chancellor on one issue that he is concerned about the teachers' salaries as he has always been talking that the teachers should be paid the full salary. He said that the Vice-Chancellor should not strictly follow the idealism that the teachers should be paid full salary but it should be ensured that whatever is to be paid that should be paid in time because the teachers are the most vulnerable section in the Colleges and are being exploited the most. The persons belonging to the poor families are working even on a salary of Rs.5,000/- and the way the teachers are treated is a slur on all of them. They should ask the Colleges that there would be no compromise on it. No teacher should be denied the dignity and reasonable salary. A Committee should be formed to look into all these aspects. However, some relaxation in terms of infrastructure could be granted. Whatever they could do is that they should form a Committee to look into all the aspects. But the UGC should not be the ideal as it is the most deceptive body. In the times, they would be facing problems from the UGC as it would not provide any grant but would impose such conditions as if they are the destroyer of the education. Presently what the MHRD and UGC are doing, it is destroying the education specially the scientific education.

The Vice-Chancellor briefly summarised what they have discussed. They need to use technology. If the present Vice-Chancellor of GNDU, who was earlier the Secretary of the UGC, has introduced something, he has done it in the background of his 4-5 years experience in the UGC. He proposed that the Vice-Chancellors of Panjab University, Punjabi University and GNDU get together and study this system by having a Small Committee to be nominated by the Syndicate as representative of Panjab University. He would talk to Professor B.S. Ghuman (Vice-Chancellor, Punjabi University) and it would be easy to convince him as he is a member of Panjab University Senate and takes the initiative to talk to Professor Jaspal Singh (Vice-Chancellor, GNDU) and this thing done as Punjab Government is involved in it because all the Colleges of Punjab are affiliated with these three universities. Since the nominee of the Punjab Government has come to attend the meeting with a seriousness to listen to the problems being faced by the Colleges of Punjab. All the politicians of Punjab are concerned about young people who are in large number. So, they have some interest in seeing that some corrections should be done so that a better quality of education is provided via a regulation mechanism in place. If the a salary of Rs.8-10,000/- is paid to the teachers, then only those teachers would come forward who are hapless and it is possible that in some cases, such persons would be belonging to local area. But in the long run, it would not be good. If they agreed to the suggestion of the Punjab Government to pay a salary of Rs.21,600/- it was accepted only as a one-time exception and on the premise that it is the start of the process of filling up the grant-in-aid posts. He had made it a point with the Punjab Government that this process was started about three years ago and at the end of three years, the Punjab Government is supposed to give full salary to these teachers and that has to be implemented. The

University would not grant the approval if a salary of Rs.21,600/- is paid by any of the College. If it is to be done under some circumstances, then it should be on the same terms as adopted by the Punjab Government. The Managements of the private Colleges could not adopt a formula that they appoint a person and after a year remove that person from the service. It could not be ad infinitum one year appointment. The appointment is made on the premise that after completion of three years, the full salary would be paid. He has also asked the U.T. Administration that if it is paying a salary of Rs.50,000/- to teachers appointed on ad hoc basis, then it be ensured that the teachers of all the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University situated in U.T. Chandigarh should also pay the same salary to teachers whether appointed on grant-in-aid posts or unaided posts otherwise the DHE, U.T. must not approve and must not compel the Panjab University for granting the approval. As far as he knows, he has not granted any approval to the teachers appointed in the U.T. on a salary of Rs.21,600/-. He has also taken up it with the U.T. Administration, that its nominee should also not approve such appointments.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the U.T. Administration has adopted the Punjab Government notification. The advertisement is issued with the pay to be paid as per the UGC/State Government and the salary structure of both these differs. The State Government pays Rs.21,600/- due to which the teachers are the suffers. The Managements say that they have advertised the posts as per State Government and as per State Government the salary is to be paid Rs.21,600/-. If the subject expert, nominee of the Vice-Chancellor are in the Selection Committee, then why the University should not grant the approval.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not advocated to the Syndicate for grant of such approvals.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that in advertisement, the pay scale is mentioned as per State Government which means the U.T. Administration and there the pay is Rs.21,600/-. Then how the University could deny.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the salary of Rs.21,600/- is being paid but at the end of three years, the Government is to regularise the teachers. Until that undertaking is given, let the matter go to the forthcoming meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested the nominee of the Punjab Government to reply on it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the nominee is not authorised to reply on it.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to what is the decision on this item.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the U.T. is also making the appointment for three years but the approval is not being given. The Dean College Development Council is not granting the approval to the teachers appointed on a salary of Rs.21,600/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the matter go to the Syndicate. He is not granting the approval because he has no assurance that the appointed teachers would not be removed from service after three years and fresh appointment would be made. When this item came up, all this was told to them. That is why he has taken up with the Chief Secretary, Punjab that after the testing point of three years, whether the teachers would be given the full salary. If after completion of three years, the full salary

is not paid, he would put the matter back to the Syndicate and let the Syndicate take a call on it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the U.T. Administration has adopted the Punjab Government notification and what is adopted by the Punjab Government would be adopted by the U.T. also. Then why the U.T. has withheld the approval of the teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is nothing in writing that the Punjab Government would regularise the teachers. Let the matter go back to the Syndicate, discussed and debated and let the Syndicate pass a resolution in this regard to be sent to the Government. Now several good suggestions have been made but the decision making body is the Syndicate, let the matter go to the Syndicate and take a call on how it has to be done, some guidelines have to be laid down under which a given Vice-Chancellor should perform this task of approving the Committees.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she has raised her hand and wanted to speak to which the Vice-Chancellor said that she has already spoken. She said that Professor Ronki Ram had also spoken and if others are allowed to speak 3-4 times, then where is the objectivity. She requested the Vice-Chancellor to be objective holding an important chair.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Rajesh Gill not to accuse him unnecessarily.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that why did not he (Vice-Chancellor) notice her raising hand.

Professor Chaman Lal requested the Vice-Chancellor to announce the names of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at some stage, the things have to be concluded. No one person could hold the things to a ransom.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that as suggested by one member that a list be prepared as to who could go and who could not go for the Selection Committee. Similarly, a list be prepared as to who could speak in the House and who could not.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are certain things as they are discussing the Inspection Committee which is an important matter. She knows that no decision would be taken and it would be referred back. But the issue is that they have to be objective and dispassionate as Professor Chaman Lal has said. There are some issues as Shri Naresh Gaur has raised and in the last meeting Dr. Neeru Malik had also raised that who would say that this is not wrong. There has to be categorical answer to certain things, either right or wrong. If they could not say so, they do not deserve to be teachers. Even on that they deliver lecture and dilute the things. As long as they are going to do this, they would not be able to do any good to the system because they do not want to. To say that, a matter could not be put in the Syndicate agenda. She said that theoretically and practically who is the person who forms the agenda for the Syndicate and the Senate, how do the items go the Syndicate and the Senate. They all know about it. She was a member of a Committee in the year 2013 and an enquiry was conducted at Ludhiana which was reported in the media also. Are they looking for the people who honestly do their job? How do they reward or punish people who honestly do their job? What kind of people do they want on the Inspection Committees? Who

are the people who are repeated, who are the people who are omitted? She requested to prepare the details of all these things. When they talk about the Syndicate agenda, she has also given a representation to the Vice-Chancellor in the morning regarding Ph.D. increments, she requested to place the same in the Syndicate agenda for the next meeting.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath endorsed Professor Rajesh Gill on the grant of Ph.D. increments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not against the grant of increments and has tried his level best.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Panjab University Teachers Association and Chandigarh College Teachers Union have given representation and requested to place it before the Syndicate on 24th February.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has tried his level best and would pursue it and would be placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Chaman Lal said that this item could be concluded if it is recorded that the Senate has approved the constitution of a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item goes to the Syndicate, the Syndicate would make guidelines relating to what is the bank of the people who would go for Inspection and Selection Committees.

Professor Chaman Lal said that why not form a Senate Committee when the Senate is unanimously saying that there should be a Committee to discuss the whole issue threadbare.

The Vice-Chancellor said that some guidelines would be prepared. Whatever Committee is formed by the Committee should give an output before his term concludes. The Committee should give its report by the end of March.

Professor Chaman Lal said that a Senate Committee should be formed instead of a Syndicate Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate is elected by the Senate.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the Senate is a larger body and this is an issue related with the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there has been a tradition that all executive things are first pushed through the Syndicate.

Some of the members said that the proposal regarding referring the matter to the Syndicate is right as they have to follow the procedure.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the operative part is that the matter goes to the Syndicate and the Syndicate members sitting here know what job has to be done. It has to be done so that his successors could operate with less degree of doubt on what he is doing. He would take up the matter relating to how the data is to be demanded from the Colleges by interfacing the Professor B.S. Ghuman (Vice-Chancellor, Punjabi

University) and persuade him to talk to Professor Jaspal Singh (Vice-Chancellor, GNDU).

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they could see such requirements online also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has to talk to them and let there be a uniform way of doing things because Punjab Government is also involved in sending the representatives.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired that if there is uniformity, then what would happen.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then the Syndicate would take a call on it and the Syndicate has a right to do whatever it wanted because it is the Government of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether what is prevailing in GNDU, does the same prevail in Punjabi University also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the matter is related to the Colleges of Punjab, it should be the same for all the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that everything is already mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar while GNDU has just implemented it.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to make a proposal and this matter goes back to the Syndicate. He requested Shri Ashok Goyal to do some work and help him and he would put up the same before the Syndicate.

At this time, the House disbursed for lunch and when the meeting resumed, Item C-3 was taken up.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in Item C-2 on the agenda, be noted.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (1) the matter for preparation of guidelines for the constitution of Inspection/Selection Committees be referred to the Syndicate;
- (2) a Data Bank(s) of the persons available/eligible for Inspection and Selection Committees be prepared;

II. The **Item C-3 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-3. To evaluate the information with regard to the Principals of non-government aided/unaided Colleges affiliated to Panjab University who have been re-employed/granted extension beyond the age of superannuation, pursuant to decision/s of the Syndicate taken from time to time i.e. 2013 onwards.

The Vice-Chancellor said that most of the issues relating to Item C-3 got discussed while they were discussing Item C-2 which goes back to the Syndicate. There is some information which is given in Item C-3. If there is a need and if somebody wanted to add something, he/she could add but in principle this issue was discussed at great length during the Item C-2.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the information about 15 Colleges has been provided and out of 15 Principals, six Principals are retired from other Colleges and have been appointed in these Colleges. As far as he knows, the rules/regulations framed in this regard are that the extension/re-employment could be given in the same College and not in any other College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate should take cognisance of this.

Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that the matter (Item C-2) which they have referred to the Syndicate is also not on the agenda of the Syndicate meeting to be held on 24th February.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it should go to the meeting of Syndicate to be held on 24th February as was discussed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be placed before the Syndicate on 24th February.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that a Principal after retirement is selected on merit with 400 points but the approval is not given on the plea that the person has come from another University. There is no involvement of the other University in this as the person has been selected on merit by the Selection Committee of the University and is having 1200 points.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be such a case beyond the age of 60 years.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they are appointing the Principals up to 65 years.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is an extension and not an appointment.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is a re-appointment. He enquired as to why then the appointment has been made.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the appointment has been made, then it is wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not applicable to retired Principals. If the Syndicate wanted to take a call on it, let it do so.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in Item C-3 on the agenda, be referred to the Syndicate in its meeting to be held on 24th February, 2018 to be considered along with the issue of extension/re-employment of Principals of aided/unaided Colleges.

III.

The **Item C-4 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

- C-4.** To evaluate the issue of validity of degrees issued by CMJ University, Shillong (Meghalaya) on the basis of which the incumbents have been appointed in the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the items is to evaluate the issue of validity of degrees issued by CMJ University, Shillong (Meghalaya) on the basis of which the incumbents have been appointed. A few appointments have been made. This is also a matter which has been discussed several times in the governing bodies of the University. The last time, the University was supposed to write to CMJ University and the office of the Dean College Development Council has written to CMJ University and also to the Government of Meghalaya. So, in the background of whatever material is there in front of the members and the information which was made available by Principal B.C. Josan when they met last time, he has provided some information because some of the appointments pertain to his College. This information is being circulated to all. Now they could discuss and evaluate this issue on the basis of whatever material they know, whatever assessment from the material they may have gathered. This is the matter which has been discussed in the meetings of the governing body numerous times and also in the media. So, there is a concern regarding this thing. This is a private University which had come under some kind of a cloud because they awarded the degrees to a large number of people on the basis of a new system that they had introduced. There was some concern that they were not doing things right in the sense that a question mark was put on it, call got taken, sometimes it appeared that the University is not allowed to function, but they have fought it out in some way and now it looks it is functional. If it is functional, what happens to the degrees that they had awarded earlier whether the same are valid or not. There were numerous issues. At one time, one of their senior members of the Senate had said that he had certain documents which amount to saying that those degrees are probably not valid but from the information that has been made available by Principal B.C. Josan, it amounts to saying that the degrees are valid. All the facts and documents are before the members and whatever is available there in the University files, has also been made available to the members. Now, the members could comment on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that before they proceed with the item he would like to know that the copies of the letter which have been provided by Principal B.C. Josan and circulated today, how come that became a part of the official record of the University when the communication is not addressed to the University. The item was on the agenda of the Senate, the item was not discussed, he was completely astonished to read in the next days' newspapers that official confirmation from the University that the degrees are valid. Before proceeding further, he would like the Vice-Chancellor to clarify it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the official confirmation did not come but the University had accepted those degrees to be valid and that is why the approvals were given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Panjab University has said that these degrees are valid by way of official press note issued to the press without getting it validated from the Senate and without circulating the letter to the Senate and without the letter having been addressed to Panjab University and without getting any reply to the letter written by Panjab University to the State of Meghalaya and CMJ University. He did not know how this letter became the official document of the University. That is what he wanted to know.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that Principal B.C. Josan made available this letter to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether it is a part of the University records. Is there any noting by the Vice-Chancellor that the degrees be approved?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the degrees have already been approved and that is why the approvals have been given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what they are discussing today has already been confirmed through media that the Panjab University says that these are the valid degrees. Then what they are discussing today.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know as to what is the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue is that a private person brings something.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Principal B.C. Josan is not a private person.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he says something in the House, the Vice-Chancellor asks to bring the documents, to give in writing, to share with him in confidence and here somebody gives the letter which is addressed as 'to whom it may concern' and without putting it before the competent body before which the agenda is to be discussed, a press note is issued that the degrees are valid and that too on a letter based on a letter written by that University which right from the day has never accepted that it is not invalid degree. The question is that could they accept the contention of that University which is fighting its legal battle in the High Court or the Supreme Court or they have to go by what the Supreme Court has said. That is what his question is.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know what Shri Ashok Goyal is asking and what he (Vice-Chancellor) is supposed to answer. His understanding is that the University had accepted. The Dean College Development Council had got his (Vice-Chancellor) signature on the approval to be given to these candidates on the premise that there were adequate papers on record to say that the degree is valid. On the basis of that, the approval had been given. Now there is an issue that the approvals have been wrongly given as if the approvals were given when the degree is not valid. A Principal of the College and a member of the Senate has made available this thing. So, it is not a private person that he has given something. It is one of the premier affiliated Colleges of the University whose Principal has made available this and brought it to his knowledge as a member of the Senate as well.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the authentication of the letter. He has never heard of the official designation of Verification Incharge. Is there any nomenclature in the University?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that since they have written a letter, the reply could also be received by the University if the same has been received by Principal B.C. Josan.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could defer the matter.

Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired as to what is the agenda item before them, whether they have to discuss an individual case or CMJ University as a whole. The item before them is the issue related with CMJ University whereas the papers attached with the

item are related with an individual. Some of the candidates have been given the approval while the approval of others has been stopped. The item before the House is whether they have to consider the CMJ University as a valid or not. They are not discussing any individual case. Legal opinion has been obtained four times on the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it becomes a case of an individual because Shri Ashok Goyal is having some documents.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Supreme Court has accepted CMJ University to be a valid University.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it has been accepted as a valid University. He pointed out that CMJ University is a valid University and there is no doubt on it. But some of the degrees have been issued by CMJ University without course work. Then the Supreme Court asked the same to get verified and the candidates have applied to the University for verification. Nobody is saying that CMJ University is illegal or is not in the list of universities available on the website. After the verdict of the Supreme Court, that University issued a notice asking the candidates to get their degrees verified and the candidates had applied in the year 2014 and till the year 2018, there is no reply. The candidate in question is asking for provisional approval whereas they are granting regular approval. He requested to first look into all the documents which have been attached with the item. What is the office note of the University on this item? Why the University has stopped the approval of other candidates who have qualified from that University?

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should not be stopped and the approval should be given.

Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired then why other candidates have not been given the approval.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the other candidates should also be given the provisional approval.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the problem started when the office is saying that CMJ University is not a valid University. Mr. Sandeep Chopra says that they should wait and legal opinion has been obtained four times.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean College Development Council why the process of approval has been stopped.

