

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the meeting of the **SYNDICATE** held on **Monday, 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018** at **4.30 p.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT**

1. Professor Raj Kumar ... (in the Chair)  
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Ameer Sultana
3. Dr. Amit Joshi
4. Professor Anita Kaushal
5. Shri Ashok Goyal
6. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi
7. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
8. Professor Keshav Malhotra
9. Professor Navdeep Goyal
10. Shri Prabhjit Singh
11. Professor Ronki Ram
12. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
13. Shri R.S. Brar, DHE, U.T. Chandigarh
14. Shri Harjit Singh, DPI (Colleges), Punjab
15. Dr. Subhash Sharma
16. Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha
17. Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

Dr. Satish Kumar and Shri Sanjay Tandon could not attend the meeting.

At the very outset, the Vice-Chancellor welcomed the members of the Syndicate of this very prestigious University. As per the traditions of the University and this august House, let they start the meeting with the playing of the Panjab University anthem.

First, the items listed in the current agenda were taken up and thereafter Item C-16 of Syndicate meeting dated 10.06.2018 was taken up and is a part of the minutes with other items.

**Condolence resolution**

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

- i) Hon'ble Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee ji, former Prime Minister of India on 16<sup>th</sup> August, 2018,
- ii) Hon'ble Shri Balramji Dass Tandon, Governor of Chattisgarh and former Deputy Chief Minister of Punjab, revered father of Shri Sanjay Tandon, Fellow, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2018,
- iii) Prof. (Mrs.) Sudesh Gakhar retired from the Department of Education and former Senate member on 26<sup>th</sup> August, 2018,
- iv) Prof. K.K. Anand, former Professor at USOL(Deptt. of Political Science), PU, on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2018,
- v) Prof. R.K. Pathak, formerly of the Department of Anthropology, PU, on 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2018,
- vi) Prof. Paresh, retired from Deptt. of Hindi and father of Prof. Latika Sharma (Dept of Education), on 2<sup>nd</sup> August, 2018,
- vii) Shri H.C. Mehra, father of Prof. Vandana Mehra, Department of Education, on 19<sup>th</sup> August, 2018,

- viii) Shri Shiv Narayan Sharma, father of Prof. Vishal Sharma of the Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, on 22<sup>nd</sup> August, 2018.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Hon'ble Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee ji, Hon'ble Shri Balramji Dass Tandon, Prof. (Mrs.) Sudesh Gakhar, Prof. K.K. Anand, Prof. R.K. Pathak, Prof. Paresh, Shri H.C. Mehra and Shri Shiv Narayan Sharma observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

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

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that-
- i) Sh. M. Venkaiah Naidu, Hon'ble Vice President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University, in exercise of powers vested in him under Section 10 of the Panjab University Act, 1947, has appointed me (Prof. Raj Kumar, Director, Dean and Head, Institute of Management Studies of Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi), as Vice Chancellor of Panjab University, a very prominent and one of the oldest Universities in India, for a term of three years w.e.f. 23<sup>rd</sup> July, 2018.

In pursuance to the orders of the Hon'ble Chancellor, I have assumed the office the 13<sup>th</sup> Vice Chancellor of this prestigious University, on July 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2018. I wish to express my deep gratitude and thanks to the Hon'ble Chancellor who has reposed confidence in me to assume this onerous responsibility. I would also like to assure the Hon'ble Chancellor through this house that I shall endeavour to best of my abilities to come up to the expectation of the Hon'ble Chancellor, the Syndicate, the Senate, the entire fraternity of the University in particular and the society in general. It would be my mission to take this Institution to greater heights at global level.

On this, my first meeting with the present Syndicate, I welcome all of you, the distinguished members. I seek the valued guidance, support and cooperation of all the members of the Syndicate and Senate to achieve our common goal. I understand the sanctity of the statutes, regulations and rules which govern this prestigious University and it would be my earnest endeavour to discharge my responsibility in conformity to these rules and regulations with cooperation of all of you.

Further, I would like to share with all the members of the Syndicate that I visited New Delhi on August 21, 2018 and met with the Secretary, MHRD, Chairman, UGC and Secretary, UGC with respect to financial concerns of the Panjab University. In this connection, Secretary, MHRD, Chairman, UGC and

Syndicate Proceedings dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

Secretary, UGC, assured me to accede to my request with respect to early release of required funds to the PU, Chandigarh.

- ii) Hon'ble Governor of Punjab and Administrator, Chandigarh, UT, has appointed Prof. Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor, as Chairman, State Higher Education Council (SHEC) under the Rashtriya Uchchar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) scheme of the MHRD.
- iii) MHRD under RUSA Scheme has accorded approval for Rs.5 crore under equity initiatives (for constructing Girls Hostel) and Rs.7 crore for faculty improvements, which will be carried out by Human Resource Development Centre (HRDC), PU.
- iv) President of India has awarded the Certificate of Honour for the year 2018 to Prof. Ved Prakash Upadhyaya, retired from Department of Sanskrit, P.U. Prof. Upadhyay served the University from 1970 to 2010.
- v) Hon'ble Governor of Haryana and Chancellor of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar, has nominated Prof. S.K. Tomar, Department of Mathematics, Panjab University on the Executive Council of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar for a term of two years w.e.f. August 2018 to August 2020.
- vi) Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Chairperson, Department of Hindi, has been selected for deputation to Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR) Chair of Hindi Language at the University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan, for a period of one academic year w.e.f. September 2018 onwards.
- vii) University Grants Commission has upgraded the Department of Anthropology from CAS-I to CAS-II for a period of 5 years (01-04-2018 to 31-03-2023) with a total grant of Rs.94 lakhs (Non-Recurring + Recurring) and one Project Fellow (Actual).
- viii) Mr Pradip Nirbhavane, Senior Research Fellow at University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been selected for Birmingham India Institute Fellowship, fully-funded to carry out interdisciplinary Indo-British collaborative research work in the domain of Lipidic Nanocarriers for the Treatment of Uveitis.
- ix) Ms Shiyana, Research Scholar at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) has been awarded the APRC Travel and Short Stay Grant by the International Brain Research Organization (IBRO) to study the molecular mechanisms which cause neuronal complications due to sleep deprivation at the Mental Biology Laboratory at the RIKEN Centre for Brain Science in Japan.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. Felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Prof. Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor, PU, on his being appointed as Chairman, State Higher Education Council (SHEC) under the Rashtriya Uchchar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) scheme of the MHRD by the Hon'ble Governor of Punjab and Administrator, Chandigarh, UT.;
  - (ii) Prof. Ved Prakash Upadhyaya, retired from Department of Sanskrit, on his being awarded the Certificate of Honour for the year 2018 by the President of India;
  - (iii) Prof. S.K. Tomar, Department of Mathematics, for being nominated on the Executive Council of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana;
  - (iv) Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Chairperson, Department of Hindi, on his being selected for deputation to Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR) Chair of Hindi Language at the University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan;
  - (v) Mr Pradip Nirbhavane, Senior Research Fellow at University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on his being selected for Birmingham India Institute Fellowship, fully-funded to carry out interdisciplinary Indo-British collaborative research work in the domain of Lipidic Nanocarriers for the Treatment of Uveitis.
  - (vi) Ms Shiyana, Research Scholar at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) on her being awarded the APRC Travel and Short Stay Grant by the International Brain Research Organization (IBRO) at the RIKEN Centre for Brain Science in Japan.
2. Information contained in Vice Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (i), (iii) and (vii) be noted and approved; and
3. Action Taken Reports on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 29.04.2018 and 26.05.2018, **as per Appendix-I**, be noted.