Shri Ashok Goyal shared with the House that the Vice-Chancellor is asking the Dean College Development Council as to why the other cases are also not being processed as if a decision has already been taken by the competent body of the University that the degrees are valid while they are questioning as to how an approval has already been granted which is in violation of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. So, let them not take a decision in haste that since two cases have been approved, the other cases should also be approved. He wished to be wrong if what he is going to state is not based on facts. He brought it to the notice of the House and the stand of Panjab University in the case of CMJ University degrees that on 30th April, 2013, the then Visitor of CMJ University passed an order that the degrees be withdrawn, recommended to the State Government to dissolve the University. Two

recommendations were made. The CMJ University or maybe in the name of CMJ Foundation challenged the order of 30th April, 2013 in the High Court of State of Meghalaya wherein the orders passed by the Visitor were upheld. The CMJ University went into LPA in the same High Court which also upheld the decision. The CMJ Foundation challenged in SLP and a Bench headed by Justice G.S. Singhvi on 13.09.2013 while passing the order divided the issue in two parts whereby the Supreme Court appreciated that keeping in view the facts which were placed before it, it was a fit case for the University to be dissolved and they ordered that process for dissolution of the University in terms of section 48 of the CMJ University Act be initiated and University be dissolved. That means they had accepted the orders of the Visitor dated 30th April, 2013 to be valid. But taking a lenient view, they said that there is another party which is aggrieved, i.e., those students whose degrees have been declared illegal or whose admissions have been declared illegal. They directed the State Government to initiate the process of dissolution which was to be done by the Legislative Assembly of Meghalaya. But for the students, they said, whose degrees have been declared illegal, they should represent to Government of Meghalaya which after hearing them would pass an order taking sympathetic view. Obviously, since it was the order of the Supreme Court, the Meghalaya Government had no option but to follow the directions. Accordingly, the Meghalaya Government through its Department of Higher and Technical Education gave a public notice on 14.02.2014 qua those students for taking the decision of those students who had been awarded degrees by CMJ University. Simultaneously, the Government of Meghalaya initiated the process of dissolution of CMJ University. In the earlier portion, the aggrieved were the students and in the case of the dissolution the aggrieved party was the University. CMJ University's stand right from the day one is that they are duly registered University floated under the University Act and whatever degrees have been awarded by them are legally valid. That is what their stand was and that is what their stand is today also and that is what they have mentioned in this 'to whomsoever it may concern' document. But they (Panjab University) are trying to give the leverage that the University is, which, he shared with the House that, the State of Meghalaya has not accepted. The students including the candidate whose name is appearing in this letter, she appeared before that Committee appointed by the State Government on 25.02.2014 along with all the relevant documents to establish that her degree was valid. She signed her personal presence before the Committee and the Committee after deliberating, all the documents were also mentioned in the order which documents she had produced in support of her contention that her degree was valid, as mandated by the Supreme Court, vide order dated 31st March, 2014 under the directions of the Supreme Court of India, the Department of Higher and Technical Education, State of Meghalaya declared all the degrees invalid as was mandated by the Supreme Court. Not only they invalidated, they informed, all those who had appeared there personally, by way of registered post that their degrees are invalid. That letter was posted by State of Meghalaya in July 2014. If he (Vice-Chancellor) wanted, he could give the registered number also vide which the State of Meghalaya has informed this candidate because only one candidate's name has been mentioned here and it has not been mentioned in general that the degrees are valid and that too by CMJ University who in fact is the aggrieved party. The issue was placed before the Vice-Chancellor wherein it was contended as applied by the respective candidates mentioning that as per the directions of the Supreme Court they have represented to the State of Meghalaya for validating their degrees and in the meantime the University is requested to grant them provisional approval. The issue after having been routed through various offices of the University reached the Law Officer of the University who quoted that in similar situated cases, they have taken a decision to await the orders of Meghalaya Government which was endorsed by everybody including the Dean College Development Council or whosoever was there in between till the file

reached the table of the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor gave a noting in his own hands that let them take the legal opinion from Mr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu who gave the opinion, appreciating the directions of the Supreme Court, that so far Meghalaya Government has not passed any adverse order. Meaning thereby, he was also appreciative of the fact that if any adverse order is passed in terms of Supreme Court's order, then probably the degrees would be invalid. Whose duty was it to find out from the candidate who had given in writing to the University that they have represented to Meghalaya Government and till the decision is arrived, they should be given provisional approval. He enquired whether the University has asked till date ever from the candidates that what happened to their personal hearing in which they had represented in 2014. It is now almost 4 years because it was on 25th March, 2014 when those candidates appeared, the University has never bothered to ask the candidates as to what happened to their hearing, what is the decision of State of Meghalaya which they were referring to while giving the representation seeking provisional approval. The order passed by the Meghalaya Government on 31st March, 2014 duly conveyed to all the candidates in the month of June-July, 2014 attained finality. To his knowledge, none of the students/candidates ever challenged the decision of Meghalaya State in any court of law or before any superior statutory authority of the State or the Centre or the UGC. Simultaneously, the State Government also took a decision to dissolve the University by way of taking the decision in Meghalaya Assembly. Since in the second case, the University was the aggrieved party, it filed a writ petition in the Meghalaya High Court challenging the order of Legislative Assembly in dissolving the University as per section 48 thereby not even mentioning about the validity of the degrees which the University is claiming that their degrees are valid. In July, 2015, the Meghalaya High Court Single Bench quashed the decision of Meghalaya Government in dissolving the University. When that dissolution was quashed, on 02.01.2017 a representation comes under the signature of one Mr. Vinod Kumar wherein he says that the decision taken by the Syndicate in its meeting in 2013 is completely illegal, wrong, etc. and not sustained in the eyes of law. Perhaps that is also annexed but he has not seen that. That representation of Mr. Vinod Kumar was endorsed or recommended by two members of the Senate and submitted to the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor appoints a Committee under the Chairmanship of one of those two to see what they are saying is correct or not. Thereafter it was taken to the Syndicate and probably a Committee was formed of 4-5 members. This Committee of 4-5 members again delegated it to a sub-Committee amongst themselves to submit the report. It submitted a report to the Syndicate. Nothing went to the office of the University at any stage. Straightaway it went to the Syndicate and in the month of March or April, 2017, the Syndicate said that all the degrees are valid and in the month of July, 2017, a circular was issued that the degrees are valid. It was only on 10th September when the meeting of the Senate was taking place when it came to his notice for the first time that some degrees have been validated and some of the teachers in the affiliated Colleges aggrieved by the decisions of some of the Principals of the Colleges and some of the Managements, in not recognising some degrees and in discriminating against some candidates, what are they talking of. It was said that the University has validated the degrees of CMJ University. This has been done by the University notwithstanding the fact that in a case named Priyanka Sharma versus Panjab University which was filed in Punjab and Haryana High Court in 2014 itself wherein they had claimed as it was only a B.Ed. degree and she wanted only admission in some course in Panjab University and Panjab University denied the admission saying that these degrees are invalid and they are not going to accept any degree of CMJ University. She filed a writ petition that on the one hand, she had also said that she had represented to the State of Meghalaya in which the decision is awaited, she also referred to the decision of the Supreme Court, the notice was issued and the University went into a filed a reply in the High Court in 2014. He made the

House aware of what is happening in the University that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. The University took a stand in the High Court that she could not be granted admission as all the degrees of CMJ University are not valid. While replying to another contention of the petitioner that some of the candidates based on the degrees awarded by CMJ University had been appointed in the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University and the University's stand is that after 18.06.2013, the University has not made any appointment. That is the stand of Panjab University as on today. Not knowing the name of the candidate whose name is appearing here, was not only appointed after 18.06.2013, but was subsequently also approved after 18.06.2013. So, what they are doing. Tomorrow if the High Court asks the University that it is telling something else while doing something else. He did not know, Mrs. Anu Chatrath would be able to tell him better, what it is. Could it be called perjury, could it be called as misleading the Court, could it be called as taking a false stand? Only to justify the stand of the University in case of a student who was seeking admission in a particular course but simultaneously appointing a person with much higher degree of the same University to the post of an Assistant Professor. Subsequently, when they filed a writ petition in the High Court, as he said earlier, in July 2015, the Meghalaya High Court quashed the decision of dissolution and the Committee made the recommendations making only that order of July 2015 a base not even touching anything about what was directed by the Supreme Court and in confidence he was shared that probably they did not know about any order of the Supreme Court but they were supplied only with a copy of the order of Meghalaya High Court. He did not know how far that is correct. It is mentioned in that recommendation that the Meghalaya Government against that quashing filed an SLP in the Supreme Court and that SLP stands withdrawn thereby concluding that the decision of Meghalaya High Court is final. Thus concluding that since the dissolution has been quashed, automatically the degrees invalidated by the State Government of Meghalaya under the orders of the Supreme Court they are automatically nullified though they have not written anything about that because they have not mentioned any such thing that State of Meghalaya has ever declared the degrees as invalid. The matter ended. He did not know, may be Mrs. Anu Chatrath might be knowing or other legal luminaries must be knowing, that a Government which went into SLP in Supreme Court, then withdrew the SLP, could they be sitting so silently. It was his own thinking that it could not be possible. They must have challenged it somewhere, they must have withdrawn the SLP on some technical grounds, may be with liberty to file fresh or might be to file it at some proper forum. He shared with the House that they filed the LPA in the High Court of which no reference has been made. He wondered as to whose duty is it to enlighten the House as far as the latest position is concerned. In LPA, the Division Bench quashed the orders passed by the Single Bench thereby bringing the situation to status quo ante that the University did not exist but this fight was only qua dissolution. Single Bench on dissolution, Double Bench on dissolution, one order in favour and another order against. But nobody, either the University or the students or the candidate in question, have ever challenged in any court of law the declaration of their degrees to be invalid by the State Government. The Committee has gone further, over and above the Supreme Court, saying that otherwise also it is settled law that the degrees could not be withdrawn retrospectively as if the Supreme Court is consisting of fools who have ordered the State to take representation and decide about the fate of the degrees of the students but here they passed a judgment that it is a settled law the degrees could not be withdrawn retrospectively. His simple submission is that, though he had discussed this with the Vice-Chancellor in person also, when the matter was brought before the Syndicate in its meeting in January, 2015, the Vice-Chancellor had given an assurance to the Syndicate that he would take an affidavit from the candidates that their degrees were never cancelled. He kept on speaking in so many meetings and to his knowledge

some public notice had been issued, these candidates had represented to the State of Meghalaya, they have appeared personally also and some orders have been passed by the State of Meghalaya. But every time ignorance was shown and they could see the minutes of the Syndicate, nowhere it was ever clarified that what he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying on the basis of his knowledge, in fact, is part of the official record of the University wherein the candidates have themselves claimed that they have represented to the State of Meghalaya. At that time also he was asked to bring some document if he had. The documents which are in the custody of the University, instead of sharing the same with the competent body, i.e., the Syndicate and the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor expected him to bring which he could not bring. But finally when he came to know that if he is claiming something, the onus would be on him to prove that what he is saying is correct. He has no question to go through as to what is contained in the files. It was subsequently when the Vice-Chancellor permitted him to go and see the files, he was completely taken aback that what he was claiming on the basis of his personal knowledge only, it was part of the University record which was never shared with him. Then he brought it to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor that to his (Shri Ashok Goyal) knowledge the affidavit to this effect has not been taken by the University. Why? The affidavit which was submitted by the candidate was about something which was not decided by the Syndicate. There was only one line missing that their degrees have never been cancelled or invalidated. That raised a suspicion in his mind that if the candidates have appeared for personal hearing and still they are not saying it that it has never been invalidated, that means that it has been invalidated. That is how he was able to get the record, the copies of the orders and attendance sheets where the candidates had appeared personally and the copies of covering letter of the registered letter that was sent conveying to them that the degrees have been cancelled. He is very much thankful to the Vice-Chancellor, he did not know how far it is correct because the copy of the affidavit which seems to have been obtained by the University in September, 2017 has not been annexed here. He asked one or two persons from the office who said that it has been annexed. So if they have been saying that it has been annexed, it might have been annexed which escaped his attention. If the affidavit has been filed by somebody that the degree has not been invalidated and affidavit has been filed, they could see the affidavit. If the affidavit has been filed that the degree has never been cancelled and what he is saying is correct who is at fault. If the affidavit is found to be wrong, what action this House decides to take. The file is with the office which he had just glanced, they could see that the affidavit which has been submitted with the University is with a covering letter probably signed by the Principal of that College. The covering letter is of dated 12th October 2017 and this letter is submitting an affidavit attested on 13th October 2017 to the University. What is this happening? That means that the covering letter is prepared in advance. The affidavit by the candidate is being got notarised on the 13th and it is being sent with a letter dated 12th October. In the light of what he has told, to send a letter to CMJ University, what he has been given to understand at the suggestion of Professor R.P. Bambah and Shri (Rashpal) Malhotra, he agreed to sit with the Vice-Chancellor in the office of the Registrar which was in the last to last meeting because they wanted to explain it to the Vice-Chancellor that how this matter could be resolved because nobody in the House is in anyway interested in supporting the cause of any candidate having an invalid degree specially Professor Arun Kumar Grover who has been campaigning the cause of excellent research. That is for the Vice-Chancellor to see on academic front whether somebody could obtain a degree of Ph.D. within a span of 1½ years or two years and that too by serving in an institution at Chandigarh simultaneously. He is not going into that. This letter is received not bothering about the reply to the University letter which has been written to CMJ University though while discussing with the Vice-Chancellor he had specifically said that all their degrees are valid. Whether they have to go by what the stand of the

University is or they have to go by what the Supreme Court says. That is why he had suggested on that day they should write to the State of Meghalaya who has passed the orders as directed by the Supreme Court of India and not to CMJ University who are fighting the legal battle in various Courts claiming that their degrees are valid and their University is valid. So their stand has never been there since 2010 when the University came into inception that their degrees are not valid. They have never said any such thing. The Supreme Court judgment is contained in the file, the legal opinion is also contained in the file, the legal opinion taken after the order of July 2015 of Meghalaya Government came is also on the file but the copy of the order passed by the DB in Meghalaya is not in the file. He did not know why. Maybe because nobody knows that an LPA was filed against the order of 2015 in 2017 and it was in 2017 after withdrawing from the Supreme Court, they went into an LPA and he could understand that the Supreme Court might have said that why they have come straight to it and they filed an LPA and the order was set aside. He is just giving a theoretical proposition that if in 2017 after the Meghalaya High Court DB has passed the order of setting aside of single bench what action Panjab University took. That means till the favourable order comes, they are inclined to take the action, if the order is not favourable, they are sitting silent. This whole thing either should have been followed up by the Laws Department of the University or by the concerned candidates or by those who are interested in some or the other way like Professor Grover has rightly informed that this letter dated 18th January because the Senate was to meet on 21st January, 2018, this letter of 18th January has been brought and that too in the form of 'to whomsoever it may concern'. He wondered what did stop that University to reply to the letter of Panjab University and what did stop the Meghalaya Government from reply to the letter of Panjab University. When he read the letter today, he could understand that the University is claiming in the last line where it is written in bold that "it is further clarified that the concerned State Government, Central Government officials have no statutory power and authority to deny the validity of a degree duly awarded by a University under section 22 of the UGC Act." Wherefrom he could easily infer that even they are admitting that they are claiming that their University degree is valid notwithstanding the action taken by the State Government in declaring the degrees invalid. Now, the question before the House is whether any action done by the State Government under the direction of the Supreme Court could be negated by any such letter. To him, it is no. Now the question comes, that is why he was referring, that the whole decision has been taken by the Committee and by the Syndicate on the basis of a letter written by Mr. Vinod Kumar. Who is that Mr. Vinod Kumar and in the same breath, he replied that he (Mr. Vinod Kumar) is also holder of one such degree. Then the whole homework had to be done by him because the onus is on him, there is no paraphernalia support. No assistance from the University. He had to search on his own and found that this Mr. Vinod Kumar also appeared before that Committee on 28th March 2014 and his degree also has been invalidated by the same Committee. Why he is saying so, that there is a reply by the State of Meghalaya that there were some 3-4 thousand odd students who had represented for their degrees to be declared valid and all those who had represented, all the degrees have been declared invalid. Obviously, if Mr. Vinod Kumar also appeared, his degree also stands invalidated. Why he is saying is because he does not have the copy of the order invalidating the degree of Mr. Vinod Kumar. But he definitely has the copy of the order invalidating the degree of a candidate whose name is appearing in this letter invalid. The issue is not so simple. He had suggested in the office of the Registrar that the University should write to the State of Meghalaya. When he enquired, in spite of that the letter was written to CMJ University and copy to State of Meghalaya. He wondered what stopped Panjab University from writing to the body which in fact was given the powers to decide the fate of the degree holders by the Supreme Court. Let him confess that the Vice-Chancellor is not personally interested in anything as he was so

liberal on that day and said that he has no problem, 2-3 persons could go there and meet his acquaintances who would help in getting the information. But the things stopped there. In the next meeting on 21st January, this letter was brought, was not even shown to the members, was not discussed in spite of the agenda being there but in the next day's newspapers he read that the Panjab University has declared these degrees to be valid in view of the receipt of this letter. According to him, it was not so as per his opinion. But from today's stand which the Vice-Chancellor is taking that yes he has accepted the degrees and is now inclined to approve some similarly placed cases of other candidates also not realising the stand which they have taken as Panjab University in the Court. What would happen to those candidates who have lost life time opportunity of pursuing their career and thereby taking a stand which is contrary to the facts on the file specifically saying that after this date they have not appointed anybody while the fact is that they have appointed two candidates before that. There were some other candidates who were appointed by various affiliated Colleges prior to these cases and were not approved for obvious reasons. When the approval was not granted by the Panjab University, their services were discontinued and were thrown out. Since those persons are no more on the rolls of the College, how they are going to grant approval to them now as somebody else has taken their place. He wanted to point out another interesting case before the House. In 2016, a member of the Senate wrote to the Vice-Chancellor that there is lot of hue and cry amongst the CMJ University degree holders and I understand that some of the cases have been approved and he is sure that it is only after looking into all the technicalities, legalities and findings the degrees to be valid, such appointments have been approved. So it is requested that that the same treatment may be meted out to the other candidates also. He was surprised, that member is no more a member of the Senate now but was a member of the earlier Senate, no care was taken of that letter because he was a member of the Senate. But in 2017 on 2nd January, somebody who is not even known to the University, has not even forwarded his letter through proper channel about which they are discussing so many things, working in a College as Lecturer on contract or temporary basis. The letter is also not forwarded through proper channel and the Vice-Chancellor straightaway marks it to the Syndicate, the Syndicate takes the decision which is circulated amongst the Colleges which came as a surprise to them. He thought as to who this powerful man is, is more powerful than a member of the Senate, is more powerful than even a member of the Syndicate that he writes a letter, gets a decision in his favour from the Syndicate and the same is circulated, the person must be very-very powerful. Again he had to do his own research which he shared with the Vice-Chancellor. That person is none other than the first cousin of the candidate whose name is appearing in this letter. Under these circumstances, could they say that Panjab University is transparent, could they say that they take decisions on merit, could they say that they take lawful decisions, could they say that they have any respect for the highest court of the country. They could only say, 'you show me the face, I will tell you the rule'. Different rules from different people, may be they are similarly placed. In view of what he has told, still if somebody feels that the degrees are valid, he would like to be enlightened and correct his opinion. But his only request is that let them take a decision under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor which does not cause any embarrassment to Panjab University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they had discussed this issue at length in the last meeting of the Syndicate and it was resolved that they should write a letter in this regard. According to him, they should wait for the reply of the Meghalaya Government and official reply of CMJ University. If the reply from both these authorities is the same and in agreement with each other, then the issue is closed. If there is a difference of opinion, then it is a complicated issue as pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal, the Supreme

Court directions are involved and the Government of Meghalaya has also done some exercise in this matter. If the opinion of Meghalaya Government is different, then either they should write to the UGC or discuss the matter in the light of the replies to be received from both these authorities. At the moment, this is a hypothetical discussion. Let the official reply from the Meghalaya Government and CMJ University come and only then they could about their stand. Only after the receipt of the replies from these authorities, they could again discuss this matter in the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the letter which has been brought to their attention by Principal B.C. Josan, if this is a reply from the University (CMJ), they could send this letter to the Meghalaya Government and ask them as to what is their take on it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that this letter should be sent both to the Meghalaya Government as well as CMJ University to know their stand on the letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not that casual an issue. Of course, he knew that maybe under the tenure of the Vice-Chancellor nobody has ever gone from this University to verify the degrees from other universities. Otherwise it has been a regular practice from this University to specially go to Magadh University and Patna University to verify the University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened and said that it was also discussed in the last meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are ready to go for the University for getting the verification. Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would also go.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is only in this case which has been hanging fire since 2013, the University has not bothered even to send an official to Meghalaya to find out what the facts are.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Dean College Development Council was handling it in the year 2015 and he has put in all the papers and on the basis of the papers and the note that he wrote, he (Vice-Chancellor) has given the approval.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in fact what was put before the Vice-Chancellor was not for granting the approval. It is the Vice-Chancellor who has overruled the recommendations of the office. He pointed out that there is a person who filed an RTI application before Meghalaya Government to tell the fate of the degrees. He did not want to make any allegation. The Meghalaya Government who under the orders of the Supreme Court invalidated the degree was never ready to share the information with anybody that the degrees have been invalidated for obvious reasons because CMJ University had said that whatever loss has been caused to it and further loss be avoided. They would be surprised that an application under RTI Act written in English was never replied and when that person filed an appeal, the Government took a stand that his application was sent for translation into English. But the person said that his application was in English. How it was sent for translation? Before the appellent authority, a stand was taken that most of the applications received are either in Hindi or Punjabi, maybe through an oversight, this was also sent for translation. Then it was asked to show as to how many applications were received in vernacular and other languages. It was found that there was none such application because they had been replying to everybody that the application had been sent for translation in English. In

this case only, the Commission imposed a fine on the State of Meghalaya for the delay of 60 days @ Rs.50/- or Rs.100/- per day for not supplying the information. That is why he apprehended that if they keep on waiting for the reply from there, it would never come. So, why should they not send some responsible person who is accountable.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath congratulated Shri Ashok Goyal that he has done a great homework. After hearing Shri Ashok Goyal, two things have come out simultaneously. First is that if anything was already on the record of the University that should have been supplied to the members or any Committee constituted. Secondly, Shri Ashok Goyal has said that the Supreme Court had taken two decisions directing the State Government to take steps to dissolve this University meaning thereby that the date of decision of the Supreme Court is a relevant date. When the steps were to be taken in pursuance of the Supreme Court, steps were taken by the State Government to dissolve that University. The date of decision of dissolving that University is relevant because any student who has passed prior to that date, dissolving is always done prospectively. She could provide thousands of judgments on the point that even at a time when a decision was taken by a State Government that this degree is invalid, the Supreme Court has gone to the extent that the student who has already taken admission in a course on the date it was not dissolved or it was a valid University, their degree could not be declared invalid. Again and again Shri Ashok Goyal is saying that the decision is contrary to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has given the decision regarding the future for dissolving that University. So far as the other directions by the Supreme Court was that a student who is already studying. But Shri Ashok Goyal has raised a valid point that if the State Government has taken a decision declaring their degrees invalid, that should have been challenged.

On a point of clarification, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Supreme Court has not said so for the degrees to be awarded in future. The Supreme Court has directed for the degrees already awarded which have been declared illegal.

Continuing, Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the State Government has passed the order declaring or invalidating their degrees that should have been challenged by the affected candidates. Unless that is challenged, then the stand and the status of the order of the Government stands. That is the legal position.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that the Dean College Development Council and Shri Prabhjit Singh be sent for the verification.

Dr. Subhash Sharma also supported it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the first issue is as to what is the status of CMJ University as on today. He has gone through the UGC website where in the list of private universities, it is mentioned at Sr.No.114 that CMJ University is a private University. That is the status as on today. Obviously, when they talk about any University, the University has to look forward to the list of universities which is being provided by the UGC and the UGC says that till date CMJ University is a valid University. Then comes the question that what is the status of the degrees which have been issued by any University and any University is a statutory body and is recognised by the UGC. If any University which is recognised by UGC and issues the degrees, about those degrees any other University could not say that those are invalid degrees. As far as who is supposed to say whether the degrees are valid or invalid, it is not the Government, it is the University only. He said that when they are talking about the Supreme Court judgment, in context to what it was. When the orders were issued by

the Secretary of the Governor directing the State Government to dissolve the University, it was in context to that this University went to Supreme Court. Obviously, when this University went to Supreme Court, in the meantime, the Visitor, i.e., the Governor gave detailed recommendations why this University should be dissolved. But when the State Government Counsel was asked whether the University had been actually dissolved or not, his answer was that he does not know about that and he has to find it out. If they look at the exact order of the Supreme Court appearing on page 293 of the agenda, where of course two directions were given, the first one was that one has to take appropriate action under section 48 of the Act of 2009 after giving notice and reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioners. It is not that the Supreme Court was saying that the University should be dissolved but it said that it has to be decided after giving reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioners. Along with those recommendations, a recommendation was that the degrees be invalidated which is not a correct kind of recommendation because once a degree has been given by a University which has been duly constituted by the State and recognized by the UGC, it could not be said that the degrees issued by the University are invalid. Of course, there was certain issue that the State Government was supposed to check particularly for the Ph.D. whether the course work for the Ph.D. conducted or not, as these were the directions of the UGC, and that it was not through distance mode. Those were the important issues which, of course, the Government should have checked. He did not know what the Government has actually checked. But looking into the case and particularly taking into consideration the fact that even today the University still exists in the list of the universities approved by the UGC. Of course, there are different judgments of different High Courts. He quoted a judgment of the Bombay High Court which says that "it will not be permissible for one University to examine the correctness of degrees awarded by another University when both these degrees are recognized by the UGC". Of course, there are other judgments also. He believed that keeping in view all these things whatever has been suggested by the Vice-Chancellor, they could also consult. If they look at the letter which has been circulated today, it talks about the legal status and validity of degrees. This is to be checked what is the legal status. They could check it either with the University or with the Government. Ultimately, any degree which has been issued by a University which even as on today is not dissolved, they could not say that those degrees are invalid.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he has not studied this case thoroughly as has been done by Shri Ashok Goyal and others. He felt that taking a decision on the basis of this letter would be wrong. He does not know the law but knows English and could not figure out what the excerpts try to say because this is only an excerpt from a long judgment. It talks of an impugned order and they do not know what that impugned order is. It talks of quashing and they do not know what is being quashed. Mrs. Anu Chatrath has raised a very valid point whether it is prospective or retrospective. By reading the para, they could not come to any conclusion. So, it is better that they do not take any haste decision and they should seek a clarification from the Government of Meghalaya. If they do not reply, then they would have to wait for the reply. He did not know whether sending an emissary would expedite the matter or not. Nevertheless, from the letter it is not clear what order is being quashed, from which date it is being quashed, what is the impugned order. Let them not take any haste decision and wait for the reply from the Government of Meghalaya.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this case needs more thorough enquiry because it is not a question of a particular candidate or some candidates those who were denied admission or those who were taken into the job. On these issues, certain complications are going to emerge because for them it is not only a question whether the degrees are

valid or not vis-à-vis CMJ University, Meghalaya. The University in itself is being questioned. Once the University has been questioned by a Court, there is an opinion right in the House whether the University which was questioned by the Court, the degrees given before that are valid or if the University has been questioned from a particular date, then those degrees also become invalid. They have to see in between the lines as to how the decisions were made by the Court and what those decisions are going to affect the future of the students because after 1991 onwards when privatization started taking place, a lot many Universities are coming up in their own State and neighbor and the students are rushing to those universities. There are some ifs and buts about those universities. Then they could say that their University is a valid University and the other universities are show off universities. So many things are coming up. Thereby this issue has become an issue at the national level. At this moment, they could find that this University of Meghalaya says that its degrees are valid because these are duly awarded by a University under section 22 of the UGC Act, 1956. He drew the attention of the House towards Section 22 of the UGC Act. Why could they also not ask the UGC that this has been quoted by the University that under this Act, the University has awarded the degrees. Whether the UGC could say that this University still exists on its website and whether it still holds the degrees issued by it as valid. The students do not know about it. As far as the candidate is concerned, at the moment, the candidate is invisible for him. But for him, the matter is important. Anybody who has taken a degree from the University does not know what kind of a University it is, how the degree is given. There are many students from his area, from his own village, who took admission in Australia, Canada and the Colleges were valid. The students went there and after a period of 1½ years, the College was declared totally illegal. Then the students approached the Court in those countries that they came there on a proper visa which has been given by the embassies and then they got the admission. But, now since the College has been declared invalid, where should they go, they need permanent residency and want to work there. This kind of problem is coming up at different levels. The students who got admission did not know primarily that it is a deemed University. Those students got the admission because their resources were giving them such kind of a facility. At this moment, if they want to help those students as a Lecture in a College or in the University or want the student to go for higher studies in the University, then comes the matter as to what this University is. Here comes the question of parity whether the degree is valid or not. In this very case, the University is still keeping on saying that it is valid but the Court says something different and the Governor has given different interpretation. How could they take a decision at this moment? The way they took a decision earlier was challenged on the basis of facts and figures. Now they have got another letter that they got something from the High Court, something from the Supreme Court. Are they in a position right now to make a decision on the basis of those documents which Shri Ashok Goyal has given to them because they are confused whether the letter is right or the other letter?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they should read 2-3 paragraphs of the Supreme Court proceedings and they could know about the status of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not quoted any judgment either for or against any case. He has referred to the judgment only in this particular relevant case. He is not referring to the judgments. He drew the attention about the stand taken by the University as per letter written by the University to Principal, A.S. College, Khanna, appearing on page 450 of the agenda. This letter is dated 5th or 6th March, 2014. This was also a case for approval of one particular Assistant Professor. He read out the letter which says “kindly refer to your letter No. W/PSC/34 dated 07.05.2013 on the subject cited above. The approval case is being kept in abeyance, till some decision is taken by

the State of Meghalaya on the issue of degree awarded by the CMJ University, Meghalaya. However, copies of the orders dated 13.09.2013 and 02.01.2014 passed by Supreme Court and Dr. Punerdeep Singh Aujla is advised to make his representation to the CMJ University, Meghalaya, if he deems it proper to do so.” Prior to this case, the stand of the University was to follow the directions of the Supreme Court. Subsequently, the stand of the University which is represented in the Hon’ble High Court by none other than the learned Advocate Mrs. Alka Chatrath who has taken a stand that “it is relevant to mention that Panjab University after 12.06.2013 has not appointed/approved the appointment of any candidate who has acquired eligibility for any post on the basis of degree awarded by CMJ University, Meghalaya”. This statement made by the University in the High Court has also been made part of the order passed by the High Court that the University stand is that no appointment has been made. It is a reported judgment. It was very clear that when they have not given this concession to anyone, how they could give the concession. When the Vice-Chancellor asked as to when this statement was given, Shri Ashok Goyal replied that statement is given in CWP No. 553 of 2014 and the date of reply is 21st April, 2014.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he looked at the file at some stage, Dr. Mandeep Josan had registered for Ph.D. in the year 2010 and awarded Ph.D. degree in December, 2012. It is about two years and the charitable view is that it is between 2 to 3 years. This is what the situation is. On the basis of the degree that she had, applied for a position, what is the status of her degree when she applied. The message is going on that the degree of that University cancelled, things are being contested that as per the Supreme Court orders, the candidates have to write to the University. That is what Shri Ashok Goyal has mentioned that the candidate had written to the Government and his (Shri Ashok Goyal) contention is that the Government has informed her that her degree is cancelled.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would provide all the documents here itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not questioning it. Whatever Shri Ashok Goyal is saying is that her (Mandeep Josan) degree is cancelled. It is nowhere in the record that her degree is cancelled.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the documents be taken from Shri Ashok Goyal and if the degree of any candidate is cancelled, then, there is no issue to discuss.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those documents have to be validated by the Meghalaya Government.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that Shri Ashok Goyal is responding and let him respond.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that there are two legal issues, who is the competent authority to declare the degree invalid. It is not so simple as Shri Prabhjit Singh is saying.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not decide these things as members of a 90-member House. This matter has to be determined legally in its entirety. He was giving just some numbers and dates. The candidate had applied in the year 2010, the degree was awarded in the year 2012 and the approval case had come to the University somewhere in 2013 or 2014. In the meanwhile, there is hue and cry in the background the Supreme Court order that the things are not valid. They had lot of applications in

the University. People came to take admission in the University with very high percentage of marks, i.e., 80% to 90% and the University was concerned that if an institution is under a cloud and giving very high percentage of marks and if these students are permitted on the basis of marks to gain admission in the University departments, all the University departments would be filled up with students of CMJ degree because the students of that University had exceptional high percentage of marks normally not coming from Kurukshetra University or Punjabi University, Patiala or from the catchment area of Panjab University. They had no way of normalizing it. So, the matter came up and some competent body on behalf of the Panjab University in the year 2013 took a decision that such students should not be admitted. So, this is the background that those students were not admitted. The matter goes on up and down. The approval of Dr. Mandeep Josan has been given only in the month of September or October, 2015. No approval was given in the year 2014. If the University Advocate filed a statement that up to 2014, no approval was given, there is no wrong statement because no approval has been given.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that it is written that no one has been appointed or approved.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have made the appointment in 2012. The reply is not regarding approval but the reply submitted is that they have not appointed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the contention has been given that the affiliated Colleges have made the appointment on the basis of the degrees awarded by that University and the University has submitted a reply that they have not made any appointment after 12.06.2013.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it be got checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a quashing thing comes in and that does not get transmitted to all the affiliated Colleges of the University instantaneously not to screen such candidates. The screening is a complicated thing. Whether the screening is to be done on the basis of M.Tech. degree or Ph.D.? These are all matters of details which are to be figured out. The factual figure is that the appointment has been approved on 30.09.2015 on the basis of the note prepared on the basis of information collected from many sources. A note had been presented to him and he had said, okay, why a person should not be given approval. In her case, the DAV Management had not cancelled the appointment, but they have heard that in some of the cases where approval was not given, the appointments were cancelled. There are many cases in which the approval has not been granted till date. He did not know whether such candidates are continuing in service or not and whether the Managements have paid them the salary from their own resources.

On a point of order, Mrs. Anu Chatrath added that Shri Ashok Goyal was saying that the University has been taking a contrary stand in the Court. But the stand taken is perfect. So far as the year of passing of Ms. Mandeep Josan is concerned, it is before 12.06.2013, i.e. the date of decision by the Supreme Court. The affidavit which has been filed by the University in the Court says that "in reply to contents of para 8 of the petition, it is submitted that the Syndicate vide its resolution dated 27th July 2013, Para 46 had resolved that the degrees awarded by the CMJ University, Meghalaya irrespective of the year of award of degree which is placed before the Registrar, Vice-Chancellor and Syndicate after 12th June, 2013 be not granted equivalence." So the year of passing after 12th June, 2013 has not been granted equivalence by the Panjab

University. This is the affidavit filed by the Government. So far as the case of Ms. Mandeep Josan is concerned, she has seen her date of passing the examination, that is before the date of decision of the Supreme Court as well as before the date of resolution by the Syndicate. Both these decisions are after her passing. Ms. Mandeep Josan has two points in her favour. First is that who is the competent authority. If a University issues a certificate, under the rules the competent authority to cancel the certificate or degree is that University.

To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that not the Syndicate of any other University.

Continuing, Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that it is the University from which the candidate had taken the degree. Because the date of decision of the Supreme Court is 12th June, 2013 and after that the State Government has issued a notification dissolving that University. The dissolving of the University has a prospective effect. So, the students who had done prior to that, as Ms. Mandeep Josan had done in the year 2012, so she believed that her degree could not be questioned on the basis of the Supreme Court decision. A decision was taken by the Committee of Department of Laws of which she (Mrs. Anu Chatrath) was a member along with other Senate and Syndicate members, she is rightly being supported by the judgements of the Hon'ble Apex Court and stated that no degree could be invalidated by any court of law retrospectively. It could be invalidated prospectively only. She has supported it with the judgements and if the Senate members of the University wanted these judgments, she could provide the same.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they could defer it and wait for the reply from Meghalaya.

The Vice-Chancellor recommended that the matter is deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what decision has been taken on the item.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that the matter is deferred and they would approach the Meghalaya Government and confront it with this certificate and ask them what is their call on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it should also be recorded that whatever documents are available with him, he would give those documents to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that okay, fine, that document would also be sent to the Meghalaya Government.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested the name of Shri Sandeep Singh to visit Meghalaya.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that only the University official, whether the Dean College Development Council or the Registrar, should be deputed to visit Meghalaya and not any other person. To this, a few of the members said that the Dean College Development Council should be deputed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would talk to Professor Srivastava, the Vice-Chancellor of NEHU to help the Dean College Development Council.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the issue of validity of degrees issued by CMJ University be deferred;
- (2) the decision earlier taken by the Syndicate and circulated to all the concerned be kept in abeyance;
- (3) Shri Ashok Goyal be requested to provide all the relevant documents available with him concerning the case;
- (4) the Dean College Development Council be requested to personally visit Department of Education and Technical Education of Government of Meghalaya to collect information regarding the validity of Degrees issued by CMJ University and its status.