When the Vice Chancellor announced that the next item on the agenda is confirmation of the previous minutes, Shri Ashok Goyal said that before they proceed further, referring to his (Vice Chancellor) statement, since it is the first formal meeting of the Syndicate after he (Professor Raj Kumar) assumed as the Vice-Chancellor, though they were expecting the meeting to be held earlier because almost one month has passed, but from his (Vice Chancellor) statement it is clear why this meeting has been delayed. Probably, instead of holding a meeting of the Syndicate, he was in a hurry to get the things expedited at the level of MHRD, the

office of the Chancellor and UGC office at Delhi for which they extend their heartfelt thanks. As far as the functioning of this University is concerned, the Vice-Chancellor has specifically mentioned in his statement that he would like to take this University to new heights within the framework of the statutes, regulations and rules of this University which is a very-very welcome step. He, for himself and, of course, on behalf of the Syndicate, admire his feelings, admire his concern for the sanctity of rules and they assure in return that within the laid down law, henceforth for running the University, specially, this University, the Syndicate and Senate of Panjab University will always be with him 24x7 and they expect that under his leadership the University will progress further and they would try to send a message to the Chancellor assuring him their best services through this House. They would also like to send a message to the Chancellor, while thanking him for appointing him (Prof. Raj Kumar) as the Vice Chancellor of this University, send a message of the Syndicate that they have the same endeavour for bringing more laurels to the University and all of them will work in that direction in unison. He thinks, most of them have already met him (Vice Chancellor). So, formally, he would like to extend his heartiest welcome to him and also express his gratitude to the Chancellor who has appointed a person like him at this University for a period of next three years. Once again, he would like to assure him their cooperation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they all endorse the feelings expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor thanked for the feelings expressed by the members and said that from this platform and this Chair, once again he assured the members that with their cooperation and support, he would go by the rules and regulations and whatever their constructive suggestion should be, within the frame work, that would be his first priority to take up that and try to implement those things because objectives and goals are the same as he uttered and that is the general feeling, not only of the University fraternity but also the feeling of the different stakeholders. For them, they are putting each and every effort. He once again thanked the members. The Vice Chancellor then mentioned about the minutes of meetings of the previous meetings and asked if there is any addition or omission in the minutes.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he would like to add one thing. They had boycotted the last two Syndicate meetings due to one or the other reason. They had decided unanimously, as they know, there are certain delegated powers on behalf of the Syndicate. He said that he thinks, everybody would agree with him that the Syndicate delegates again all the powers to the Vice Chancellor, on behalf of Syndicate, as provided in the Panjab University Calendar. They do hope that the Vice-Chancellor would exercise those powers in the best interest of the University, in the best interest of the society, keeping in mind the laid down statutes and provisions of the Calendar. He hoped that everybody would agree with him.

Shri Prabhjit Singh while endorsing it said that they all agree with it.

The Vice Chancellor once again thanked the members for the feelings expressed by them and the interest that they have shown by

heart. He requested to join together and put their entire efforts for putting the University on a very greater height and the University should be one and one only, not only in India, but on the international map also. What he is telling, that is not anything new, they have already achieved those heights. For one or the other reasons there were issues, let they should not go into that detail now. Time is very precious, he could understand their engagements and all those things. They should start with a new feeling and new initiatives, forgetting all the past things and put up their energy for the rebuilding of this great University. He once again thanked the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal while referring to the previous minutes of the meetings, said that he could not understand as to what is this.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are the dates of circulation of the minutes of the previous meetings of the Syndicate. It is the confirmation of minutes. These minutes are not yet confirmed and in case they want to change it, they could do so even now.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know if it is an agenda item. He said that he wanted to know that the meeting of the Syndicate took place on 30<sup>th</sup> of March, 2018 and the same meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> April, and thereafter on 29<sup>th</sup> April. So, one meeting of Syndicate was held on three consecutive dates. Another meeting i.e. 29<sup>th</sup> April, because on 29<sup>th</sup> April some leftover items of the earlier meeting were also taken up and meeting scheduled for 29<sup>th</sup> April, was also held on 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2018. He thinks, it should be a matter of concern, without naming anyone, that the minutes of both the meetings were circulated on the same date i.e. on 17<sup>th</sup> August. He just wanted to bring to the notice of the Vice Chancellor that there is no such provision in the regulations that as to within how many days the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate have to be circulated because it is expected that the meetings of the Syndicate are to take place very frequently. So, obviously, they have not fixed any time. But the meetings which are generally expected to be held after every three months i.e. of the Senate, it is specifically mentioned that within one month, the minutes are to be circulated, meaning thereby that it is expected that the minutes of the Syndicate are supposed to be sent much earlier than the one month period. But here they are getting the minutes four months or three months after the meeting has been held and they are given 15 days time to point out any discrepancy which is yet to come out after confirmation of minutes. While discussing this item, he just wanted to suggest that even if he knows that so many meetings take place and the office is also overburdened while recording the minutes, preparing the minutes and circulating the minutes and he could understand that it is not possible to prepare for so many things and it takes time. But he thinks that they must try their best that under any circumstances, the regulations are not violated and they should see to it that the minutes are circulated well in time as stipulated in the Calendar. Otherwise also, it is not humanly possible to remember after 4-5 months, what was discussed and what was decided. Actually, that is why in 2012, it is rather 2010, they introduced the video recording of the meetings of the Syndicate as well as the Senate because people started raising doubts about what was discussed and decided and what was recorded in the minutes. He just wants to point out that even after video recording, in spite of the fact that video recording says

something, it has been referred to also that this is what has been decided and this is what has been discussed. In some cases, he did not know for what reasons, the recording is altogether different. So, these 2-3 things, he thinks, need to be taken care of. Coming to Senate minutes, he said that he (Vice Chancellor) would be surprised that a meeting which took place in September, 2017, the minutes of that meeting have been sent alongwith the agenda papers of this Syndicate meeting. That means after 11 months, is it possible, after 11 months to recollect as to what was decided, except to refer to the video recording? So, his simple submission is that as far as the minutes of meeting of Senate of September 2017, are concerned, because these are the final minutes which have been circulated just three days back, those final minutes should be subject to verification from what is recorded in the file and what is in the video recording.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is correct, he honours this suggestion. This is a very good suggestion. He thinks that the reason for all these things and misunderstandings is the time consumed for various activities. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) has suggested that it should be rectified and circulated to the members in time within the framework.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that one of the difficulties which the staff is facing is that of lengthy minutes and also the people used to speak in Hindi, Punjabi and English. These are problems being faced by them. Last time also he made a suggestion that there is no point in writing the version of each member. He thinks that it is meaningless. For record, they can have the DVD on record. This DVD could be uploaded on the website and if somebody wants to confirm, he could do that from there. There should be short minutes of 3-4 pages. They should just mention the agenda item and the resolved part and this can be prepared in three days. So, there cannot be any problem at all and this can be uploaded on the website. So, there cannot be any point in reducing the minutes and circulating the same. He does not see any point in it and this is the wastage of the administrative staff's time. He had never read the discussion part of the minutes and he only reads the resolved part. For somebody who is very keen to see, what he has said and what the others have said, he could see it on the website as to what he has said. The resolution part can be prepared in three days.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they had decided here in a meeting that the resolved part would be circulated within three days, but as far as the recording of minutes is concerned, this is a practice since decades. There is reason for recording the minutes. He has personally witnessed lot of things like, as Shri Ashok Goyal has referred to the minutes of the meeting of September 2017. He is sure that the information items were never passed in that meeting. They can see the CD, those items were never discussed and those were never passed. Every recording should be made. Even in the Parliament also the minutes are recorded. The minutes should be recorded. It is just because of the wrong interpretation of what has been decided in the Senate. The whole problem then arises. If the minutes are recorded with clarity and if these minutes match with the CD, then there would be no space for ambiguity because everything would be crystal clear. So, he suggested that the minutes should be recorded and there is no way that they can do away with this. It is a very sacred part of the proceedings. So, these must be recorded. They can bring out the resolved part and circulate it in

three days, he is not against it. But the proceedings should be recorded in proper context. They have been doing this as it has been the practice.

When some members started speaking together, the Vice Chancellor requested them to speak one by one.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they can use the technology for this. Now such software is available which could translate the recorded version in text form. Though these software are not hundred percent correct, but these are able to do at least eighty percent work. He said that now there is no need to type the minutes after listening from the video recording. The recording could be uploaded on the software and the software would convert it into text form. There could be some words which might not be written correctly, such words could be corrected manually. This would reduce 80% work and there could be only 20% ambiguity. Only 1/5 of the work would be left which could be done manually. This would save time and labour to great extent.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that now it is computer era, when there were no computers, there used to be very big agendas and proper recording was done.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is a worldwide practice.

Shri Ashok Goyal while supplementing Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he really admires the feelings of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Subhash Sharma. Let they should not forget one thing that in Panjab University, they are following the parliamentary system of governance and even in the modern era of technology, they are following the same system in Parliament and also in the Assembly, even if at the cost of spending some more time, the minutes are to be recorded in detail. It has its inherent value that even after 20 years, the discussion in the Senate and the resolutions passed are referred to in the High Courts and Supreme Court of India. Why it is important to record every detail alongwith the resolved part is that unless and until it is preceded by the basis on which the resolved part has been reached, like, if they are referring to a particular circular issued by the Government of India, on the basis of that they have taken some decision, if they record only the resolved part and forget the part on which they have taken the decision, then they will be in the dark. When the minutes go to the Court or when these go for reference to the future generation, there it will be pointed out that this time of the relevant date of the meeting, when it was held 10 years back this circular was already superseded and the Syndicate took the decision based on some wrong circular. Unless and until that is part of the minutes, how they would correct themselves, so if they go to 1947, they have got everything in detail. Secondly, it is an academic body, more than the resolved part, the academic discussion is important. Even after 50 years, they reached in Court that in such and such meeting Shri Mehr Chand Mahajan said this thing, Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal said this thing, Shri Gurdial Singh Dhillon said this thing. If it is only resolved part, probably, they would be forgetting their legacy. So, without going into any technicality, he is simply saying that these are the time tested practices which have been the legacy of this University. They should not by-pass them and record the minutes. As far as application of technology as suggested by Dr. Subhash Sharma is concerned that can be

explored. Now such software have come wherein even if a person is speaking in Punjabi it is simultaneously converted into English, not only text, even the spoken language also. That can be taken care of and if in the interest of the sanctity of these bodies, the staff also needs to be increased and they should not hesitate for that also. But the minutes should be very religiously recorded in the spirit in which these have been discussed.

Shri R.S. Brar said that this is the first meeting being chaired by him (Vice Chancellor). He urged the members that, they should start it with a positive note and they should repose faith in him. They should have mutual cooperation, faith and confidence on each other and in the body as well, leaving behind whatever has happened in the past.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not talking about the past. They are rather saying that they should be wiser for times to come.

Professor Ronki Ram said that two things are discussed here i.e. number one, that whatever each and every member of the Syndicate says, that should be recorded. Second, that the resolved part should be circulated and the other that video recording is there. So, now the resolved part is there, detailed notes are taken and video recording is there. Take both the minutes and proceedings in detail, but do not circulate it in such large number. If somebody wants to know what he had said, if there is some discrepancy, video CDs are there and the minutes are also put on the University portal. If somebody points out changes, the concerned person would make the change. But do not circulate the entire agenda. Only the resolved part should be circulated. The record in detail is available in the CDs. If somebody wants the record, give him, the record would be available in the office. Now, there is a question, how to know that the minutes taken are true to as per the recording. The preparation of minutes would take lot of time and to get it confirmed. The problem is how to get it confirmed. If they want that the minutes are confirmed from each and everyone then the stipulated time of one month, again be a problem. They can decide it because it the question of making the proceedings more regularly and more easier. If they can decide it, the problem would be solved. Resolved part should be circulated, details are there, how to confirm those details, it is to be decided.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said whatever is the practice, let it continue and it would be taken care of later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that everybody is speaking some positive point of view. This can be discussed further formally and informally also. Till that time let they should go on with the prevalent system. They can all then discuss it and try to bring out best possible improvements whatever can be done.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor as to what is to be done, Dr. Amit Joshi said that the minutes have to be recorded as it has been the practice.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to summarise the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be recorded, as Dr. Amit Joshi has said that the minutes of the meeting of Senate of September 2017 are subject to verification of text with video recording and these should not be taken as final and system as per past-practice be considered till a decision is taken.

The Vice Chancellor said that if there is any objection, they should tell him and he would see as to what has to be done as per the prevailing practice. If they want to make any changes, these would be done if their system permits it.

The Vice Chancellor further said that the Action Taken Report has already been supplied.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that before the start of the agenda, he would like to say for his (Vice Chancellor) information that 26 items have been withdrawn from the previous agenda to which the Vice Chancellor said that they would talk about it when they would come to that part of the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has divided the agenda in three parts. Yesterday, he had an informal meeting with them where he shared it with them. Since the day he joined the University (i.e. 23<sup>rd</sup> July) till 27<sup>th</sup> August, the agenda items have been incorporated. After that the deferred agenda items were taken. Those agenda items have been grouped majorly into 3-4 parts. One category is related to the routine type of selections. The second category relates to extensions, retirement and reappointments etc. Those are the items which are of routine type items. He would present the items and the members would give their observations and thereafter they are supposed to pass those items. Then the third category is recommendations/minutes of various committees which have been held time to time, they have been put over here. Again, they will find that these are matters which are more or less at the level of finalization. The items in the fourth category relate to policies and decisions. Some policy matters are there. He would like to present the background of those items. In many cases the opinions of the legal Counsels and legal experts are there but have not been taken into account. The members might be knowing better than him that many cases are pending in the Courts and they are spending lacs of rupees over that in spite of this, no concrete decision has been taken. So, his submission is that they should see those things one by one. Let they should have thorough deliberation on these issues so that they can minimize those controversies. Though it is the right of anybody to go to the Courts, but they should try to minimize it. He pointed out that the expert opinion of the Professors of Department of Laws and Lawyers has not been taken and it has been finalized at the academic level. He desired and sought the cooperation of the members and said that they should scan those things, if needed. In the last category, the items for deliberations have been included. These items need debate from the members and they should feel comfortable in it and he informed the members that he would listen to them patiently, but the time constraint is there which have to be kept in mind. With honesty and sincerity he informed the members that the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate would be held frequently as per the schedule i.e. monthly and quarterly, respectively. But as they know that many things are pending and these have to be accelerated. He is preparing some academic proposals worth crores of rupees and as soon as these are finalized,

the same will be put up before them for their input/ approval. Though they have reposed faith in him, but it is his sincere effort to put it before them for formal approval and for that he needed the frequent meetings with the members. In case they feel that if there is any problem in any item or it needed any revisit, he would be the first person to honour it and rectify, provided the rules and regulations permit it. With this note he wanted to start the agenda items i.e. Item No. 2.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) that the previous practice of recording the proceedings would continue till some new best method is evolved;
- (2) the minutes of the meeting of Senate of September 2017 are subject to verification of text with video recording and these should not be taken as final;
- (3) the powers delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor which had been withdrawn from the Vice-Chancellor in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 29<sup>th</sup> April, 2018, under the Panjab University Rules and Regulations be restored.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Urdu, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(i).** Considered minutes dated 19.07.2018 (**Appendix-II**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (stage-1) to Assistant Professor (stage-2) under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Urdu, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Ali Abbas be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Urdu, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **06.06.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Assistant Librarian (Sr. scale) (stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(ii).** Considered minutes dated 19.07.2018 (**Appendix-III**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Librarian (Sr. scale) (stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (stage-2) under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Ms. Seema Sood be promoted from Assistant Librarian to Assistant Librarian (Sr. Scale) (stage-1) to (stage-2), A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **08.10.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Deputy Librarian (stage-3) to Deputy Librarian (stage-4),, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh.**

**2(iii).** Considered minutes dated 19.07.2018 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Deputy Librarian (stage-3) to Deputy Librarian (stage-4) under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Jivesh Bansal be promoted from Deputy Librarian (stage-3) to Deputy Librarian (stage-4), A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **20.06.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 19.07.2018 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Namita Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**), at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **14.08.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur**

2(v). Considered minutes dated 19.07.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Ravinder Kumar Pal be promoted from Assistant Professor in Mech. Engg. (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor in Mech. Engg. (Stage-2), Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **14.10.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(vi).** Considered minutes dated 19.07.2018 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Jai Mala be promoted from Assistant Professor in Law (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Law (**Stage-3**), University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **19.09.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIET, Panjab University, Chandigarh.**