IV. The **Item C-5 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-5. To evaluate the information received from Manager, P.U. Guest House and Dean College Development Council with regard to booking of P.U. Guest House and Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan w.e.f. 2014 onwards.

NOTE: The information from D.C.D.C. with regard to booking of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan and P.U. Guest w.e.f. 2011 to 2013 will follow.

The information from D.C.D.C. with regard to booking of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan w.e.f. 2011 to 2013 was provided on the table in the meeting held on 21.01.2018.

While briefing about the item, the Vice-Chancellor said again there was a concern that the University Guest House is not available. The Senate members say that there is inadequate accommodation. The University Professors also say that there is inadequate accommodation whereas the fact of the matter is that since he joined as the Vice-Chancellor, the number of rooms available to the guests of the University has increased 3-4 times. The Guest House accommodation has enhanced and 7 suites have been added. There is a College Bhawan for the visitors from the Colleges. The Faculty House has also been renovated. The Golden Jubilee Guest House has also been improved a little bit. The Panjab University Alumni House has 14 suites though available at a cost. There is a huge lot of accommodation available on the campus. But still there is a feeling that the accommodation available on the campus for the guests of the University is inadequate. The problem is not of the availability of rooms. The problem is that rooms for official visits are available at a very low cost something which is Rs.100 or less. But there are other rooms which have to be cost effective. Cost effective is not to make profit but to recover the cost of a room in terms of linen and other services provided by the Guest House. So there is a cost of the order of Rs.100/- and another of the order of Rs.1000/-. There is a ten times difference but the accommodation is available on the campus. He had told the University colleagues that if due to some circumstances the accommodation is not available for the Ph.D. viva examiners, they could approach the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor for allotting the accommodation out of his quota and it would be ensured that no Ph.D. examiner is turned away from the University or has to be kept in a hotel. So, there is no shortage of accommodation. This matter is going on for the last about 3-4 years. Earlier in the

Guest House, there were 14 rooms out of which 3 rooms were kept for the Vice-Chancellor's quota. Let those 11 rooms be given to the Senators. There is adequate accommodation available.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the rooms are very good and are available to the members.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that about 6 months ago he had raised this issue that the College teachers of Punjab who occasionally visit Panjab University normally do not get a room in the Guest Houses. They get the room only by approaching some Senate member. He requested that at least half of the rooms of the College Bhawan should be reserved for the College teachers. To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that the data has been provided. Continuing, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that from the data provided it has come out that most of the rooms are booked either for marriages or for conferences. He requested to reserve at least half of the rooms for the teachers.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the cleanliness of the Faculty House should be improved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point raised by Shri Jagdeep Kumar is well taken and the Faculty House should be improved in an express way and could be kept exclusively for the College teachers.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that some Senators were facing some difficulty and she has examined this issue. She said that most of the Departments of the University organise the seminars and conferences in the month of February and March to spend their earmarked budget and that is the main difficulty. She suggested that the seminars/conference should be organised in a phased manner. Otherwise, there is no problem of rooms either in the College Bhawan or the Guest House.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in view of what has been decided by the Senate today about the validity of the degrees of CMJ University, what is the status of the decision which had been taken by the Syndicate and circulated amongst the Colleges. He suggested that it should be kept in abeyance and a letter be issued.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Dr. Gurmit Singh said that whatever has been said by Shri Jagdeep Kumar that the College teachers face the problem is right. He suggested that if possible, the booking of the Guest Houses should be made online so that the teachers could know about the availability and status of the booking.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, this suggestion could be worked out.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested that 50% of the rooms of the College Bhawan should be reserved for the College teachers.

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

Shri Varinder Singh said that rent of the Guest Houses has been increased to a level that in this amount, a person could rent a room in the hotels. He said that the rooms are available and there is no problem. If only a person is not getting the accommodation, it does not mean that it is a problem for others also. He pointed out

that the College teachers should not be sent for the inspection of the Colleges as they indulge in politics for the sake of seeking votes from the College teachers.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar objected to it saying that it is a wrong allegation and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu also supported him.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that last time also it was discussed that since the College Bhawan has been constructed with the funds of the Colleges, 50% of its rooms be reserved for the College teachers and the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the funds from the Colleges are collected through the students but not from the teachers.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that the booking of the Guest Houses should be made online.

Professor Chaman Lal said that all the accommodation of the Guest Houses on the University is primarily meant for academic purposes. He fully supported what Mrs. Anu Chatrath has pointed out that the seminars/conferences should be organised in a phased manner. The organisation of the seminars/conferences during the month of February-March is a problem all over India. He suggested that the schedule should be prepared to hold these starting from September onwards. It should not be such a situation that on a single day, 3-4 seminars are being organised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Government releases the money except for the salary after the first half of a financial year after the revised estimates are approved.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that there is no problem of rooms but there is a problem in casual booking. He had given a suggestion to the Finance and Development Officer also that on the basis of one-time password, the payment for the booking should be made in advance. It would put a check on casual bookings.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the booking system in the Institute from where he has retired is that if one wanted to get the booking cancelled, the 50% of the payment deposited is deducted.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the booking has to be made by the Manager of the Guest House and through one-time password the payment should be deposited in advance. If the booking is to be cancelled, at least 50% of the amount should be deducted which would put a check on casual booking.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even the India International Centre (IIC) in Delhi also deducts 50% of the booking amount if the booking is cancelled.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired that if the Senate members wanted to go to Delhi, could they get accommodation at IIC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Panjab University is one of the founding members of the IIC and up to 4 rooms could be booked in the name of Panjab University. There are different rates for the official purpose, personal purpose and guests. The booking could be got done through a designated officer of the office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that against the designation of the Director, Hospitality, the name of a Clerk has been mentioned. He enquired as to how a Clerk could be the Director Hospitality. He suggested that a person of the designation of at least a Professor should be given the charge of Director Hospitality.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, okay, fine.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in Item C-5 on the agenda, be noted.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (1) the possibility of the following be explored:-
 - (i) reserving 50% of the rooms for the College teachers in the Faculty House and College Bhawan;
 - (ii) online booking of the Guest Houses.
- (2) the renovation work at faculty house be expedited.

V. The **Item C-6 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-6. That recommendation dated 21.06.2017 of the Academic Council regarding introduction of Choice Based Credit System be approved in principle but be implemented from the session 2018-19.

(Syndicate dated 25.6.2017 Para 35)

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Dean College Development Council has taken an initiative to have this matter discussed through several bodies and it is moving very slowly. They have to file a report to the UGC as to what is the status of the Choice Based Credit System year after year. On behalf of the State Higher Education Council (SHEC), U.T. they have to file the report as to how they are implementing it in the Colleges which come under the domain of the SHEC, U.T. Chandigarh. This is a thing from which there is no escape but he understands that there are serious difficulties in implementing it in real sense. If it is to be implemented in real sense, then the faculty has to be appointed, there is need of money to have newer courses which the students wish to take. The students do not wish to take traditional courses under Choice Based Credit System but they want to take those courses which would enhance their skills or which are commensurate with the real passion and so on. Because of that, the resource crunch is coming in the way. Sooner or later, they would have to implement it.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that for the time being it should be stopped.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that this could be implemented from the next year onwards.

Dr. K.K. Sharma also suggested that it could be implemented from the next session.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is a need to take the feedback from the Colleges about the semester system.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the semester system could not be capped and they have to find the ways to overcome the difficulties which have arisen due to its introduction. Feedback is necessary but it is to see how to make its implementation less painful. The idea of feedback is well taken and they should take the feedback but not reverse anything.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when they shifted from annual system to the semester system, in fact the Colleges were not well prepared for it. The Colleges Branch and the Examination Branches of the University were not well prepared and even the Examination branch had said that shifting to the semester system is not very simple. Since it was said that the semester system has to be adopted as there are guidelines from the UGC in this regard and also that the grants are linked with it. That is why they accepted it. It is the 3rd year since the semester system started. They could take the feedback from the Dean College Development Council and the Controller of Examinations and would find that the backbone of the Colleges is hurt as the strength of the Colleges has drastically decreased. During these three years, no feedback has been taken. With this system, the number of subjects has increased and the declaration of the results for the last about two years is pending. In one of the conferences organised at Ludhiana, the requirement of staff for running the courses was explained. As is known, the Colleges do not receive the grants. If the Choice Based Credit System is to be implemented, it would affect the workload in the Colleges. Until the Colleges offer honours courses in every subject, the workload could not be justified. The Principals were invited for this conference. Could the Principals take decision on their own to start the honours in every stream? The Managements are not paying full salary to the staff. The honours courses already going on have also been withheld. The masters courses have been sidelined. It might be that with the introduction of semester system, the University must be getting the grants from the UGC, but the Colleges in Punjab are not getting any grants. The salaries of the Colleges in the rural area are pending for about 8 months which was not such a case earlier. It would take a long time to adapt to the new system. The target of the semester system was to increase the number of teaching days. It is a reality that the number of working days has increase but the number of classes has decreased. No teacher could deny it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they prepare a small white paper and the Dean College Development Council office should submit a compilation of what is the pass percentages of the last 6 semesters. Since the annual system has run parallel with semester system, the results of both these systems be compiled, look at the data and then they could take a call on it and till then it be deferred.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that till that time, the choice based credit system be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would run on the campus but not in the Colleges.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the recommendation dated 21.06.2017 of the Academic Council regarding introduction of Choice Based Credit System be approved in principle but its implementation from the session 2018-19 in the affiliated Colleges be kept in abeyance;

- (2) in the meanwhile, the data for the last 5 years of the pass percentage of annual and semester be compiled and compared;

VI. The **Item C-7 on the agenda** was read out viz. -

C-7. That the recommendations of the Committee dated 01.03.2017 constituted by the Vice-chancellor, with regard to representations received from teachers to enhance the payment/rates of setting of question papers of Under/Post-Graduate Courses, M.A./ M.Com./ M.Ed./M.Sc. practical exam, M.E./M.Tech. thesis, M.Phil./Ph.D. viva-voce, etc. and thereafter in view of Syndicate resolved on 21.01.2017 and Board of Finance held on 13.02.2017 for non-teaching staff and making recommendations in this regard, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 20.3.2017 Para 12)

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the rate of paper setter for undergraduate classes has been classified under two categories. One is enhancement from Rs.500 to Rs.650/- and another is for practical paper setters. He pointed out that there is one more category of setting of numerical question paper. The Finance and Development Officer, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra would agree that setting of a numerical question paper for B.Com. students is a very difficult job. He showed a related question paper containing 15 printed pages as it contains balance sheet and other things of the accounting and income tax papers. So, it is very difficult and time consuming. He pointed out that a theory question paper contains only two printed pages. He suggested that the payment for the question paper of B.Com. should be doubled than the theoretical paper.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. K.K. Sharma to give to him in writing.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that then the rates should be increased for other such subjects like Mathematics, etc.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the questions of the question paper of Mathematics are very small.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they not take a call on it and requested Dr. K.K. Sharma to give in writing and if it is to be treated as an exceptional thing, not to mix it up with the remaining, a case be prepared and he would plead for it.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that the question paper setting should be a part of the teaching assignment. On the one side they are facing the financial crunch while on the other hand they are enhancing the rates. In most of the universities, it is a part of the teaching assignment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in some categories, rates were reduced particularly for the dissertation which had been corrected later on. He suggested that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to approve the decision taken by the Committee on this issue.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the concept of paper setting, evaluation and declaration of results should be taken up as a whole and these should

be decided and publicised together. He said that he had earlier also brought it to the notice of the Controller of Examinations and the Vice-Chancellor that some timeframe should be fixed for the declaration of re-evaluation results so that the students might get the benefit. He further suggested that some extra amount could be charged for declaring the results at an early date.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Controller of Examinations is attending to the matter.

Professor J.K. Goswamy pointed out that there is a big issue which is cropping up in the newspapers since last 2 years that in many of the papers, there were large number of errors even to the extent that the papers are blatantly made outside the course. At the same time, they are also talking about increasing the rates. That is good as they have to really honour every paper setter. At the same time, they should have some written commitment from the paper setter that he/she has neither taken the paper from the earlier year. He pointed out that even the last year's paper was set as such.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such type of errors is very small in number as compared to the number of examinations being conducted by the University, i.e., 10 in 10000. So the aberrations would never go away. They are trying to put penal action and other measures but that should not be made a point to approve or disapprove it.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (1) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to approve the rates which were reduced but later on corrected by the Committee;
- (2) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to look into the issue of enhancing the rates of paper setting in the B.Com. subjects, as well as others, where the question paper is lengthy;

The following Items C-8, C-9 and C-10 were withdrawn.

C-8 That the amendments, additions and deletions of the following Regulations circulated to the Fellow vide ST No. 56303-388 dated 21.8.2017, be approved:

ITEM 1

Amendment/addition in Regulation 3.9 under Chapter-X 'Panjab University Employees (Pension) appearing at page 184 Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 2

Amendment/addition in Regulations 11 (J) appearing at pages 143-144 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in anticipation

of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

ITEM 3

Addition of clause (v) in Regulation 10 appearing at page 149 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007 (effective from the decision of the Senate dated 27.3.2016), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 4

xx

xx

xx

xx

ITEM 5

Change in nomenclature for Master in Social Work to Master of Social Work (effective from the session 2016-17), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 6

Amendment in Regulation 2.1 for LL.M. (Two year course) at page 396 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2016-17, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

ITEM 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11

xx

xx

xx

xx

ITEM 12

Addition in Regulation 4 meant for LL.B. (Three-Year Course) appearing at page 388 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2016-17), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

ITEM 13

Addition of Regulation 13 for Bachelor of Laws appearing at page 389 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 from the session 2016-17 (i.e. those who have cleared/passed LL.B. degree in session 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 shall also be eligible), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

ITEM 14

Addition of nomenclature of M.A. Women & Gender Studies in Regulation 11.3 meant for Master of Arts/Regulations (Semester System) (effective from the session 2010-11), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 15

Amendment in Regulation 2.5(b) at page 53 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2009 (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 16

Change in nomenclature of B.A. Hons.(Education) B.Ed.-Four Year Integrated Course (Semester System) to **Four-Year Integrated Programme B.A. B.Ed.** (Semester System) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 17

Regulations for Bachelor of Library & Information Sciences (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the academic session 2016-17), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 18

Regulations for Master of Library & Information Sciences (One -Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the academic session 2017-18), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 19, 20 and 21

xx

xx

xx

xx

ITEM 22

Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Statistics (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 23

Regulations for Certificate Course in Sri Guru Granth Sahib Studies (effective from the session 2016-17), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 24

Regulations for Master of Business Administration for Executives (MBAfEX) restarted from the session 2015-16 at University Business School, in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 25

- (i) Change in nomenclature of Master of Business Economics **to that of MBA (Business Economics) and M.Com. (Business Economics)** (effective from the session 2015), in anticipation of approval of the Senate/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

and

- (ii) **Regulations for MBA (Business Economics) at UIAMS (for the session 2015-17)**, as **per appendix**, in implementation of approval of the Senate/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

(Syndicate dated 30.4.2017 Para 3)

C-9. That –

- (i) recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 19.07.2017 (Item 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29 and 30), be considered:

ITEM 2

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

| PRESENT REGULATION | PROPOSED REGULATION |
|---|---|
| <p>11.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education.</p> <p>(i) to (iii) xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>1(a) For the Public Administration course, a person who has passed</p> | <p>11.1 No Change</p> <p>(i) to (iii) No change</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>1(a) No Change</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>one of the following examinations shall be eligible:-</p> <p>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology or History.</p> | <p><u>B.A. (Pass) with 45 per cent marks in Political Science or Economics or Sociology or Psychology.</u></p> |
|--|---|

ITEM 3

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

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

ITEM 5

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

| PRESENT REGULATION | PROPOSED REGULATION |
|---|--|
| <p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. 1st year in Nuclear Medicine will be B.Sc. from a recognized University with Physics and Chemistry (Non-medical stream) or Chemistry and Biology (Medical stream) as core subjects. The candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine and Biophysics shall also be eligible for admission to the course.</p> | <p>Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. 1st year in Nuclear Medicine shall be B.Sc. with at least 50% marks in the aggregate from Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto with Physics and Chemistry (Non-Medical stream) or Chemistry and Biology (Medical stream) as Core subjects. The candidates having B.Sc. in Nuclear Medicine/Biophysics/ Radiation Sciences shall also be eligible for the</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Admission to M.Sc. course in Nuclear Medicine will be through Entrance Test, to be conducted by the Panjab University. The candidates should have passed the graduation (B.Sc.) from a recognized University/Institute with at least 50% marks. While deciding the final merit of the entrance test, a weightage shall also be given to the B.Sc. marks obtained by the candidate, as per the University rules. The cut off percentage marks secured in the entrance test will also be as per the University Rules.</p> | <p>admission to the course.</p> |
|--|--|

ITEM 6

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

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| University. While deciding the final merit of the entrance test, a weight-age shall also be given to the marks obtained in B.Sc. by the candidate, as per the University rules. The cut off percentage marks secured in the entrance test will also be as per the University Rules. | least 50% marks. |
|---|------------------|

ITEM 7

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

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

ITEM 10

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

| PRESENT REGULATION | PROPOSED REGULATION |
|--|---|
| <p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join these courses :-</p> <p>(a) Certificate in French/German/ Russian of the Panjab University;</p> <p>(b) B.A. Part I examination with French/German/Russian as an elective subject of the Panjab University;</p> <p>(c) For admission to Diploma Course in Russian, Elementary Technical Translation Certificate in Russian;</p> <p>(d)*For admission to Diploma Course in German, the Certificate in German for Science Students with 50% marks;</p> <p>(e) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a), (b), (c) or (d).</p> | <p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join these courses:-</p> <p>(a) to (c) No change</p> <p>(d) The students passing Deutsch Niveau (Level) A2 examination of Goethe Institute/Mueller Bhavan shall be admitted to Diploma Course in German.</p> <p>(e) No Change</p> |

ITEM 11

That addition in Regulation 2(d) for Advanced Diploma Courses in (i) German (ii) Russian and (iii) French appearing at page