**2(vii).** Considered minutes dated 19.07.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Aditya Kaushik be promoted from Assistant Professor in Mathematics (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor in Mathematics (Stage-2), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **10.07.2012**, (**subject to production of office order for past service counting from Establishment Branch**) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

Shri Ashok Goyal referring to the selection items said that these are routine items and there is no problem in these items as everything must have been done as per record. However, he pointed out that in the last item i.e. C-2 (vii), page 3 of the proceedings, it has been written that an Assistant Professor is being promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-II) and in the bracket it has been mentioned "Subject to production of office order for past service counting from Estt. Br.". He thinks that this is

very rightly pointed out. All the promotions should be approved. In this case, as per his understanding, there is a Committee working on the benefit of past service to be extended in various cases. Probably, this case is also covered under that Committee. So, it is subject to that they have given the date as 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2012. Suppose he does not find favour with the Committee, then his date of promotion would be shifted to 2015. They have mentioned the date of promotion as 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2012 "Subject to production of office order for past service counting from Estt. Br.". What he wants to point out is that wherever such kind of position is there, in those cases they approve, subject to benefit of past service through an order by the Estt. Branch. It should be applicable to all. It should not be mentioned only for one case. Otherwise, it would give an impression of pick and choose, that one person has been given the benefit with "subject to" and the other without "subject to". So, it should be, subject to the recommendation of the Committee. This was endorsed by the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Committee is writing this. The question is that the candidate has provided the past experience along with the application form for CAS promotion. At the time of screening in the Department or the Dean of University Instruction office, if at that time there is a doubt about the certificate, the Establishment branch could be asked to check whether the certificate is clear or not. It is not a question of verifying but that the candidate might have claimed advantage for the service but the certificate is not attached. For want of certificate, it should not be stopped.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was also speaking the same thing. He said that nothing is being stopped, everything is approved. As they have put a condition in this case, all such similar cases also stand approved subject to the same condition. He is not saying to stop it. This is what the Vice-Chancellor as Chairperson of the Committee has also said that it is subject to counting of past service and order to that effect should be issued by the Establishment branch.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that all the marks are to be awarded per year. 75 marks are required for Category-I related with teaching, learning and evaluation activities. All these have been checked and verified. The candidate would claim the marks only if the past experience has been counted. It could not be a case that the past service has not been counted but the marks have been approved. There could not be two yardsticks.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the case could be considered only when the requirement of minimum number of years in service is fulfilled.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that then why the case is being stopped.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not being stopped. He said that whether the past service is counted or not but the case stands approved. The only difference is that if the past service is counted, then his date of promotion would be 2012 and if the past service is not to be counted, then the date of promotion would be 2015. So, it is not a question of marks. The date of promotion of 2012 is subject to orders from the Establishment branch to the effect that his past

service before joining Panjab University is also to be counted for the purpose of promotion from Stage-1 to Stage-2.

Professor Ronki Ram explained that the candidate has applied for CAS and has submitted all the certificates that he served in S.P. Jain College and Kurukshetra University. That question should not have arisen at this stage. It should have been clarified earlier by the Establishment branch. There are many cases in which such a problem is there. This case should be approved and should not be clubbed with the other cases of counting of past service.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying other way round. They are trying to help others that such cases should be clubbed with this case.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Shri Ashok Goyal is saying that the condition has been mentioned in one case while not in others whereas it applies to all other cases also.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that all similar cases of counting of past service which have not been decided should also be dealt with in the same manner so that they have not to apply time and again and appear before the Committee.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said out that the eligibility for promotion to Ph.D. degree holders, the time period is 4 years and in the case of non-Ph.D. degree holders, it is 5 years. Against the marks for the year 2008-09 and 2009-10, 'NA' (not applicable) is written. So, according to her, this case is a different one from other cases. It is not clear as to what is meant by NA. When the condition has been put, they need a clarification for this.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the concept of API score was introduced in the year 2010 and Category-I and II are applicable after the year 2010. That is why NA is mentioned for the year 2008-09 and 2009-10 whereas for the year 2010-11, the API marks have been shown.

#### **RESOLVED FURTHER:**

- (1) That the letters of promotion to the persons promoted under Item **C-2(i) to C-2(vii)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.
- (2) All cases similar to C-2(vii) be considered for promotion under career Advancement Scheme (CAS).

#### **Recommendations dated 23.07.2018 of Executive Committee of PUSC**

**3.** Considered recommendations dated 23.07.2018 (Item No. 10, 11 & 14) (**Appendix-IX**) of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that in this item, they are considering the minutes of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. He read out Item No. 10 of the proceedings, where it is written that 'administrative sanction to the following payments to be made to the players, coaches and managers, who are selected for any World University Games out of the money collected from them'. Under this item at serial number 1, it is written, 'Track suit plus T-shirts, Ceremonial dress & Playing Kit @ Rs. 25000/- approx. per head.' He

asked, how it is possible that a kit of Kabbadi, kit of Cricket or Hockey would cost equal. The amount of Rs.25000/- is too much. It is not clear as to which playing kit is required for which game. In some games there is no playing kit required. Rs. 25000/- cannot be the price of all playing kits.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the amount should be as per the game.

Continuing, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that what kit and dress is required to the managers. Sanction of blanket amount of Rs. 25000/- for all games is not possible as there are different kits for different games.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that for some games like shooting and some other games, kit is required.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that what they have to approve, it is not mentioned here.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if they start giving details of each game, it would be very difficult.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they have fixed an upper limit.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the amount should be fixed differently for different games. Players and Coaches need a kit, but there is no need of a kit to a manager. In the game of cricket and hockey, a kit is not needed for the manager. Only ceremonial dress or T-shirt is required for the Manager. He is not objecting to the track suit, but he is only objecting to provide the kit to the manager.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that these items are for World University Games, somebody has to go abroad and present himself in a presentable manner. The amount of Rs. 25000/- is not much, it is nothing. When it is converted in dollars, it is no amount at all. So, he thinks that the amount of Rs. 25000/- is a reasonable amount for the University world games. When they go abroad, they are Ambassadors of their country. They have to be in a good and presentable form. His shoes and track suit have to match the quality of others. So, he thinks that Rs. 25000/- is not a bigger amount for this purpose. So, they should retain it.

At this point of time some discussion on Item C-2 regarding API score took place and the same has been shifted under that item.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal Surinder Singh Sangha to explain about it as he has been the member of this Committee.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that it varies from game to game. In the kit many things are there such as Hockey, track suits etc. which are very costly. However, they can ask the Director Sports to give them game-wise details.

Some members opined that this would be a very lengthy process.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Rs. 25000/- is the maximum limit. If one item costs Rs. 10000/-, they would then spend only Rs. 10000/- for that.

The Vice Chancellor said they should trust and they should not put the people in tight compartment. He thinks it would not make much difference if a shirt is given to a Coach also.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the shooting kit sometimes even costs Rs. 50000/- and not Rs. 25000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that Rs. 25000/- is approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know from which fund this amount has to be spent.

The Vice Chancellor said that there must be some fund and they would spend it out of that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at page 6 of the agenda, second last line, Item No. 10, it has been mentioned 'Administrative sanction to the following payments to be made to the players, coaches and manages who are selected for any World University Games out of the money collected from them...' He wanted to know as to whom the word 'them' refers to.

The Vice Chancellor while agreeing to Shri Ashok Goyal said that though the provision is there, but it needs to be clearly mentioned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have mentioned the name of the bank and the account number also, but they have not mentioned the fund from which the amount is to be paid.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while explaining the issue said that when the Panjab University has to send some team, then players and Coaches from other Universities do come. The expenditure which they have to incur, that expenditure is done by those Universities and that amount is deposited in one head and then the money is spent out of that fund.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the money is collected from the players or Coaches or from their University by the Director Sports and the whole expenditure is incurred from the money so collected from them. So, this is very clear.