235-236 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2015-16), be made as under, and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

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

ITEM 15

That amendment in Regulation 11.6 for Master of Social Work be made as under and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of

Senate Proceedings dated 21st January/17th February 2018

the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

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

ITEM 16

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

ITEM 17

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

ITEM 18

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

ITEM 19

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

ITEM 20

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

ITEM 21

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

ITEM 23

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

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

ITEM 25

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

ITEM 27

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

ITEM 29

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

| PRESENT REGULATIONS | PROPOSED REGULATIONS |
|---|--|
| <p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join M.Sc. (Honours School) Semester System:</p> <p>(i) B.Sc. (Honours School) examination of the Panjab University in the subject of M.Sc. (Honours School) course provided that BCA/B.Tech./B.E. (Computer Science/Engineering) with 50% marks or any other examination recognized as equivalent thereto shall also be eligible for M.Sc. (Honours School) Computer Science.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. or B.Sc. examination of the Panjab University or any other examination recognized by the Panjab University as equivalent thereto, for admission to M.Sc. (Honours School) in Anthropology.</p> <p>Provided that admission of the eligible students other than B.Sc. (Honours School) from Panjab University will be based on their merit in the Entrance Test (OCET) for B.Sc. (Pass or Honours) examination with 50% marks from Panjab University or</p> | <p>2. No Change</p> <p>(i) to (ii) No Change</p> <p><u>For M.Sc. (Honours) course in Chemistry (from the session 2016-17)</u></p> <p>(a) B.Sc.(Honours School) examination of the Panjab University in the subject of</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>any other University recognized as equivalent thereto/the fulfillments of such other requirements as may be laid down by the Syndicate.</p> | <p>Chemistry. OR (b) B.Sc.(Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks (45% marks in case of Sc/ST/BC) from Panjab University or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry (ii) Physics (iii) Mathematics or any other Science subject during all the three years of graduation .</p> <p><u>For M.Sc. (Honours) course in Chemistry (effective from the session 2017-18)</u></p> <p>(a) B.Sc.(Honours School) examination of the Panjab University in the subject of Chemistry. OR (b) B.Sc.(Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks (45% marks in case of Sc/ST/BC) from Panjab University or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry in all the three years /six semesters and (ii) any two Science subjects during two years/four semester during of graduation.</p> |
|--|--|

ITEM 30

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

| <u>PRESENT REGULATION</u> | <u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u> |
|---|---|
| <p>2. The minimum qualification for admission to the first year class of the LL.B. course shall be one of the following :-</p> <p>(a) A Bachelor's degree in any faculty of the Panjab University with at least 45% of the aggregate marks;</p> <p>(b) A degree in any faculty of any other University recognized as equivalent to the corresponding degree of the Panjab University, with at least 45% of the aggregate marks.</p> <p>Provided that in case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate, through Modern Indian Languages (Hindi or Urdu or Panjabi/Gurmukhi Script) and/or in a classical Language (Sanskrit or Persian or Arabic) the aggregate of 45% marks shall be calculated by taking into account the percentage of aggregate marks that he had secured at the language examination, excluding the marks for the additional optional paper, English and the elective subject taken together.</p> <p>(c) A Master's degree from the Panjab University;</p> <p>(d) A Master's degree from any other University recognized as equivalent to the Master's degree of the Panjab University.</p> | <p>2. The minimum qualification for admission to the first year class of the LL.B. course shall be:-</p> <p>A Bachelor's/Master's degree in any discipline with at 45% marks in aggregate from Panjab University or any other University recognized by Bar Council of India and Panjab University.</p> <p>In case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate, through Modern Indian Languages (Hindi or Urdu or Panjabi/Gurmukhi Script) and/or in a classical Language (Sanskrit or Persian or Arabic) the aggregate of 45% marks shall be calculated by taking into account the percentage of aggregate marks that he had secured at the language examination, excluding the marks for the additional optional paper, English and the elective subject taken together.</p> <p>5% concession is admissible in eligibility marks to SC/ST/BC/PWD candidates.</p> |

- (ii) recommendation of the Regulations Committee dated 19.07.2017 (Item 5), for the session 2015-16 be approved. From the session 2018-19, the subjects of Bioinformatics, Microbiology, Biochemistry and Industrial Chemistry be also added in the proposed regulation.

(Syndicate dated 20.8.2017 Para 13)

- (iii) the following recommendation of the Regulations Committee dated 19.07.2017, be approved:

ITEM 28

That the required amendment in Regulation 17.4 appearing at page 133 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007 in pursuant to the recommendations of the Administrative Committee of BGJ Institute of Health be made as under:

| <u>PRESENT REGULATION</u> | <u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u> |
|---|---|
| 17.4 A whole-time Medical Officer of the University shall retire on reaching the age of sixty years ; provided that extension may be granted for a period up to two years in special cases, on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor. | 17.4 A whole-time Medical Officer of the University shall retire on reaching the age of sixty five years. |

(Syndicate dated 23.7.2016 Para 38)

- C-10.** To consider the summary of the reports submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U. on various matters.

- NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 26.03.2017 (Para I-33) (Appendix-) had read out the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 21.04.2017 (Para 48 (i)) regarding summary report submitted by CVO, P.U. and resolved that the Sub-item (I-33) be placed for consideration in future.
2. A copy of the letter No. 160/CVO/D dated 31.05.2017 is enclosed (Appendix-).
3. As per decision of the Senate dated 26.3.2017, the matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.6.2017 (Para 6) (Appendix-) for consideration. The Syndicate after discussion resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to form a Committee of Syndics to study the reports in detail and submit its report.

Accordingly, the following committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the CVO Reports:

1. Shri Jarnail Singh,
Chairperson
2. Dr. Dalip Kumar
3. Dr. Subhash Sharma
4. Principal N.R. Sharma
5. Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli
D.R. Estt. (Convener)

4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 (Para 10) (Appendix) has considered the report of the above Committee dated 15.09.2017 and resolved that:

- (1) recommendation of the committee at Sr. No. 1 to 4, 7 to 10, 12 to 33 of the status and summary report submitted by the CVO be noted.
- (2) recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No. 5 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted and it be added in the guidelines for appointment of Chief Coordinators/ Coordinators of Examination Centres that they would not perform any other duty while working as Chief Coordinators/ Coordinators;
- (3) recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No. 6 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be referred to the same Committee which is already looking into the case;
- (4) recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No. 11 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted; and information from the XEN be solicited on the following points:

- (i) information about the supplier (Dwivedi Furniture) who had supplied the items in the University during that period;
 - (ii) the list of competitors for the tenders;
 - (iii) the details of the specifications of the tender and the specifications of the items supplied;
 - (iv) the names of the persons who approved the tenders and received the material;
 - (v) legal opinion be sought on the possibility of filing a police complaint against Dwivedi Furniture.
- (5) the complaints which have already been recommended by the CVO as 'filed/withdrawn' be not placed before the Syndicate; and
- (6) an additional column be created in the status and summary report table showing the action taken on the issues.

The Vice-Chancellor recused himself from the meeting when this item was taken up for consideration. Accordingly, Professor Ronki Ram chaired the meeting for this item only.

VII.

The **Item C-11 on the agenda** was read out viz. –

C-11. That

- (1) the Committee recommended by Syndicate on 21.01.2017 to look into the specific complaint(s) of a Senate member against Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University be reconstituted by substituting the Chairperson of the Committee, Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, Former Chief Secretary, Haryana, by any one of the following senior women IAS officers from Haryana Government :

- (i) Mrs. Navraj Sandhu, Additional Chief Secretary (Departments of Cooperation and Vigilance), Government of Haryana, Chandigarh; and

- (ii) Mrs. Jyoti Arora, Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Government of Haryana, Chandigarh.

Further, following two additional women members be included in the above Committee:

- (i) Senior most woman Professor of the University namely, Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, Dean of University Instruction, Panjab University; and
- (ii) Current Chairperson of Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) namely, Professor Manvinder Kaur, Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies & Development.

Rest of the members as recommended by the Syndicate dated 21st January, 2017 may remain the same, except Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh, who had expressed his inability.

- (2) The reconstituted Committee as proposed, be sent to the Chancellor for approval with any deletion or further inclusion, as may be deemed appropriate by the Hon'ble Chancellor.
- (3) a copy of the letter to be sent to the Chancellor be also forwarded to the Ministry of Human Resource Development for information.

(Syndicate dated 10.01.2018 Para 2)

The Vice-Chancellor informed that this item was handled by Principal Satish Kumar Sharma in the Syndicate. But, Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma is not here today as the President is coming to visit one of their Colleges of which Dr. Sharma is a senior officer and he gave him (Vice-Chancellor) a note and the same was read out by the Vice-Chancellor which states that he (Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma) has to go to Delhi and has suggested that Professor Ronki Ram may be requested to chair the meeting for this item.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the reply to his letter has not been provided as he had written a letter to the Registrar on 7th February, 2018 which refers to the proceedings of the special meeting of the Syndicate held on 10th January, 2018. He has compared the proceedings of the notes read out and distributed by the Vice-Chancellor during the said meeting. There are number of glaring differences between notes and proceedings. The notes which had been provided to the members are different from what the Vice-Chancellor had read. But till today the amended notes have not been provided to them. He read out from the letter, "So, all the proceedings must be true to the notes as well as the video recording of the meeting since any modification of the same amount after the meeting amounts to manipulation of the proceedings/minutes. It must be mentioned in the Proceedings that copies of the "Notes" read out by the Vice Chancellor in the meeting, were distributed among the members. Final Minutes with

the above said corrections may be supplied to me at the earliest and the corrected Proceedings must be circulated during the Senate meeting". There are many discrepancies what was read by the Vice-Chancellor and what was in the print line. He had told this to the Registrar on 7th February, 2018 to supply this.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what is the discrepancy related to what he had said.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it should be checked by your office and only then he could see whether the same is right or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has approved whatever he had said. If there is a particular line or a phrase which is added or missing, that should be pointed out as otherwise it is a general comment.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he remembers that the Vice-Chancellor had read out from a note. He said that whatever the Vice-Chancellor had read out should have been recorded but the same is not recorded.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the note which he had read out contained points from Sr.No. 1 to 26 and point no. 26 was eliminated.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are lot of differences and discrepancies. He requested that the same should be corrected and circulated and only then he could point out what is the difference.

The Vice-Chancellor said that point no.26 from that note has been deleted and it contains 25 points. Then what is the issue, there is no issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he had written a letter on 7th February, 2018 that the minutes are recorded wrongly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the minutes are not recorded wrongly. He (Professor Keshav Malhotra) has not pointed out any such thing related to what he (Vice-Chancellor) had stated.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that all the proceedings must be true to the notes and the video recording of the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could tell only about the portion relating to him which is there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested to play the video recording and compare the minutes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no such thing could be done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to why not.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that the copy of the video recording be provided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be taken.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath enquired as to what is the difference.

Senate Proceedings dated 21st January/17th February 2018

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to be recused and Professor Ronki Ram would chair the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal while addressing the Vice-Chancellor said that everybody has a right to raise a point. He also wanted to raise some points.

The Vice-Chancellor, therefore, stopped to listen to him.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said supplementing what Professor Keshav Malhotra has said, he would like to repeat because it is a very technical, legal and ticklish matter. He had said it in the Syndicate also that this item could not be taken and included in the agenda of the special meeting of the Senate. This is a special meeting of the Senate exclusively to discuss the College related issues which have been listed out in the agenda. It is provided for in the Calendar that no other business would be conducted except for the business for which the special meeting has been convened. In spite of that he did not know for what reasons this item has been included in the special meeting of the Senate which probably is going to cause a lot of embarrassment to the Senate as a whole, a litigation which he apprehended would be there. As far as the proceedings are concerned, he would appreciate if Vice-Chancellor, as Chairman of the Syndicate and Senate briefs instead of telling Professor Keshav Malhotra to point out what is wrong. That if there is any difference between the notes circulated in the Syndicate and what is recorded in the minutes because it is not something which the Vice-Chancellor had read something verbally. The Vice-Chancellor had read a note which was very much typed and circulated amongst all the members. How come there is an iota of difference of comma (,) and full stop(.). If the Vice-Chancellor says that he did not know all the 25 points which were read by him from a note are exactly the same, then he wondered from where those changes have come only on that note. The Vice-Chancellor is right that as far as other proceedings are concerned, the same are to be verified and confirmed by the person who presided over the meeting for the rest of the portion. But they are only sticking to the note part which was a document circulated not only amongst the members of the Syndicate but was a document which was sent as official press release to the media also and if there are changes in that, is it not something very serious. Has anybody got any authority to add something as an afterthought to something which has not been deliberated in the Syndicate or the Senate? If yes, then probably every member would have to be given in writing by way of notice that what one could not say in the Senate, one is free to say within 10 days.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to how this matter came and where is the item related with the Selection Committees as they are discussing the issues related with the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter had already been discussed last time. But there is no issue that the matter has to be discussed.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to which matter.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that the item C-11 was already discussed. Shri Ashok Goyal had enquired as to how it would happen, though the minutes are not yet written, he (Vice-Chancellor) had already replied to this and not offering more reply.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the last meeting nothing was discussed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that last meeting was the second sitting and this one is the third sitting of the same.

Senate Proceedings dated 21st January/17th February 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the first meeting also nothing was discussed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had told in the Syndicate also that the item would be taken up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, yes, the Vice-Chancellor had told it but he had also told about the reservation of the provision. First of all, in the first meeting, this was not an agenda item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had adequately answered to Shri Ashok Goyal in the Syndicate meeting as to why this item has to go to the Senate. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) could not just hold the thing to ransom to just technicality.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to be technical.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the academic administration could not be run just by mere technicalities.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how the written minutes have been changed.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to point out as to what has been changed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the Vice-Chancellor should say that nothing has been changed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has told that he has circulated what he had read out. If a word has been changed, Shri Ashok Goyal should tell as to what it has affected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why at all it has been changed if it has not affected.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal as to what has been changed and Shri Ashok Goyal had adequate time to point out to him as to what has been changed. But he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has not pointed out it to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it had been pointed out.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, no, it has not been pointed out. They had not pointed anything to him.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even it has happened that DVDs are not provided to them saying that until the minutes are not approved, the same would not be provided. They have to be transparent and the objectivity has been crushed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nothing has been crushed and Professor Keshav Malhotra should not level accusations and objected to accusations levelled by Professor Keshav Malhotra.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier the DVDs used to be given within a week. Now without DVDs, how he could compare. He requested that the DVDs should be supplied to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to submit because the Vice-Chancellor has specifically asked that why he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had not pointed out it to him. He

did not want to say in the House but since the Vice-Chancellor is asking for it, let him say that he had made a special request in the Syndicate. After the meeting concluded, he made a special request to the Vice-Chancellor that the DVDs of this meeting may please be sent to him at the earliest and the Vice-Chancellor had acceded to his request but he is sorry to point out.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not stopped it. He enquired whether he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had pointed out it that he did not receive.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is pointing out it today that in spite of the Vice-Chancellor telling it on that day, why the DVDs have not been provided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is just making an excuse. It is not his job to go to his house and give the DVDs. If the office has not given the DVDs and the office has deliberately withheld it, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should point out to him and he would check it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now he is pointing out and it is for the Vice-Chancellor as to what could be done. He is not making any excuse.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to make excuse and attend to the job for which he has been elected. They have to attend to a very serious matter that a member of this House has made an accusation against the Vice-Chancellor of this University and that matter is to be investigated as per the directive of the Government of India by a Committee. Why are they shying of forming, approving a Committee which has to do this job.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired as to who is stopping him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is being stopped by making unnecessary accusations that he has not supplied such and such things. He would like to recuse himself.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the House is in motion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to recuse himself as there is nothing more for him to answer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor would have to answer as to why the minutes have been changed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not changed the minutes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is pointing out the changes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are not his (Shri Ashok Goyal) minutes but these minutes are for the entire House.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor abstained from the meeting.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there is no change in the minutes. Some members are deliberately trying to stop the enquiry. What is the problem, let the enquiry be done.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the statement had been changed, a fresh one could be given.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that Shri Ashok Goyal knows the technicality that at the moment only 26 members are present.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the notice was issued and the House is in motion and there is no requirement of minimum quorum.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he just wanted to know whether with this strength they could discuss the item, if it is so, he has no objection.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the House is in motion.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that when the meeting started, the quorum was complete and the House is in motion.

Professor Ronki Ram said that since the House is in motion now there is no need of quorum.

At this stage, Professor Ronki Ram chaired the meeting for this item.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they have to discuss the Item C-11 thoroughly because this is an item wherein there is a very important and serious issue of the University. It has been lingering on for the last many years. The issue has been that how to find a way to enquire into the matter. There is certain internal mechanism in which they were not able to find a proper way of conducting it either on one or the other legality. Then the matter was referred to the UGC, National Commission for Women, MHRD. Now, this Item C-11 has come to them with a briefing that the MHRD has asked to constitute a Committee which is not a Committee which is already there but has asked for a new Committee and that Committee should give the report within 90 days. So, now this is up to the House that are they not going to give their attention to the call where a Committee is to be formed. On this issue, they are not going to decide as to who is right or who is wrong. The only small issue is to form a Committee and let the Committee start the proceedings. Let them start the proceedings. This House has the great challenge, would be responsible to the society at large that they are not taking a call on the issue. Thereby his sincere request to the all the esteemed colleagues is that they should put their minds and brains together and constitute a Committee which as MHRD has asked them and let the enquiry to be started. Whosoever is responsible, whosoever is falling short of information, falling short of accusation, let it be decided by the Committee. It is the only job and they are not going to decide as to who is right or who is wrong. Their only job is to constitute a Committee and inform the MHRD that the Committee has been formed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to point out that this be specifically noted that Professor Ronki Ram, the hon'ble member of the Senate has been requested by the Vice-Chancellor to chair the meeting in his absence.

To this, a few of the members said that it is not so. The Vice-Chancellor had informed that Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma had mentioned the name of Professor Ronki Ram.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, no, they could see the recording as to what the Vice-Chancellor had said.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Vice-Chancellor had said Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma had told that Professor Ronki Ram would chair the meeting in his place.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in case of any difference, any person amongst them could chair the meeting.