The Vice Chancellor said to Shri Ashok Goyal that perhaps his point has now been cleared, to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could not understand it.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know whether the amount is to be collected from the players, coaches or manager.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan while clarifying the point said that the money would be collected from the University to which the players, coaches and manager belong to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said in the item it has been written that the amount would be collected from players, coaches and managers or from the concerned University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Finance and Development Officer should explain about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here it could be said that as the funds are generated after collecting it from the players, coaches and managers coming from various Universities or directly from the concerned University, a fund is created and kept in such and such account in the name of such and such. Out of that fund, it is proposed that this expenditure would be incurred, but this is not understandable.

The Vice Chancellor while agreeing to Shri Ashok Goyal said that these minutes have been prepared by very respected members. He suggested that minutes should be recorded properly and with clarity as is being done here. They should follow it literally.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee members knew that there are 2-3 such persons everywhere who could understand whatever is written, but he cannot understand.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there should not be any ambiguity in the minutes. Clarity should be there.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the recommendations dated 23.07.2018 (Item No. 10, 11 & 14) of the Executive Committee of PUSC, **as per Appendix**, be approved;
- (2) the language under Item No. 10 of the recommendations of PUSC be properly worded.

**Starting of new  
Courses in University  
School of Open  
Learning**

**4.** Considered if the following new courses be started in the Department of Defence and Strategic Studies, University School of Open Learning (USOL), from the academic session 2018-2019 and Rules/Regulations be also approved:

1. Postgraduate Diploma in Disaster Management and Corporate Security.
2. Certificate course in Corporate Security, Safety and Fire Protection Management.

**NOTE:** 1. The Academic Council in its meeting dated 26.06.2018 (Item Nos. IV & VI) (**Appendix-X**) considered and resolved that the recommendations of the Faculty of Arts (meeting dated 19.12.2017) (**Appendix-X**) with regard to introduction of the above courses for the academic session 2018-19, be approved.

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

Syndicate Proceedings dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

The Vice Chancellor said that this item is regarding starting of new courses in the Department of Defence and Strategic Studies of University School of Open Learning.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha informed that the University School of Open Learning in the year 2015 has applied for starting the M.A. Education Course. The item is already passed by the Academic Council, Board of Studies and also from the Faculty. But it could not be implemented because as per the latest regulations of 2017-18, recognition from the UGC is required. The University has applied for this to the UGC and the required letter of recognition from UGC has been received on 14th August. It has been approved by all other bodies and now it is to be approved by the Syndicate. The last date for making admission is 1.10.2018. He requested to approve it so that admission notice could be advertised.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that their B.Ed. Course has already been stopped. The issue of starting this Course has come at a very proper time. The teachers who were teaching the Education Courses, their work load has reduced because the B.Ed. has stopped. So, now in place of that Course, the M.A. Education course would be introduced and it would also help increase their income. Therefore, he requested to approve the introduction of this Course.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have very less time. He has received the supplementary agenda which contains some items. If the members agree, he could be authorised to take action at his end to which the members agreed.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested the Vice Chancellor to thoroughly examine whether everything is okay, to which the Vice Chancellor said that he would do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that since this involves the issue of fee also, he desired that instead of authorising him as he is not aware of many things, he desired that 2-3 members may suggest him about this within two/three days. He believes in the approach of the members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that a Syndicate Committee is already there.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that a Committee be constituted consisting of Principal Surinder Singh Sangha, Professor Keshav Malhotra and Professor Navdeep Goyal to look into the issue of fee of M.A. (Education) Course. It was also suggested by some members that Chairperson, USOL may also be associated with this Committee and the Vice Chancellor agreed to the formation of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor requested the Committee members to submit their report on the issue within two days.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that Principal Surinder Singh Sangha would Chair the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor desired that the Chairperson, USOL should have been the Chairperson of the Committee, but Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as per the seniority, the Dean of the Faculty used to be the Chairperson of the Committee. The Chairperson, USOL could be added as a member of the Committee. This was agreed to.

Dr. Amit Joshi raised the issue of admissions of postgraduate courses. He said that in the postgraduate courses central admission is done through OCET examination. It is the past practice that the seats which remains vacant, those are filled on merit. He requested that circular in this regard be got issued at the earliest because the last date for admission is 31st August and a good number of seats is lying vacant.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the seats are lying vacant in the colleges at Chandigarh as also at colleges situated in Punjab.

The Vice Chancellor said that though they would give authorisation to him, but he would like to take their help and Committee could be formed to look into the issue.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan requested the Vice Chancellor to approve it as all the Syndicate members are in agreement to it.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi while agreeing to the Vice Chancellor said that a Committee should be formed to get the issue examined and they should not do anything in hurry.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he would like to make a suggestion to which the Vice Chancellor said that now a Committee would be formed and he (Dr. Amit Joshi) give his suggestion to the Committee. Dr. Amit Joshi stated that he (Vice Chancellor) has to take a decision on this issue as the last date for admission to postgraduate courses is 31st August or they have to extend the date for admission here now.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Committee should give it's report within two days to which Dr. Amit Joshi said that it would be very difficult to make admissions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue is not so big. The Committee has nothing to do. The only thing is that after the OCET examinations, some seats remain vacant in the Colleges. A letter has to be sent that those seats can be filled on the basis of merit of qualifying examinations. That is all which they have to do. Such a circular is sent every time.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) being a learned and esteemed person is telling one part, but he would like that they should revisit to see whether the adequate infrastructure is there.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the colleges have been allotted the seats only after inspection and also on finding the infrastructure adequate.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu to meet him tomorrow itself and they would resolve the issue.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha requested the Vice Chancellor that the issue of admission to the B.P.Ed. Course be also taken up.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested the issue relating to B.P.Ed. may also be referred to the Committee constituted to look into the issue of admission of postgraduate courses.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the inspections have been done and necessary facilities are available in the colleges where the seats are lying vacant, but the seats could not be filled.

As requested by Shri Ashok Goyal, the Vice Chancellor agreed to hold the meeting next day i.e. 28.8.2018 at 11.00 a.m.

**RESOLVED:** That the following new courses be started in the Department of Defence and Strategic Studies, University School of Open Learning (USOL), from the academic session 2018-2019 and Rules/Regulations be also approved:

1. Postgraduate Diploma in Disaster Management and Corporate Security.
2. Certificate course in Corporate Security, Safety and Fire Protection Management.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee consisting of the following persons be constituted to chalk out the modalities including the fee structure and any other issue for starting M.A. Education in the University School of Open Learning from the current session, i.e., 2018-19 and the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate, be authorised to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee:

- (i) Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha  
(Chairperson)
- (ii) Professor Keshav Malhotra
- (iii) Professor Navdeep Goyal
- (iv) Chairperson, USOL (Convener)

Arising out of the discussion on Item C-4, on the issue of filling up the vacant seats of postgraduate courses, admission to which is otherwise made on the basis of an entrance test, be filled up on merit basis and the following be constituted to look into the issue and the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate, be authorised to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee:

- (i) Shri Ashok Goyal
- (ii) Dr. Amit Joshi
- (iii) Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
- (iv) Professor Navdeep Goyal
- (v) D.R. (Colleges) (Convener)

On a point raised by Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha about making admission to the course of B.P.Ed., it was further resolved to refer the matter to the Committee already constituted as above to look into the issue of filling up the vacant seats of postgraduate courses.

**Re-appointment of Assistant Professor in Department of Community Education and Disability Studies**

- 5.** Considered if, Mohd. Samshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, P.U., with immediate effect for the session 2018-2019, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions on which they have worked previously during the session 2017-2018, under Regulation 5 page 111, P.U. Calendar-I, 2007.

- NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 16.12.2017 (Para XXXIII (I-45)) had re-appointed Mohd. Samshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of Education & Disability Studies, w.e.f. 10.07.2017, for the session 2017-18.
2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (General discussion) has agreed with the suggestions of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath that all the persons working as Guest faculty and/or temporary or part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointees. Accordingly a circular was issued vide no. 5536-5635/Estt.I dated 30.06.2015.
3. A copy of minutes dated 09.07.2018 of the Joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee along with request dated 19.07.2018 of the Chairperson, Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

While the Vice Chancellor was reading out Item No. 5, the members said this item is alright.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, however, wanted to know for how many years these persons are continuing.

Dr. Subhash Sharma while supplementing to Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, asked for how many more years would these persons continue. The adhocism should not continue like this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in many courses where there is requirement of teachers, many teachers were appointed from time to time through walk-in-interviews and also through advertisement. After that the Court gave a decision that the persons who have been appointed either on contract or temporary or even as guest faculty, the University cannot replace them with a new person in the same capacity. In case the University wants to replace them, they can replace the person by making a regular appointment on that seat. If the services of a temporary person have to be dispensed with, then no new appointment would be made in his place. But, the services of such persons are dispensed with, then there would be problem in running courses. So, what is happening is that the same persons are continuing with one day break. If they are regularised, then it is okay.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is not against these people, but he wants that fair chance should be given to everybody in the society. If this position is for disabled person, all disabled persons in the region should be given a chance to apply for that position. The same two persons should not be given chance year after year. Secondly, why a person is appointed on adhoc or temporary basis. Thirdly, if there is a Court judgement, then those papers should come to them. They would be able to see that. If there is a Court order, let them should make an appeal against that Court order. They should see the papers with their own eyes. He cannot go simply what someone is saying. He wants that the papers should be produced before him. Otherwise, they would

continue the adhocism for years together. Now there is a simple question as to how long they are here, that question is not being answered. Are they working since one year, ten years or 25 years?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that what Professor Navdeep has said, that is connected to this case. There are many positions in the University for which they have not appointed regular faculty and due to one or the other reasons the persons were appointed on contract basis. The regular faculty is not being appointed and as per the Court order they have allowed these persons to continue. He suggested that the office should be asked to find the positions where the regular faculty is required, but they are running the courses with the adhoc faculty. The MHRD has put a rider on the University for not filling up the positions. Due to that rider they have got some posts cleared for allowing appointments on them from the Board of Finance and permission to fill up those posts has been given. He said they should fill these posts in a phased manner. Suppose, there are 130 posts lying vacant, they should first send a proposal to the MHRD to fill 25 posts in the first instance. In this way, in a year or so, they should appoint the faculty on regular basis on all the posts. He thinks, for this the Vice Chancellor should take an initiative. It is the right time to do it as whole atmosphere is positive and he (Vice Chancellor) should utilize it. By doing so, the concern of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi would be addressed automatically because regular faculty would be in place.

In addition to what Dr. Subhash Sharma has said, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should look into the so called Court case and see whether they can do something in it, whether they can go into an appeal, whether they can get the judgement upset. They have to give a fair chance to everybody in the society.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they could dispense with the services of a person only if there is no work load and the Course has been discontinued. But otherwise the Court judgement says that they cannot appoint anyone else in place of that person.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that at least they should show the Court case.

Principal Anita Kaushal suggested that they should move towards regularization.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he has a bit different view on this issue. He wanted to know why the previous Vice Chancellor has not cleared this item. The items which he (Vice Chancellor) has withdrawn, all these items have been approved because the Vice Chancellor has already issued an order. He (previous Vice Chancellor) has approved the cases who were being appointed for the second term, third term or even for the fourth term. He just wanted to know what was the problem with this item, why this item was not cleared. Secondly, the Vice Chancellor is only authorised in emergent cases for appointment for one year as per regulation 5 and after one year only Syndicate is competent. The Syndicate had withdrawn all the powers from the previous Vice Chancellor, due to any reason. He said that all the appointments items which have been withdrawn, all are illegal now. The Vice Chancellor did not have the powers. How the Vice Chancellor has approved the appointment for 2<sup>nd</sup> year, 3<sup>rd</sup> year and 4<sup>th</sup> year and how the appointment letters were issued. He said proper enquiry should be held. He is putting an allegation. Corruption is involved in it. They can see the items. Some

items are before them. In some items, even the Vice Chancellor was not authorised to do it and he has done it at his own level. All the appointments are illegal. So, the items which have been withdrawn and put under ratification, should come for consideration. He further said that he has the agenda papers of all the previous meetings. In this item, the time table has been included. But, there are items where no time table is attached. For example, they are giving re-employment to the USOL. He is concerned only about the financial position of the University. They are giving re-employment to USOL and they are also giving re-employment to the Urdu Department, without knowing whether there is requirement of faculty or not or whether there are students or not. The Vice Chancellor has already done it. What is the hurry to re-employ other people and not to these people. Secondly, he does not agree with what Professor Navdeep Goyal has said because if there is any Court case to allow the persons to continue, but to fill vacancy on regular basis only then the temporary person could be removed. Then Panjab University is one, whether they are affiliated colleges or University, in all the affiliated colleges of Chandigarh, every Principal, every Managing Committee holds interview on year by year basis. Where that judgement has gone for that purpose? In every affiliated college of Panjab University, every college holds the interviews to fill up the vacancies. The Colleges used to appoint even upto 35 people for teaching various subjects, but it is not being done in the University. The judgement should have been made applicable unanimously in all the affiliated colleges and the University. Now the third point is, why the teachers are not regularised. When they start a course, they can appoint a person on temporary or adhoc or part time basis for a year or two, that is a separate thing. But, they continue him for years together, then it is victimization and exploitation of the persons. He is kept under a constant threat of removing from the service. So, there should be some limit. In Panjab University Calendar, under Regulation 5 (b), it has been clearly written that a teacher could be appointed for a shorter period. Now they have to decide, what is the shorter period. It is not fair to continue him for 3-4 years continuously. He said that under Regulation 5 of Chapter V(A), the appointment would be for a shorter period.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that such cases should be placed before the Syndicate with full background, i.e., from which date the appointment had been made and up to how long, it would continue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this item belongs to the last meeting of the Syndicate which was scheduled to be held on 7<sup>th</sup> July. The Department submitted the request on 19.07.2018. Since the meeting of the Syndicate could not be held and the academic session had started, the emergency power of the Vice-Chancellor could not be withdrawn by the Syndicate which is clearly specified in the Panjab University Calendar. On page 28 of the agenda under Note 3, it is clearly mentioned that "A copy of minutes dated 09.07.2018 of the Joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee along with request dated 19.07.2018 of the Chairperson, Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, is enclosed". The Vice-Chancellor had taken action on the items of the Syndicate but did not take action on the items which were not there on the Syndicate agenda. The Vice-Chancellor had used his emergency powers under Regulation 14.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Regulation 14 of Chapter II(A)(ii) clearly states about the emergency powers. Whatever anguish is there, it is not because of the use of Regulation 14. No member has any objection to use of Regulation 14 by the previous Vice-Chancellor but the anguish is

how it has been used. He pointed out that there is a case in the Department of Biotechnology. Regulation 14 clearly says that in case of emergent situation, the Vice-Chancellor could exercise the powers. He wanted to know as to what was the emergency in that case, who has done it. He wanted to ask the Registrar as what was the emergency. Whether the Department needed the teacher? Has the Department submitted the workload? Who has done it? Again, as pointed out by Shri Prabhjit Singh that there is a corruption, he wanted to put it on record that this is a very-very serious case of corruption. It is clearly cut case of favouritism which has been done as there is no workload in the Department, there was no requisition from the Department. Here he wanted to know as to what was the emergency? Could the Registrar show him even one document that there is an emergency? What made him (the previous Vice-Chancellor) use the special power for that purpose where it is written that in view of the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor, she (Dr. Monika Sharma) may be appointed in the Department of Microbial Biotechnology and adjusted in the Department of Biotechnology. This is connected with the item. They could see the ambiguity in the item as it is mentioned that the appointment is to be made purely on temporary basis till the posts are filled on regular basis. What Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has said is valid because it is not an appointment purely on temporary basis. He said that the University staff is involved in this corruption. Even the officers are involved in it and it is a backdoor entry of the teachers. As suggested by Shri Prabhjit Singh, there should be a high-powered Committee which should look into all the allegations. He pointed out that very meritorious persons have been turned back and their applications have not been accepted.