Professor Ronki Ram asked the Registrar to read the letter given by Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that he is reading the letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since he (Professor Ronki Ram) has given the ruling that the issue is to be discussed and the ruling was given by the Vice-Chancellor also and had also told him the reason why it is required to be added as agenda item for the special meeting of the Senate though there is no provision in the Calendar. After having registered his objection in the Syndicate and registering the same objection in the Senate also, the Vice-Chancellor did not want to hear and did not listen to him and thought as if he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying that the DVD was not supplied to him in spite of his specific request and probably he was trying to make an excuse. It is not so. In spite of the fact that he did not receive the DVD, he has every document to say that the minutes have been changed. Who has changed the minutes, this is for the office to know. A document which was circulated in the Syndicate, a typed document which was read by the Vice-Chancellor with each comma (,) and full stop (.), how could that be changed. He pointed out the changes. In para 2, it is written “the Standing Committee submitted a report which was forwarded to the Syndicate in its meeting on 20th April 2015”. He enquired as to why four words “within a few days” have been added after the word ‘a report’ which was not part of the note which was circulated. In para 3, “VC to refer the matter to PUCASH consisting of his own sycophants” is mentioned in the circulated note. The five words ‘consisting of his own sycophants’ are missing. In para 3, “instead the complainant had used the words misbehaviour or harassment”, the words added are ‘at work place for women employees’. In para 5, it is written “a complaint was also submitted by the complainant to the UT Police” and in the end it is written ‘at P.U. Campus’”. In para 7, “The Vice-Chancellor had filed a detailed reply to the UGC Fact Finding Committee in July, 2015 itself”. In para 9, “MHRD forwarded all the documents submitted by the complainant to the Registrar, PU to get an inquiry conducted by PUCASH. (Letter dated 24 June, 2015)”. But what has been added is, which was not the part of the original note, ‘the letter arrived on 24 June, 2015’. Then, in para 11, in the end it is added which was not in the note circulated in the Syndicate, Professor Ronki Ram is also member of the Syndicate and he might very well recollect, ‘they had a policy in the University and there was procedure by that policy, that procedure has some lacking, that lacunae had to be repaired, that was pointed out by the complainant in response to a report given by the complainant, the new PUCASH had to be’. It was not part of the note which was circulated, this has also been added. Then para 21, “Professor Nishtha Jaswal did not proceed with any inquiry” ‘until she was responded to’ has been incorporated. In para 24, after “MHRD had consulted DoPT”, ‘which is an office attached to the Prime Minister’s office’ was not part of the note. Then in para 25, it is mentioned “A reply from Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary was received on 5th June (January) 2018”. It was part of the note and the words which have been added are ‘which was forwarded to them with the agenda papers’. Then, para 26, “matter now stands referred to the Syndicate today and the Syndicate today needs to consider the reconstitution of the committee in the light of what Ms. Meenaxi Ji has said, by asking. The new Presiding Officer of the reconstituted Internal Committee ought to be a ‘Serving Member’ if one has to go what Ms. Meenaxi Ji has written”. According to him, para 26 was withdrawn or deleted. After recording this, he wanted to ask the House could it be said that so what if I (Vice-Chancellor) have put hyphen in it, how does it change the meaning. If it does not change the meaning, then where is the occasion to put in the hyphen. That means that there must be some

difference by putting an hyphen. That is why he (Vice-Chancellor) thought so, or may be whosoever has changed, he is not blaming it on the Vice-Chancellor who has changed. But they have received it. The Vice-Chancellor had said that why he was not pointed out. Probably, he (Vice-Chancellor) forgot the provision that whatever is to be pointed out, it is to be pointed out to a person who has circulated the tentative minutes as Secretary of the Syndicate, i.e., the Registrar. It is also advised that if anyone has anything to say, the same could be said within a specified period to the undersigned, whether it is the Deputy Registrar or the Registrar. Professor Keshav Malhotra, well within time, pointed out the discrepancies. For the Vice-Chancellor to say that why he was not pointed out probably is not acceptable. On one side he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying this. When they (members) say that they brought it to his (Vice-Chancellor) notice, he says that he is not the one to take care of all these small nitty-gritty, why did they not tell the Controller of Examinations, Dean College Development Council or the Registrar and why they expect the Vice-Chancellor only to attend to their queries. If the Vice-Chancellor in the presence of all, in the presence of even Professor Ronki Ram has acceded to his request that yes, he would get the DVDs and today if he is pointing out and that too only on his (Vice-Chancellor) asking that in spite of his instructions, he has not got it, he (Vice-Chancellor) says that why he (Shri Ashok Goyal) did not point it out to him earlier. If he is not pointing out, that is also not acceptable. If he is pointing out, that is also not acceptable. Then, tell him, what to do. As far as the recommendation of the Syndicate is concerned, he had already said there. Now, Professor Ronki Ram is chairing and the other day in the Syndicate it was Principal Jarnail Singh who was chairing. According to him, the responsibility of the Chairman is definitely much more than the members of the House. Let Professor Ronki Ram, member of the Syndicate who is presiding over the Senate in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor, say for the knowledge of the House that the recommendation of the Syndicate is in accordance with the relevant Act so that the House which has been doing something contrary to law is again not involved in something which is not sustainable in the eyes of law. He remembered one of the letter, of course, copy of that letter is not available with him now that MHRD had written a letter to the University that the other issues raised by the then PUCASH under the chairmanship of Professor Nishtha Jaswal should also be addressed. Instead of addressing those issues, they still wanted to go ahead. Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary has also written something with an advice that issues to be addressed. According to him, it would be much better for the Chairman to say, to affirm that all the issues raised in various letters including that letter of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary have been addressed and the recommendation of the Syndicate is strictly in accordance with the Act. Only then, according to him, they should proceed further.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Shri Ashok Goyal has raised an issue on this whether there is any change in the circulations of the points made earlier and the one which he has mentioned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the same note has been circulated in media as a part of the press release issued by the Panjab University. After having done that, if there is some change, according to him, the members have legitimate right to point out.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the note which is discussed over here, has come because since the Chairman of the Syndicate and the Chairman in the absence of the Chancellor was in this dispute. So, he would not, he should not and he did not like to plead the case. But he, through this preamble not a part of the agenda of the Syndicate, as a preamble to the whole discussion circulated this note of points.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is part of the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that because before the Syndicate, this was the issue, he (Vice-Chancellor) said that this is the brief summary because the matter has already gone for more than two years and eight months. Within that what the note said, he wanted that the House should also go through it because this matter was thoroughly discussed in the Syndicate. What is there in that note, they could take cognisance of that before they could talk about?

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether any changes could be made.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the question of change because this paper and the agenda matters does not come here in this pattern.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these are the parts of the minutes of the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now the parts of the minutes of the Syndicate are here. If say for a few seconds, if there is any change, then they are not going to constitute a Committee and this letter would also go to the Committee.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the change only constitutes when its sense changes. When the sense is not changed, the change in full stop (.) and comma (,) hardly matters.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if there is some deliberate attempt to mislead the House or the Enquiry Committee, then they could say. But only because they want to further delay it whether there are changes or not. These are tentative.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if these are the tentative, then these should be corrected. Could they take a decision on the tentative also?

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should not try to deliberately stall the proceedings to take place.

Professor Keshav Malhotra strongly objected to it as the mistake is being committed on their own as the minutes have been changed.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now the Vice-Chancellor is not here and they are discussing it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his (Professor Ronki Ram) anxiety and the anxiety of the University and the anxiety of the Senate keeping in view that the bad name which they are earning for the last so many years is well understood that it should be expedited. But did he (Professor Ronki Ram) mean to say that in the name of expediting they do something illegal or wrong.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if something illegal is done that would not be set aside, that would again be enquired by the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the minutes are not recorded properly or something has been added or deleted, what is recorded in the video, in this case it is a proper note which had been read out by the Vice-Chancellor relating to the item on the agenda. Special meeting of the Syndicate was called only for this issue. While chairing the meeting on this agenda, he (Vice-Chancellor) read out a note and after reading out the note and making a brief introduction, left the chair and Professor Jarnail Singh was requested to chair.

Professor Ronki Ram pointed out that it was not Shri Jarnail Singh but Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma.

Shri Ashok Goyal felt sorry that he has wrongly mentioned the name of Shri Jarnail Singh instead of Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma who had chaired the meeting. If in a written document also some changes have been made, according to him, one has any intention to justify that this could also be done. One could have said that it should not have been done but anyway it does not change the sense or does not affect the case, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) could understand. But the answer to this is whether it could be done, the simple answer is 'no' as nobody has the authority. Secondly, as Professor Ronki Ram is saying, probably he should not have said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) wanted to stall the enquiry proceedings, wanted to delay the enquiry, do not want the enquiry to be held. He would recall his (Professor Ronki Ram) attention, recall the memory that he is the one who has always been saying that they have never said whether 'A' is wrong or 'B' is wrong, 'A' is right or 'B' is right. What they have always been demanding an impartial enquiry into the matter strictly as per the Act.

Professor Ronki Ram said that all of them want it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that not all of them. The issue has been lingering on for such a long time because there was difference of opinion amongst the members of the Senate and the Syndicate and may be amongst the members of PUCASH also whether the things were moving in accordance with the Act or not. The things travelled to the Chancellor's office, UGC, MHRD and so on. According to him, today it is expected that they should be cautious and wiser enough to ensure that at least from this stage, they do not commit any such illegality which might cause embarrassment to them. That is why he said that at least as Chairman, he (Professor Ronki Ram) says that it is strictly in accordance with the Act, the recommendation of the Syndicate is strictly in accordance with the Act. Only then after introducing the subject, he could ask the members that if they wanted to make any suggestion or not. He had said in the Syndicate also this recommendation is not in accordance with the Act. But everybody says that how it is not. But he is saying that it is not in accordance with the Act. When they have already come prepared with a proposal, so there is no idea of his telling, he could simply say that it is not in accordance with the Act as it was not in accordance with the Act as far as appointment of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary was concerned.

Professor Chaman Lal said that let them know some technical things. Many of them are members of the Syndicate. What has gone through in the Syndicate where the minutes have been distorted or not, they do not know, only the members of the Syndicate know. But what they know is that the issue is of forming PUCASH or Internal Complaints Committee. He has not yet heard what the Syndicate has proposed. But even without Syndicate's proposal, he could say with certainty that the Internal Complaints Committee is not constituted according to the MHRD, UGC guidelines and these guidelines are binding not just guidelines. But all the Universities, all Colleges, all IITs have to constitute Internal Complaints Committee as per the MHRD notifications circulated by UGC to all the Universities, Colleges. Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) has its own GSCASH. Even that GSCASH was scrapped which is being contested in the Court because GSCASH was much advanced form of anti sexual harassment committee than what has been proposed by the UGC itself. That was a totally elected body. But since the new Vice-Chancellor scrapped the GSCASH, that is being contested. Whatever is the UGC guideline, that has also not been followed by this University. He has with him the circular of MHRD. He could share it with the members to know as to what should be the constitution of the Committee. He is not talking about the members. He is talking about the generality. He read out from the UGC

Gazette Notification dated 5th July, 2016, letter DO No. F-91-9/2015/GS of MHRD addressed to the Vice-Chancellors of all the universities and it has been sent by Dr. Jaspal Sandhu, who was the Secretary at that time. It is a gazetted kind of thing and the University has not followed it. If the thing of the Gazette regarding Internal Complaints Committee is followed, then most of the issue/differences could be sorted out. There are lot many other things but he would talk about the constitution of the Committee. He read out from the notification that a Presiding Officer who shall be a woman faculty member employed at a senior level not below Professor in case of University and not below an Associate Professor or Reader in case of a College at the educational institution nominated by the executive authority provided that in case a senior level woman employee is not available, the Presiding Officer shall be nominated from other offices or administrative units of the workplace referred to in sub-section 2(b). Provided further that in case the other offices or administrative units of the workplace do not have a senior level woman employee, the Presiding Officer shall be nominated from any other workplace of the same employer. The appointment of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary was totally wrong and whatever is being proposed is also totally wrong.

To this Shri Ashok Goyal said, 'yes'.

Continuing, Professor Chaman Lal read out the portions (b) saying that two faculty members and two non-teaching employees preferably committed to the cause of women who have had a experience in social work or have legal knowledge nominated by the executive authority. (c) three students if the matter involves the students who shall be enrolled at the undergraduate, masters and research scholars level respectively elected through transparent democratic procedure. (d) one member from amongst non-governmental organisations or associations committed to the cause of women or a person familiar with the issues related to sexual harassment nominated by the executive authority. Only one member could be from the outside. According to him, here more than one member are in the Committee. So, according to him, the Senate independent of Syndicate should itself constitute a Committee as per the Internal Complaints Committee constitution circulated by the UGC. According to him, more than half of the teachers are women. It has to be presided over by the University teacher. He suggested two things because the faculty members are not elected, but it would be more democratic if they could be elected. If these could not be elected, PUTA might be asked to nominate 2 members from the faculty. It is just a suggestion and not a binding. In case of students, students have to be elected. In JNU also, they are even being elected now. But in the present case if there is some urgency, the elected PUCSC could be asked to nominate one undergraduate student, one postgraduate student and one research scholar to make this Committee complete. If they constitute a Committee at that particular level, then according to him there should be no difference amongst the Senate members to unnecessarily prolong the issue.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if she remembers correctly, in the previous Senate meeting as well as Syndicate meetings, this discussion came up for consideration. The UGC recommendations in guidelines talk about regarding a faculty member if there is a complaint. The agenda and the point which came up for consideration in previous meeting was and here the question is or the complaint and allegation is against the head of the institution, i.e., the Vice-Chancellor. She remembered correctly that the complainant also raised and wrote to the MHRD and higher authority, i.e., the Chancellor of the University that because he (Vice-Chancellor) is the head of the University and if the Committee is constituted from amongst the teaching faculty members who are subordinate to him, so obviously she (complainant) is not expecting any justice. So far as what Professor Chaman Lal is talking about the guidelines and

the constitution of the Committee, that is a permanent Committee for considering complaints against all the faculty members. That is the reason that the outside members were included so that the Vice-Chancellor did not have any influence over them. That is the reason that the names of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary and others were unanimously approved by the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was not approved unanimously but by majority.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the complainant spoke in the Senate that if the subordinate members teaching in the University are included, then she is not expecting any justice from that Committee because obviously they would be under the full fledged control of the Vice-Chancellor.

On a point of order Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Professor Ronki Ram) was to respond in a query as to the proposal for the name to preside the meeting, please tell, as he (Professor Ronki Ram) was saying that it was Dr. Satish Sharma, who is not present in the meeting, before leaving in the forenoon, had requested in writing that Professor Ronki Ram be requested to preside the meeting. He asked, is it correct? This was replied as 'yes'. He said that this be recorded as it is. The regulations do not allow any such thing.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that if there is a need to be countered or changed, one of them can now propose the name of Dr. Ronki Ram.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the meeting is already on and he is already presiding.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that ratification by the competent authority can be made to which Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what ratification, as the situation now is like post-facto.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that his point is that the issue is already in motion. Most of the things which he would like to say have already been expressed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked why the gaps have not been circulated to which Professor Ronki Ram said he would give a reply to that. He said that first he should reply to his question, only then the meeting would start.

Shri Ashok Goyal also requested that he (Professor Ronki Ram) should give the reply to him (Professor Keshav Malhotra).

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that to her mind, they actually do not want to discuss the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they want that the issue should be taken up in the right perspective so that it may not be get spoiled again. They want that the issue be settled rightly once for all.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they in the process of settling the issue, but they should listen to the members. The issue would neither be solved in any one's favour nor against any one. It would be solved as per the genuine justice.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that in his opinion as per the principle of natural justice this is the first time he is seeing that the meeting is in proper perspective. The complainant is not here who is part of this House and the person against whom the

allegation is, he is also not here in the House. It is again well taken. It is really good thing that both of them are not here and the issue is being discussed. From day one, when this issue came to his knowledge, he was of the opinion that any Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor is not going to deliver the complete and total fair verdict because it is going to be opposed by the principle of natural justice. The person who is accused cannot constitute a Committee. So, this is the first time, it has happened that in the absence of both the issue is being discussed and in the same spirit, it should be forwarded to the highest authorities of this University i.e. the Chancellor and the MHRD or the UGC to take note of it. Let those top or apex bodies of this University take note of it and let them constitute a Committee and let them get it examined, whatever would be there, that would be the fairest thing in the interest of justice.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he supports him, but asked who would constitute the Committee. Secondly, what about the differences recorded. He asked to show him the differences.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he was present in the Syndicate when the decision was taken, to his mind the main contention is, what Shri Ashok Goyal is saying, that the minutes are wrongly recorded. This is one part.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they can respond to it.

Continuing, Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a discrepancy.

At this moment, Professor Ronki Ram asked the Registrar to clarify the point. The Registrar said that the tentative minutes were circulated, it was based on whatever the Vice Chancellor spoke. He read out from a script. That script was there which was circulated. He read out from there, but probably, once he is giving a reading, when one talks, at times he adds a word here or there. So, there could have been something which has been recorded as per the video and that has been taken by their staff. They go by that and put their headphones and record it. So, once his observation had come to him, he had marked it to the Deputy Registrar to clarify and verify it if there is anything and asked to amend and correct it in the final script. That is the spirit. This is where they stand and the minutes are not finalized as yet.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the answer to this thing that what was read there in the Syndicate, while reading some words were added by the Vice Chancellor which were not written on the paper and it is based on the video recording that the tentative minutes have been sent. What Professor Keshav Malhotra is saying that minutes be recorded strictly in terms of video recording. That is also not acceptable. He (Professor Keshav Malhotra) says, alright, play the video and see what is recorded is spoken to which the Registrar said that it is as per the video recording. So, the answer to this is that these minutes are not final, these are subject to correction and his query is that if any meeting's minutes are not finalized, how the item is coming to the Senate as recommendation. That means the finalization of minutes would take later on, but the issue be discussed before that. If it was asked that why the item relating to the age of Principals was not added in the agenda of the Syndicate meeting to be held on 24th, the answer given was that the minutes are yet to be finalized to which the Registrar said that the resolved part was there. So, nobody is questioning the authority of anybody or integrity of anybody, but at the same time, members of this Senate are very well entitled to point out something which is technically wrong. To this, they should not take any offence to.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that their target and his target is the same. His target is that they should do the things with great care, but if they did not do that, they could plunge into a fix.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they would act as per consensus and it might not happen that the time might pass.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, it means they want to go without taking any care, but they would not let the time pass.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Senate is a very big House, two years and eight months have passed, but so far they could not decide the issue as to how would conduct the enquiry.

Shri H.S. Dua said that 25 complaints of such type of complaints of harassments relating to teachers and students are lying with them from the last four years. If they want, he could name the college also. If those complaints are older than this complaint, then what.

Professor Ronki Ram asked why those are not dealt with.

Professor Chaman Lal while clarifying it said that it is not the job of the University to conduct enquiries in colleges. Colleges have to constitute their own internal complaint committees. It is the job of the colleges and said that he (Shri H.S. Dua) is wrong. If their colleges are not doing it, the University is not responsible for it.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested the Chair to give his ruling on the issue.

Shri H.S. Dua said that he wanted to clear the things. If he did not clear it, he would be proved wrong. So, he said that there was no enquiry from the college, rather a Committee was sent by the University and the report is pending in the University.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should not go into what has already happened and take up the issue which is there before them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Professor Keshav is saying to tread with caution and Shri Ashok Goyal is saying something else, but he says that at least they should allow to move ahead.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that last time they raised the issue two-three times. There is only one authority in the University called Secretary to Vice Chancellor (SVC). Just as Shri Dua has pointed out that he (SVC) went to a college for conducting an enquiry against a sexual harassment complaint. The Vice Chancellor by sitting on the Chair of the Vice Chancellor stated that the job of the Secretary to Vice Chancellor is to assist the Vice Chancellor inside his office only. He has no authority to conduct the enquiry, to sit in the inspection committees, to conduct the affiliation Committee and to go to the departments.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they would take care of it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that when this matter came for discussion in the Syndicate, as read out by Professor Chaman Lal, they deliberated on the issue thoroughly. The Syndicate deliberated on all the aspects very carefully. Dr. Ameer Sultana was also there and the Act which Professor Chaman Lal is reading out, to his mind, they discussed it at length and after due deliberations, they reached at the consensus. As

far as he remembers, he may be wrong, but Shri Ashok Goyal might correct him, that when it was decided in the Syndicate that the issue would go to the Senate, at that time he (Shri Ashok Goyal) only said that this is wrong. When it was asked as to how this is wrong, then he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said, they can see to it. But he (Dr. Amit Joshi) thinks that it was resolved that it would go to the Senate and so it has come to the Senate. So, he would like to make only one request to Shri Ashok Goyal that, if he says that something is wrong, then he should tell them, what is wrong. If they tell it later on after the matter is resolved, it is wrong. He has said the same thing in the Syndicate also that whatever is wrong, that might be told. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) has said in the Syndicate that whatever they are passing in the Syndicate is wrong. They may be wrong and they agree to it also, many a times they agree to what he (Shri Ashok Goyal) says, but when it was asked in the Syndicate as to what wrong has been done, he did not reply to that. He requested to correct him if he is wrong. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) had said nothing at that time, but had only said that he did not know and they should see to it themselves. This is on record.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is on record is that he had said that it is not in accordance with the Act. Now, to say, why it is not in accordance with the Act, they tried to convince the Senate number of times. Every time the Committee was constituted in violation of the Act, that is why he has said on that day also that it is not in accordance with the Act and they should see whether what has been pointed out by Smt Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, it is a slap on the face of the University, let they should not repeat the process again and see to it. That is what he is asking the Chairman even today, let him say that it is in accordance with the Act.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Chairman (Professor Ronki Ram) would respond himself about it to which Shri Ashok Goyal requested Dr. Joshi to say if it is in accordance with the Act. Dr. Joshi said that when the discussion was going on, Dr. Ameer Sultana read the Act and they finalized the names.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that Dr. Ameer Sultana did not read the Act.

Dr. Amit Joshi said, she did read the Act. A copy of the Act was in her hands. He further said that apart from that he has said at that time he has specifically asked that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has just said that what is being done, it is wrong. Even at that time, it was asked as to what wrong is being done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at that time he had told him that he would tell it in the Senate. On being asked by Dr. Amit Joshi as to what is this, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that on such issue also the decisions are taken by way of voting.

Dr. Amit Joshi said, then let him tell that the main quorum (agenda) of the Syndicate and Senate was that all the complaints, should be resolved in due course of time and as speedily as possible. He asked, was it not done there or not?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is the provision in the Act and what the Senate or Syndicate has to do in this.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to what is the provision in the Act and where is the violation of the Act. He asked as to what is the violation in the present committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there is no violation as this Committee has been formed under peculiar circumstances after taking guidelines from the Department of Personnel Training (DoPT). They said that this Committee is over and above the PUCASH. This Committee, they said, has been approved, as per the internal Committee.

Now the MHRD has said that let this Committee hold the enquiry and the Syndicate has constituted the Committee.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Shri Ashok Goyal had said in the Syndicate meeting that this should be sent along with all the documents to the Chancellor. The suggestions which were given by him (Shri Ashok Goyal) they all were agreed to, but now they are again deliberating on the same thing.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he would very briefly recall the sequence of events leading to the present situation. First, the PUCASH refused to handle the issue, they pointed out certain objections, which were then considered and a Committee was formed. That was the Committee which was headed by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. That Committee was recommended by the Syndicate to the Senate. When it came to the Senate, it was felt here that the competent authority to constitute the Committee is the Chancellor because the Chancellor was supposed to be the employer of the Vice Chancellor. At that time he agreed with this, but now looking back, he felt that it was not correct. The Chancellor is not the employer, but the Chancellor is the appointing authority. The employer is the University because employer is the one who pays salary and determines the conditions and so on. The appointing authority is the Chancellor. Anyway, the Senate did not either approve or reject, it simply forwarded the recommendations of the Syndicate to the Chancellor and asked the Chancellor, he remembers the wording, 'in his capacity as the employer to kindly approve or constitute a Committee'. The Chancellor deliberated on it, got legal advice and decided that he was not competent to constitute a Committee and, therefore, referred the matter to the MHRD. The MHRD, after due deliberations, came back and said, 'no, the Committee recommended by the Syndicate to the Senate is already there and is the one which should handle the matter. That directive of the MHRD came and he did not know what choice they have, but to carry out that directive. In accordance with that directive, they asked that Committee, to be headed by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary to kindly do it. Now, Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary came back with certain objections. It were those objections which they are now dealing with. They have a limited mandate. They can *ab initio* start discussing that it should be X Committee or Y Committee to deal. This is a follow up of the directive of MHRD. The directive of the MHRD came, after going through the rounds of Syndicate to Senate, then to Chancellor and from Chancellor to MHRD. The MHRD gave a directive and they carried it out and then found that there was one, a so called illegality and now they are trying to correct that illegality that is all. They cannot start it now whether X or Y should be there. There is no end to it. They have gone through the process i.e. Syndicate, Senate, Chancellor and the MHRD. Now, they are bound by the directive of MHRD and the changes which they are now making have arisen due to circumstances which are known and that is what they have to discuss.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now what they have decided as in the last meeting they have some differences because of the Chairperson of the Committee, in her own wisdom she has written it. So, what they did in the last Syndicate meeting, the Committee which was constituted was not changed at all. The only name which has expressed inability to act as a Chairperson, the Syndicate when met last time has changed that. But they said that the Committee recommended by the Syndicate on 21st January, 2017 to look into a specific complaint of a Senate member against the Vice Chancellor, Panjab University be reconstituted by substituting the Chairperson of the Committee, Mrs Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, former Chief Secretary, Haryana by anyone of the senior women IAS Officer. So, there was no change, except the change of the person, who told that she is not a serving officer. So, what they did in that. They tried to replace the person who is not serving with a serving. In her place, they chose

two persons in the Syndicate meeting i.e. Ms. Navraj Sandhu and Smt. Jyoti Arora and two additional women members to be included in the Committee, because that Committee is as per the DoPT guidelines and as per the MHRD, because this Committee is not exactly the internal PUCASH. PUCASH is already in order. This Committee is formed in peculiar circumstances. That means to say that two people are there. So, this is not going to be decided finally. They have to send it to the Chancellor. It is the will of the Chancellor to accept it or not to accept it. What is there which they want to say which is right or which is wrong. The names were suggested, the Committee was formed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the meeting was held after they got a letter from Mrs Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary and she made two observations, one was about section 4(2) of the Act which states that “the internal committee shall consist of the following members to be nominated by the employer, namely (a) a Presiding Officer who shall be a woman employed at a senior level at workplace... provided... of the other department or organization”. So, in this case, because there was a specific direction from the MHRD that the person who would Chair the Committee will not be from the University.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this Committee is not exactly as per the PUCASH rules and this is independent of that.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for that reason, they thought that the person should be working in some organization. In fact, when Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary’s name was proposed by the Syndicate, the matter was discussed in the Senate, it was pointed out that there seems to be some problem in the constitution of the Committee, but at that time Senate was of the opinion that whatever the names, they would send those names along with the discussion to the Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that this was also decided that only after taking the consent of those whose names are being sent and it was clarified in the Syndicate that no consent was taken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right. For that reason when they discussed it in the Syndicate, it was supposed to be external, working person and that is why two names have been suggested out of which one can either be picked up by the Senate or may be out of the two suggested, one name could be picked up by the Chancellor.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that in the High Court, there is also a Committee against sexual harassment for employees and Professor Rajesh Gill is member of that Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the second thing pointed out by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary is that “the Committee in terms of Section 4(2)(c) of the Act should necessarily have one member from amongst non-government organizations or associations associated to the cause of women or a person familiar with the issues relating to sexual harassment”. So, when they look at the constitution of the Committee, one name which was suggested on that day i.e. Professor Manvinder Kaur. She is a person from Women Studies Department and she was also in the original Committee. There was one more name i.e. Professor Pam Rajput, who is also familiar with these issues. This is what was pointed out by Professor Ameer Sultana while reading the Act. What was discussed, it is there on page 21. What he is trying to say it that it was thoroughly discussed and only after that these names were decided and also

because there should be two faculty members, so they suggested the names senior most faculty member of the University i.e. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they have not to do anything, but they have to send the names only and let them decide.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he is not aware of the discussion that went on in the Syndicate and how they went about choosing those names. He did not have the idea about the credentials of the first two IAS Officers who seem to be from the one neighbouring State i.e. Haryana. He was of the opinion that these two women also, if they have the credential of some contribution towards the women's cause and then he would agree that this is a very legitimate choice. They all want that there should be an impartial enquiry. They want that it should be immediate and fast because it has been stretched too long and it has been discussed *ad nauseam*. Therefore, he suggested that if any suggestion comes from the Syndicate to the Senate, then the Senate has the right to review it, to ask questions, to debate over the members and also to see where these members stand so that the decision finally is very-very objective. He would like to know (from Dr. Amit Joshi) and requested to specify and define the credentials of the people who were chosen and would like to ask that they have actually debated and came to the decision that these were the right people who are going to take the right decision. For instance, he was wondering as to why the Chairperson or a member from the National Commission for Women is not there, the people who deal with such kind of cases. Why is not there a person from a Women Cell. On one side, as Professor Chaman Lal has said, they say that they cannot have two senior Professors from the University, but on the other hand, they have Professor Pam Rajput who is very much part of senior faculty of the University, they are having Professor Meenakshi Malhotra who is very much part of the senior faculty, coming under the Vice Chancellor. So, when he looks at it very objectively, he would like that there should be an impartial enquiry, a decision which should be totally objective, based on absolute rationality and enquiry. If that is the case, he said that the Senate should have the right to carry out certain changes, alterations, to make suggestions. He also has the right to make suggestion that so and so person should be on the Committee so that Committee is all enveloping and above board.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they have taken these two names of senior IAS Officers.

Professor Shelley Walia intervened to say that he does not go by this IAS. He would say that a Professor from JNU in the department of Sociology or History would be far superior to an IAS.

Continuing, Professor Ronki Ram said that the reconstituted Committee, as proposed, would be sent to the Chancellor for approval with any deletion. It is upto the Chancellor to accept it or not. They are giving two names, one is Additional Chief Secretary (Department of Cooperation and Vigilance) and the other is Principal Secretary, Higher Education. So, what else they want.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that why they do not include a person from the Education Department because the names are going to be shortlisted by the Chancellor. Why they do not include that, what is the objection to that? Why they stick to the IAS only?

Professor Chaman Lal said that he has just a technical point. First, whatever has been reported, that needed to be supported by documents. As for as he

remembers, the way Shri Chadha ji has explained the whole thing, the MHRD has referred back to the University without approving any Committee. They have said that whatever is the system of internal complaint committee, that has to be applied on this.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he would read the letter being referred to by Professor Chaman Lal. It states that "In this regard, it is informed that the matter of constitution of a new Internal Committee to look into the allegations made by Prof. Rajesh Gill was examined by the Ministry in consultation with the Department of Personnel and Training (DoPT). DoPT has also examined the matter and has concluded that this is a peculiar case where the complaint committee, which consists of officers junior to the Vice Chancellor, against whom the complaint has been made, is confused about its jurisdiction and the complainant is not convinced with the composition of the Committee. In view of the peculiarity of the case, DoPT has suggested to consider constituting an independent committee specifically to look into all aspects of the matter to maintain fairness in such a sensitive matter, which was also recommended by the O/o Vice President of India in its letter dated 14.06.2017". So, now keeping that in mind, a Committee has been constituted. However, some members requested to read the whole letter. So, Professor Ronki Ram read out the other part of the letter which states, "You are, therefore, requested to go ahead with the Internal Committee, as recommended by the Syndicate, Panjab University in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 for enquiry into the allegations made by Prof. Rajesh Gill". He said that his only submission is this Committee what happened is that the Committee was about to meet, informally, the date was decided, somehow, it could not take place. Then the matter came up. Now, they want that the Committee should work, thereby, in place of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, the two names have been given.

Professor Chaman Lal said that whatever is the formation of the Internal Committee. Actually they can form a Committee beyond this because of peculiar condition, but Internal Complaint Committee guidelines cannot be overlooked. They have put the name of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra. While reading out the guidelines, which state, that the persons in senior administrative positions in the higher education institutes, such as Vice Chancellor, Pro Vice Chancellor, Rectors, Registrars, Deans, Head of the Departments etc. shall not be members of ICC in order to ensure autonomy of their functioning. They are recommending Professor Meenakshi Malhotra who is second to Vice Chancellor. How can they make her a member which is against the ICC recommendations? He agreed that they have to get a persons from outside, but as far as members from University is concerned, they cannot put officers of the University in this Committee. That is the spirit of the ICC.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that in the committee of eight members if there is one person from the University, even then the dominance of the outsiders would be there.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that she (Professor Meenakshi Malhotra) is not officer, but she is a teacher and a Professor first.

Professor Chaman Lal again read out the guidelines and said that 'persons in senior administrative positions, Pro Vice Chancellor, Rector, D.U.I. is equivalent to Rector.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about as to how a Committee is to be constituted, what they have approved in the University is the Act. So they have to go by the Act and not by the UGC guidelines.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that, no, they have to go by the directive of the MHRD. The MHRD, after consulting everybody, told them that the Committee recommended by the Syndicate on such and such date, to be headed by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, should be asked to do the enquiry. It is a directive from the MHRD and they cannot violate that. The directive of the MHRD is that this enquiry should be conducted by the Committee recommended by the Syndicate on such and such date. That Committee was supposed to be headed by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. Right or wrong, whether it complies with the Act or not, that is not the scrutiny they can do now. They can only replace her with two other names.

Professor Ronki Ram said that here they are not to go into the legality whether it is properly constituted or not because the MHRD has already taken a call on it and directed them to do this. Are they going to delay that?

Professor Chaman Lal said that if they follow the MHRD directions, then what Ambassador is saying is totally wrong. They have to replace only Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary and they cannot put two additional members. How they can put two additional members if the Chancellor/MHRD has approved certain Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that with all due respect and due apologies, he completely beg to differ with Mr. I.S. Chadha. MHRD is nobody to dictate them, for that matter no authority has competence to direct them in violation of the Act. First of all, the MHRD is not the employer of the Vice Chancellor. It is only and only the Chancellor. Now, this is the new information shared by Mr. I.S. Chadha with the House that the Hon'ble Chancellor, after taking legal opinion, decided that he is not the employer of the Vice Chancellor. Of course, it is the new addition to their knowledge, because there is no such communication in the records of the University, where the Chancellor, after taking the legal opinion, has made an opinion that he is not the employer of the Vice Chancellor. Alright, that is still debatable. But which provision makes MHRD as the employer of the Vice Chancellor, just because that the complainant sent the complaint to the MHRD, do they get the authority to dictate them that this is the Committee which would enquire into the matter which is in violation of the Act. The complainant has sent the complaint to I.G. Police, Chandigarh, to SSP, Chandigarh also, may be to the Mayor of Chandigarh also, may be to the President of Sector-15 Rehri Market Association also. That means wherever the complaint goes, they get the competence to make the Committee and dictate them. He said, no, as far as the seniority and juniority is concerned, with the permission of the two learned Advocates, one Advocate and one Senior Advocate, who are sitting here, he would just like to draw their attention to a sexual harassment case, filed by an Additional Session Judge against a High Court Judge, where the Committee was constituted by the Chief Justice of that High Court and that was Madhya Pradesh High Court. The judgement was given by Justice Khehar wherein it was specifically observed that the justice cannot be expected from those two senior judges of the High Court who are to conduct the enquiry against their own colleague on a complaint filed by their subordinate. The Supreme Court had constituted the Committee for that case specifically because it was the Supreme Court under whose jurisdiction all the High Courts were there. There is no Ministry of Law, no MHRD, no Ministry of Home Affairs, no Prime Minister's Office, they could not interfere. As far as the letter which he (Professor Ronki Ram) read, they say there should be a Committee which should look into all the aspects of the case keeping in view its peculiarity, not that a Committee be constituted to act as an Internal Enquiry Committee, it is not written. Though in the second para, which is totally contradictory says, therefore, the Committee recommended by the Syndicate in its meeting dated so and so, shall hold an enquiry. If, at all, he believes, what Mr. Chadha has said, that the matter was referred by the Chancellor to the MHRD, then why the MHRD sent a letter

directly to them. They should have sent the letter to the Chancellor and Chancellor has the competence to advise them. But unfortunately, what has happened, Dr. Randhawa was referring a very pertinent issue half an hour back that right from the beginning they were of the opinion that it is the Chancellor who should constitute the Committee. The Senate took a unanimous decision here today in December, 2015 to write to the Chancellor to constitute a Committee. He had pointed it earlier also that the Registrar, in his capacity as Secretary of the Senate, sent that resolved part of the Senate for legal opinion to the Legal Retainer, there are three Legal Retainers, whether the Senate has taken the right decision or not. Instead of sending the decision as it is, to the Chancellor, it was sent along with the legal opinion of two legal Retainers, the third Legal Retainer refused to give the legal opinion, saying that it is only the Chancellor, if he asks for his opinion, he will give, otherwise, in what capacity, they are seeking his opinion. In fact, they should not shy away from accepting that everybody is keen to get the enquiry conducted, but some are interested only in getting the enquiry conducted from a particular set of people. Some are interested only in fair, neutral and transparent enquiry into the matter, otherwise nobody is interested in delaying things. Even if now he is asking, these two names which have been brought for the consideration of the Senate, he asked the Chairperson if they have taken their consent. He asked, what was decided in the Syndicate?