On a used of order, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Vice-Chancellor had emergent powers and he neither asked for the time table nor the Department sent the requisition, even then the Vice-Chancellor made the appointment. Why the Vice-Chancellor made the appointment, it is because he knew that now the person could not removed. It is a backdoor entry. Since now the person could not be removed, he/she could continue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is the House and the person could be removed and they could take a decision.

Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out that earlier this item was for information and the matter was not discussed. Now it is for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this particular case relates to the year 2016. Regarding the requirement of workload, it is attached with the item. As pointed out by Dr. Amit Joshi, it might be possible that in some of the items, the requirement of workload might not be there. Regulation 14 says "whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval." It means that now the matter is for the approval of the Syndicate. It is not a case that as is being pointed out that it would continue, it is not so. Whatever this august House would want, it would happen that way.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that in the Panjab University Calendar, there is no bifurcation that there is any difference between item under consideration or ratification. For the information of the Vice-Chancellor, ratification and approval are one and the same thing and anything could be ratified and approved only after

consideration. In both the cases, they have to consider and then approve or to consider and then ratify. He did not know what was the need of shifting some items from the items for consideration to ratification because it is just nothing. The only difference is that where something has already been acted upon, that is like post facto approval and in the other cases it is prior approval. But both the things could be done only after consideration. So, the items should have been for consideration only. So many times, it has happened that the item which has neither been approved nor been considered nor been ratified and has been included in information and it is said that the members could not discuss anything on information items. Let them take the practical view that anything which is in front of the Syndicate under any head, that actually needs the nod of the Syndicate whether the item is for information or ratification. So much so that sometimes even in the Vice-Chancellor's statement, something is suggested. He did not know as to who suggested that since the action has already been taken, these items should be put under ratification. Ratification also needs approval as the Vice-Chancellor has already read Regulation 14 which says that the matter be reported in the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval. So, the word 'ratification' has been used. He would come later on to what for Regulation 14 is. This Regulation has never been used till May, 2018. It was he who for the first time brought it to the notice of the University authorities when they said that since the Syndicate had already withdrawn all the delegated powers to the Vice-Chancellor and they went to the media that the work of the University has come to a standstill, now nothing could work. Then he went to the office of the Registrar and told not to mislead the society on this thing. If the University authorities wanted to do something, there is a Regulation where under emergency, the Vice-Chancellor could take any decision subject to the approval of the Syndicate at its next meeting. He did not know that the spirit in which he had told that Regulation would be used so mercilessly in misusing the powers under Regulation 14 read with Regulation 5 of different Chapter. Regulation 14 is being used to make an appointment under emergent circumstances and to make appointment under Regulation 5 and that too not Regulation 5 as Shri Prabhjit Singh has said under Regulation 5(ii), which is the power of the Syndicate and the Syndicate has withdrawn the delegated power. Otherwise also that is the power of the Syndicate and that power, for the information of the Vice-Chancellor, had never been delegated to the Vice-Chancellor. It is still not delegated even today. There were specific powers which were delegated to the Vice-Chancellor which were withdrawn under peculiar circumstances, which of course earlier today have been restored. Using Regulation 14 for making such appointments under Regulation 5, probably there could not be a bigger abuse of power by anybody. The impression which everybody gets after the items have been shifted to ratification, everybody was under the impression, which now the Vice-Chancellor has clarified, that it is *fate accompli* and they could not do anything since the matter has already been acted upon and they have no alternative except to endorse the item. That is not the position. But as Professor Navdeep Goyal has clarified about this Item C-5 that this has come to the office for consideration much after the last meeting of the Syndicate which could not be held for one reason or the other. That is why that the Vice-Chancellor probably did not do it. But definitely, this item was placed in the office much before he (then Vice-Chancellor) relinquished the charge. If that person (then Vice-Chancellor) could pass orders on 20.07.2018 or 21.07.2018 or 22.07.2018 or may be in some cases on 23.07.2018 also. He wondered, as it has been asked, what did stop him (then Vice-Chancellor) from doing this. The items which he wanted to do, he did and which probably were not brought to his

knowledge were not done. He does not have any proof to say that any kind of corruption has been done nor he could put any allegation unless and until he has concrete evidence. But this is a letter from where a signal goes that definitely nepotism and favouritism has been done to which according to him none of the members of the Syndicate is a part. In the light of that, this Item C-5 be considered independent of other items which have been shifted to Ratification and for those items, they could take a decision on merit department-wise because there might be some urgency in some departments whereas there might be some departments who have said that they do not need the teachers but still the emergency power has been used and the appointment has been made. They have to see that also whether it could be endorsed or not. In view of this, he requested that first this item be taken up though it is to be done or not and rest of the items they could consider in one go. His view on Regulation 14 is that it was never warranted at any stage. When there is a specific Regulation under the Chapter on Appointment of University Teachers, emergency powers which are contained under Regulation 5.1 with the Vice-Chancellor and with the Syndicate under 5.2, do they think that there could be another emergent regulation in another chapter to deal with the same situation and there is a specific provision. Now, that Regulation has been used. To say that some direction has come from the Court that that this has to be done within 3 days, that action has to be decided by the Syndicate. The Vice-Chancellor is left with no other alternative except to use that emergency power under Regulation 14 and then explain with the reasons to be recorded as to what was the emergency and then bring to the Syndicate that this was the condition under which he had to act under emergency and now the matter is before the Syndicate for approval. If the Syndicate approves, well and good but if it does not approve, then whatever has been done till then it is alright but thereafter it does not exist. It is rarest of the rare occasions. That is why he had told the Vice-Chancellor yesterday that Panjab University Calendar is so beautifully worded that the remotest exigency has also been taken under consideration while framing the Regulations that in practical functioning, there should not be difficulty faced by any of the officers of the University or members of the Syndicate and Senate. Still, if they intentionally flout the rules and regulations, that probably is not the right course.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this is somewhere that timetable has been given while in others it has not been given. The case would be placed before the Syndicate and Senate for approval. Whenever there is a Court case that once it has been shown that there is a post which could not be filled up permanently and a Committee has been constituted under certain conditions to make the appointment on ad hoc basis. Now it could be said that till the appointment is made on permanent basis, the University has already constituted a Committee to select a person, what is the problem to continue that person. In this case, sometimes it is found that those names are put up by the Departments time and again to the Syndicate which they are approving. Sometimes they have been doing it on the basis of the teaching workload. Sometimes, they get the feedback from the Chairpersons that they do not need it. Then there are some problems on some count in the Departments. But how to check it, whether such things are really required. They need to put some foolproof mechanism in this case. Whereas if the posts are there, it has been told that before advertising the post, first it has to be got cleared from the MHRD. The total number of posts of teachers sanctioned for the University is 1378. Still, they have to approach the MHRD for clearance because the MHRD has committed. In this case, they could not take all the cases to the Court.

The Chairperson could be asked about the requirement. The Syndicate meets every month and take decision but sometimes the data is not available. So, it is a very herculean task to ask the Departments whether there is a workload, for how many periods the teachers teach. So, adhocism system is there. He brought it to the notice that in this University many people have been made permanent without facing the interview. Such persons were appointed as Research Assistants or Research Associates in some projects. When those projects came to an end, the University was very generous to absorb those persons in the University. It is right that sometimes the University should be generous but they have to follow the Calendar. If someone would have objected to it, the MHRD would have asked about it. For them, the University is important. On this basis, the things should be very much clear.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would go by the Regulations.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that two wrongs never make a right. If it is said that at that time no complaint was made, then what could they do.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the cases being referred by Professor Ronki Ram, if he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has understood him right, it could be seen from the record that the persons who under the garb of rules are objecting to it, those used to object at that time also but no one cared for them. As it is being said that earlier there was a backdoor entry but now they have to see that such things do not happen in future.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that since the timetable and other requirements have been provided, it should be approved.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Amit Joshi endorsed this.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in future if any such proposal is submitted, it should be placed with full justification by the Department that because of the restraint from MHRD that the posts could not be filled up on regular basis, under the circumstances, the Department is recommending that the same persons be continued. If there is any Court order which Professor Ronki Ram is talking about, this is not in their knowledge. He brought Note 2 of the item to the notice of the members according to which the University had issued a circular on 30.06.2015 that persons working as guest faculty and/or temporary or part-time basis would not be discontinued because it is an order of the Court. What Shri Prabhjit Singh has talked about is right that the Colleges are not following it. If the Colleges are not following the Court orders, then somebody has to go and challenge but it is applicable everywhere to every institute. In Chandigarh Colleges, whether it is the guest faculty or otherwise, Professor Anita Kaushal would bear with him, that none of them is being relieved only under the garb of that Court order.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the DAV College and SD College are not doing it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in those cases nobody has challenged it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is the duty of the University also as the Colleges are issuing the advertisements.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not the duty of the University to get the Court orders implemented.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is not to get the orders of the Court implemented but the Vice-Chancellor's nominee is going to the Colleges for the appointments of guest faculty.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor's nominee does not go for temporary appointments.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he could name the person who had gone as Vice-Chancellor's nominee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it must be in unofficial capacity.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that then how the University could grant duty leave for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to take up such things as to what could they do about it. The point raised by Shri Prabhjit Singh is a valid one and he agrees with Shri Ashok Goyal that the University does not have a right to get the Court orders executed. But there is a need to supervise such things as the Colleges are the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the teachers of the DAV College approached the Court and they also got the same relief.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Constituent Colleges of Panjab University are also following the same policy while the other affiliated Colleges are not following it.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that in the Government Colleges, they have contractual staff which has been appointed through proper procedure by the Administration. Instead of guest faculty, they are called as Resource Persons. They are paid on lecture basis and such persons could be from any specialised walk of life in that particular field. Such Resource Persons are paid a sum of Rs.1000/- per lecture if they are NET qualified and Rs.500/- in case of non-NET as per the UGC norms. So, such persons could not approach the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is only to circumvent the orders of the Court, that they change the nomenclature to resource person which again is not tenable because the teachers need the job, they are getting the salary on the period basis i.e. Rs. 25000/- per month maximum. So, they do not bother whether the nomenclature is Guest Faculty or Resource Person. He has no hesitation in saying that the even the government has started exploiting teachers, what to talk of the private sector. This is what is happening.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Resource Persons is no word which the UGC is using. So, they should pass it in the Syndicate/appeal the Chandigarh Administration not to use this word.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this view could be explained by the Vice Chancellor on behalf of the Syndicate informally, let they should see what can be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would request Dr. Subhash Sharma, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal Anita Kaushal to see whether there is any need to look into the issue and submit a report to him in this regard immediately. Since he is going to address the College Principals at the Principals Conference on 1st of September, it would give him an input on the issue.

**RESOLVED:** That Mohd. Samshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, P.U., with immediate effect for the session 2018-2019, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions on which they have worked previously during the session 2017-2018, under Regulation 5 page 111, P.U. Calendar-I, 2007.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That in future for appointments on temporary basis, the directive of MHRD not to fill up the posts and the direction of the Court not to replace the persons already employed on temporary basis with another temporary person be mentioned in the background of the item.

Arising out of the discussion on Item C-5, on the issue of appointment of Resource Persons in the Colleges instead of Guest Faculty, a Committee of the following members be constituted to look into the issue:

- (1) Dr. Subhash Sharma
- (2) Professor Navdeep Goyal
- (3) Professor Anita Kaushal
- (4) D.R. (Colleges) (Convener)

**Grant of half pay leave  
to Dr. Dhian Kaur,  
Department of  
Geography**

6. Considered if, half pay leave, be granted to Dr. Dhian Kaur, Professor, Department of Geography, w.e.f. 01.03.2019 to 28.05.2019, subject to CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Bhura Singh Ghuman & Ors. Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) pending in the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court with regard to age of retirement.

- NOTE:** 1. Request dated 11.07.2018 of Dr. Dhian Kaur, recommended and forwarded by the Chairperson, Department of Geography is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).
2. Dr. Dhian Kaur has granted half pay leave for six months w.e.f. 01.08.2018, under Regulation 11 (e) at page 139 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-1, 2007 vide order No.5363-65/Estt.-I dated 24.07.2018 (**Appendix-XII**).
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

**RESOLVED:** That half pay leave, be granted to Dr. Dhian Kaur, Professor, Department of Geography, w.e.f. 01.02.2019 to 28.05.2019, subject to CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Bhura Singh Ghuman & Ors. Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) pending in the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court with regard to age of retirement.

**Re-appointment of part-time Professor, Ludhiana Assistant PURC,**

7. Considered if, the following persons, be re-appointed as Part-time Assistant Professor, PURC, Ludhiana, from July, 2018 for the current session 2018-19, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) against the vacant position of the Centre:

1. Ms. Vandana Bhanot
2. Ms. Sarita Paul
3. Dr. Kuljit Singh
4. Mr. Sunil Mittal

**NOTE:** 1. The above persons were re-appointed as Part-Time Assistant Professor on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed), PURC, Ludhiana, for the session 2017-18 and the same was noted by the Senate in its meeting dated 16.12.2017 (Para XXXIII).

2. A copy of the joint meeting of the Administrative and Academic Committee dated 09.07.2018 is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (General discussion) has agreed with the suggestions of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath that all the persons working as Guest faculty and/or temporary or part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointees. Accordingly a circular was issued vide no. 5536-5635/Estt.I dated 30.06.2015.
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the persons as mentioned under Item No. 7, were appointed after 2015. He read out Note 3 under Item No.7 which says, "The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (General discussion) has agreed with the suggestion of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath that all the persons working as Guest Faculty and/or temporary or part-time basis should be allowed to continue..." This was stated by Shri Chatrath in the year 2015, which means that the persons who were continuing before 2015 should be allowed to continue. He (Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath) did not mean to say that the persons who would join even after 2015 would keep continuing. Making his point more clear Shri Prabhjit Singh said that what Shri Chatrath meant was that the persons who were continuing in 2015 should be allowed to continue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while clarifying the point said that what it meant was that in order to stop the persons to go to the Court time and again, they should take a decision on the issue.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they appoint persons sometimes on part time basis and sometimes on adhoc basis.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Court has done it for all.

The Vice Chancellor that that it has been done for all the persons. He read out some portion of Note No.3 of Item 7 which states, "...all the

persons working as Guest faculty and /or temporary or part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointees....”

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is not against anybody. The only point is that somebody should look at the Court case and not take it as such. Secondly, people in society, everyone should get a chance to compete.

Dr. Subahsh Sharma said that all their Regional Centres and Constituent Colleges are following this practice. Whatever is being followed in the University, the same is being followed by the Constituent Colleges and Regional Centres.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this relief has been given through the Court order.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is right that it is not being followed only there where it has not been challenged whether it is a private college or a Government College, affiliated college, University or Regional Centres. This, in fact, as on today, is the law of land and they cannot violate. Now the concern of the Vice Chancellor is that whether they should explore the possibility to find a solution of this problem by going to the Court again to get that order modified, if possible. He said that he would like to bring another thing to the notice of the Vice Chancellor that in this campus, there is one such department who has made unwritten rule. The rule has not been made by the University, not by the Court and there is no provision in the Calendar. That is their Law Department. They have made a rule that they would not appoint part time teachers for more than six years. The Law Department which is directly connected with the Courts i.e. High Court and Supreme Court, they have made their own rule. When they made this unwritten rule, at that time such an order from the High Court or Supreme Court was not there. But now when such a rule has been made by the Court, it is understood that part-time teachers would continue. It is not in his knowledge that after the receipt of such an order from the Court anybody had been removed from the service after completing six years of service.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that where such teachers are being removed, there is other reason for this. Actually, their class sections have reduced.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a temporary person cannot be replaced by a temporary. It cannot happen that one person is removed and in his place another person is employed. Such a thing has not happened so far. So, they have to be very cautious that they should not do such a thing where they could indulge in unnecessary litigation and they have to be care. If it happens as Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has said, it is okay, otherwise, these instructions should be reiterated by issuing a circular in which affiliated