Professor Ronki Ram said that in the Syndicate it was said that they must take the consent of the persons whose name they are proposing. But, clarifying the point, he said that like that they may say again like that of Smt. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. But they have not taken the consent and left it to the Chancellor. They are not going to form a Committee. This Committee would go to the Chancellor and he might take the opinion. They are referring it to the Chancellor.

On a point of order, Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that as he has been named by Shri Ashok Goyal, he needs to know because in the Courts the word is used, the credential of the complaint. But here he would not use that word and deliberately use the words, seriousness of the complaint and the complainant. If they are so serious about it, so that the justice is delivered and the allegation of the complaint be required to be investigated. Is this the way, they are pulling it for their political purpose or for other purpose. Is it the right way to take this case into that direction. To his mind, if there would have been any seriousness in the complaint, the matter should have been gone to the High Court under Section 482 seeking direction to the all concerned to whom the representation has been made. Secondly, if so, sometimes the High Court say that they should have opted for making a criminal complaint before the Court of law before the local Magistrate. So, under Section 156 Cr.P.C., they have the proviso that one can proceed with one's complaint if the case is of criminal nature. So, he needed to know whether there is any complaint filed before the local Magistrate or has any petition been sought by the petitioner in the High Court or it is just a political matter to just linger it on to harass a particular person.

Professor Ronki Ram said, that is why, this Committee which was constituted, in the emergency coming out of the Chairperson saying that she is not a serving officer. So, they immediately met and will send two names to the Chancellor and the Chancellor would definitely ask them for their consent whether they would take the charge and take the consent. So, what is wrong in it, he could not understand by sending these two names/Committee or this Committee to the Chancellor, what is going to stop them. What they would do against law by doing this. They are following certain set procedures which they have been asked for and before that, this Committee was already approved. It was due to this emergency that the Chairperson of the Committee was of the opinion that she is not serving. So, in the absence of that, small changes, they want to include

the name and send it to the Chancellor so that the enquiry could be done. So, what is the problem here.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if he had been at his (Professor Ronki Ram) place he would have made the suggestion that instead of these two people which he does not know, he would substitute the Chairperson of the JNU Sexual Harassment Committee, they could invite that person as they are inviting her. They could also request persons from Delhi University or some other University. He asked Professor Chaman Lal as to what he was saying in this regard. He does not know those person or anybody else also does not know them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should tell the two names which they want to be added and the same could be added. He asked Professor Shelley Walia to tell the names of two persons who could be included in the list.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if he mentions the name of any person, it would mean that he knows the persons and it would show his closeness to them. He further said that they should find out who is the Chairperson of the JNU sexual harassment committee and they should send her an invitation. They should leave it to the Chancellor.

Professor Ronki Ram requested Professor Chaman Lal to give two names and then they would go ahead. He said that he (Professor Chaman Lal) has mentioned two names, one from JNU and the other from Delhi University.

Professor Chaman Lal said that first they should exclude the names of two additional members put in the Committee as there is no need of two additional members. This was also endorsed by Shri H.S. Dua. He further said that as per the MHRD direction, as has been stated by Shri Chadha ji, they have only to change the Chairperson. In order to change that, they can give 3-4 names.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the names could be added.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they need not to mention the names, let the Chancellor decide it.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that one member from National Commission for Women could be included.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he would agree if they have to strictly adhere to the MHRD directive, which he himself feel that they should, then he is prepared to grant that they should confine themselves to replacing Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. There are two names which have come, they can add those two names and send four names. He has no problem with them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that let two more names be added and send it to the Chancellor. Both Professor Shelley Walia and Professor Chaman Lal have given a very good suggestion and they are reaching towards some consensus.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he would just like to know whether they would like to solve this issue or want to mingle it to which Professor Ronki Ram said that they would definitely like to solve this issue. He further said that there is no issue in the world which could not be solved. A special meeting has also been held on this issue. There are ninety members in the House and all of them are well educated, at least those

who have done graduation 5 years ago. It is very unfortunate that an issue which has cropped up in this family, they are not able to solve it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he can understand his feeling and they would solve this issue. The issue would definitely be solved and he (Shri Sandeep Singh) should not worry about it and requested to suggest two names.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the reason for which he has asked for time to speak is that a golden chance be given to the candidates and requested that this should be approved.

Many of the members said it is approved.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if they have started zero hour, they should take up the other issues also.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that Chairperson of Sexual Harassment Committee of any University or any other academic Institute could be added.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that all the lady Senate members should be included in the Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked the Chair (Prof. Ronki Ram) if he has given his ruling.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he has not to give any ruling. A good discussion has taken place. Many members like Professor Shelley Walia, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Chaman Lal, all of them have given many suggestions.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item before the Syndicate was to discuss the letter written by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. The item before the Syndicate was not to reconstitute the Committee or to replace somebody with Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. It was not pointed out there also. He told that had they known that the agenda is to reconstitute or to replace a new Chairperson, the situation was different. The item was only to discuss the letter and when Mr. I.S. Chadha said that they must stick to that only, then he thought that let him read the agenda. The agenda which was there before the Syndicate is different from what is before them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this is what Dr. Randhawa ji has said that they have to choose a new person in place of the Chairperson who has resigned. They are not to think what Mrs. Meenaxi Chaudhary Anand has said in her letter. The only request was to appoint a Chairperson. He said if the agenda is not prepared properly, he requested Shri Ashok Goyal to give suggestions to the Registrar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Para 26, which was withdrawn by the Vice Chancellor, it is he who gave the idea in Para 26 that this meeting is convened for reconstituting the Committee. When he said that he did not know it, the Vice Chancellor said, alright, Para 26 is withdrawn. After giving the idea he (Vice Chancellor) gave a hint to the Syndicate that they could replace the Chairperson. Now, he thought, the same agenda which was there in the Syndicate, would be placed before the Senate also to discuss the letter of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. No, the agenda

is to consider the two names, this and that. The letter of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary only has been attached as annexure, the letter is not to be discussed here. Today also, had he known that it is the constitution of the Committee which is to be considered by the Senate, maybe he would also be in a position to suggest some names, because he believed even today, as has been pointed out earlier, even these Committee members, whose names have been suggested, no bio-data has been attached. Every time it is assured that it would be circulated and it will be attached, but nothing is attached. His contention still remains, it will be in the fitness of things that they reiterate their decision of December, 2015 Senate that Chancellor be requested to appoint a Committee in terms of Sexual Harassment of Women of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 to enquire into the matter if they want to expedite the matter.

Professor Ronki Ram requested the Registrar that he should send the names of the persons by attaching their bio-data to the Chancellor and let the Chancellor decide on it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, why they should suggest the names. Let the Chancellor do whatever he would like to do.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier the Chancellor had said that the Internal Complaints Committee which is already there, will enquire into the matter. At that time the consent was asked for from the MHRD. Rather, the PUCASH was requested to enquire into the matter, but the PUCASH refused to do it and desired that clearance from the MHRD should also be taken. When it was sent to the MHRD for clearance, they approved the Committee. Now, there is no meaning if they change the whole Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should go ahead from where the things have already settled. They have reached at this point with a great difficulty. So, now, as said by Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Shelley Walia, they should add two additional names, attach their bio-data and send it to the Chancellor. He asked the Registrar to send the names after attaching their bio-data. It is for the Chancellor to do whatever he likes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Chancellor should also be advised and Professor Ronki Ram completed the sentence by saying that to approve or whatever he (Chancellor) likes

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this view should also be recorded that some members are of the opinion that an independent committee be constituted by the Chancellor.

Professor Ronki Ram and Professor Navdeep Goyal said, it is ok and it should be added.

At this stage, Professor Ronki Ram left the chair and requested the Registrar to invite the Vice-Chancellor to chair the meeting. After a while the Vice-Chancellor rejoined the meeting.

Before the Vice-Chancellor entered the hall, Professor Keshav Malhotra was announcing the names of Professor Shelley Walia, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Harpreet Dua, Shri Naresh Gaur, Dr. Parveen Goyal, Professor Chaman Lal, Professor J.K. Goswamy, Shri Ashok Goyal and said that these persons were of the opinion that an independent Committee should be there.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it be also written that when this decision was taken, 16 persons were sitting there and out of those the members expressed their opinion as stated above.

However, Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that Professor Chaman Lal's name should not be included in the list as he has not said anything about this.

Professor Chaman Lal said, let him state his position. He thinks, he and Professor Shelley Walia have certain consensus that apart from the first two names, the further two additional names are to be withdrawn because that was not in letter of the MHRD. Along with these two names one person, without mentioning name, member of National Commission for Women. National Commission for Women should nominate a person on its own. That would make it more objective. They just want that National Commission for Women, which is a national Body, if they nominate a person, there would be no problem whether it is serving or not serving. That would give more credibility to this, but the names of two women members included in the Committee should be withdrawn. It is their consensus, if others agree, it would be fine. If they do not agree, it is up to them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this is in addition to two names Ms. Navraj Sandhu and Smt. Jyoti Arora.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that these two names have already been finalized and there is no objection on that.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that no name has been withdrawn which was also endorsed by Mrs. Anu Chatrath.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that this with respect to the Chair, in addition to two names, they can add one name, but not withdraw any name.

Professor Ronki Ram made it clear that there is no withdrawal of any name.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the House actually came to the decision that the first two names also, instead of having IAS Officers, why not persons from academics. He thinks that everyone has agreed to it.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that this issue has been settled when Professor Ronki Ram was chairing the meeting.

Professor Shelley Walia said that this issue has not been settled. Professor Ronki Ram was asking to give the names of the person, but they are not giving any names. But they were saying was that one member from the National Commission for Women and one member from Ambedkar University Sexual Harassment Committee and one member from the Delhi University could be taken.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar, Mrs Anu Chatrath and some other members said, no, it was not there and why he was pinpointing, particularly the Ambedkar University.

Professor Shelley Walia said now suddenly they have started saying 'no'. If they say it should be from any University, then let it be from any University.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that at the most they can add a member from the National Commission for Women, but these four names should continue.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if they are still discussing, it would be a problem as the person against whom the complaint is, is sitting here.

Shri H.S. Dua asked they should be told as to what decision has been taken.

Professor Chaman Lal said that Professor Ronki Ram should make the position clear as to what is the resolved part. Let them all be patient because Professor Ronki Ram was the Chairperson and whatever he has understood, he should clear the position.

At this point of time, Mrs. Anu Chatrath requested Professor Ronki Ram to chair the meeting. The Vice-Chancellor again abstained himself and Professor Ronki Ram chaired the meeting.

Professor Ronki Ram said that everything has been resolved and he clarified again that it was resolved that the names which are already there on the Committee, those will remain as such and that an addition is to be made in the names already there. The addition which is to be made, the members have said that they are not to name any person, but make the addition. When the question of removing the name cropped up, most of the persons were of the view that they should not remove the names as it is not good, but they agree to add the names. When it was asked as to which names have to be added, Professor Shelley Walia has said that a member from the National Commission for Women or her nominee. He has also said that the persons who would be added, their bio-data be also sent along with. Secondly, the Hon'ble Chancellor could retain any names, he would deem fit out of these names, they are sending it to the Chancellor with this view in mind and their bio-data would be sent along with. That was all what was decided and if there is any doubt, they could tell.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has some doubt. The persons who have got their names recorded, want that the Chancellor should make an independent Committee as he deems fit.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it is an additional clause and it was a view of some members which was objected by Shri H.S. Dua.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the word 'some' came up in the discussion, he (Professor Ronki Ram) has said that the persons who have that opinion, they should get their names noted and the names were got noted to which Professor Ronki Ram said, yes. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now seven people have said that they reiterate that it is the Chancellor who should make an independent Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said that those persons should get their names noted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they have got their names recorded and now they have again started it. It was stated that 16 persons were present at that time to which Professor Ronki Ram said, 'no'.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the issue could be resolved only if they talk patiently. He said that he is not in those seven persons who have got their names noted to which Professor Ronki Ram said that is okay. The issue was almost resolved when Shri I.S. Chadha said that 'yes' they should restrict to MHRD, which means that they have to think only of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary's replacement and nothing else. He would like to make it clear that there is no disrespect shown to Mrs Meenakshi Malhotra. The question is that they should do only that what the directive is. The directive was that since Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary could not become the

Chairperson, the other person has to be given the charge. The two names which are already there, those two names have been more or less have been approved by all of them and simultaneously it was also approved that National Commission for Women or their representative might be added. The confusion is on the additional two members. Once he (Professor Ronki Ram) says that those two additional members have been withdrawn, to his mind that was the total consensus. Making it clear, Professor Chaman Lal said that the total consensus is that three names for Chairpersonship would be sent i.e the two names which have already been proposed plus a nominee or a member of the National Commission for Women and no other name.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it should also include from two members from other Universities.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that seven members out of sixteen have desired to get their names noted for constituting the Committee by the Hon'ble Chancellor.

Professor Ronki Ram said that no such change has been made which violate to the internal structure of the Committee. It was agreed that there should be women members in the Committee, so in order to maintain the proper number of women members, the names of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra and Chairperson PUCASH were added.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath informed that as per the Supreme Court judgement in the Vishakha Guidelines, majority of the members could be women.

Professor Ronki Ram said 'yes' that is why their names were added in the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he does not know how Professor Chaman Lal has mistakenly understood, but he has not asked to note his (Professor Chaman Lal) name in the names of seven persons. So, he requested to note down the names of seven persons. He said that out of seventeen, including the person, who is chairing the meeting, seven persons are of the opinion, it is the Chancellor who should make an independent committee.

Shri Naresh Gaur announced these seven names which includes Shri Naresh Gaur himself, Professor Shelley Walia, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Dr. Parveen Goyal, Professor J.K. Goswamy and Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they may give the proposal and they are passing a resolution in which they would say that they are sending these two names. He asked, do they agree to it?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, no, they do not agree to it.

Professor Ronki Ram asked, do they have their dissent on it.

Professor Ashok Goyal said, no, their view is that the seven persons are saying that the Chancellor should make an independent committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said, it means that neither they have their dissent nor they are in favour of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they say that they are against it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it means that these members have a dissent on the Committee which they are sending, the seven members are not in favour of that to which Shri Ashok Goyal said, 'yes'.

Professor Ronki Ram said, okay. Seven persons out of sixteen say that they are not in favor of the Committee which they are sending.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if Shri Ashok Goyal is saying so. The Committee approved by the Syndicate which was subsequently has been approved by the Senate, now they have to give a substitute of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. But if at this time they say that the Chancellor should constitute the Committee, it means they are deviating from their own decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let it reflect too early on the Senate. If they say it is such an important issue that the meeting could go on up to 12'O clock and now say that they could not continue after 5.00 p.m. they should show then.

Shri H.S. Dua said that they know that this single item is being considered after extracting the agenda items.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when the decision was taken, there were about 18-19 members, including Ambassador I.S. Chadha and Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said at that time Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa, Dr. Harjot Singh, Shri Sandeep Singh, Ambassador I.S. Chadha were also present.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri H.S. Dua said at that time there were some other persons also i.e. Dr. Harsh Batra.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it be written that it is resolved in the presence of sixteen members that the names be sent. However, seven persons namely so and so (named above), (at this time Professor Ronki Ram completed the statement by saying that) were of the opinion that the Chancellor should constitute Committee . However, Shri Ashok Goyal while correcting him said 'independent committee of his own'.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also endorsed the constitution of independent committee on his own.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath requested that now they should stop discussing this matter.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now the discussion is over and asked to invite the Vice Chancellor and he left the Chair.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 10th January, 2018 be approved and one member from the National Commission for Women or an existing Chairperson of Internal Committee against Sexual Harassment from any other University be added to the list of the persons already recommended to preside the Committee and the same be sent to the Hon'ble Chancellor along with their bio-data for approval. The Hon'ble Chancellor may delete or include any person as may be deemed appropriate.

Seven members namely Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Professor Shelley Walia, Professor J.K. Goswamy, Dr. Parveen

Senate Proceedings dated 21st January/17th February 2018

Goyal, Shri Naresh Gaur were of the opinion that the Hon'ble Chancellor should constitute an independent Committee.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Professor Ronki Ram (in the Chair)

At this point of time, the Vice Chancellor again joined to Chair the meeting.

As Mrs. Anu Chatrath wanted to speak, the Vice Chancellor said that since there is no zero hour, he would listen to her later as no decision can be taken here.

Shri Sandeep Singh requested to grant a golden chance to the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot take this decision now as meeting of the Syndicate is going to be held on 24th February and the matter could be included in the supplementary agenda.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR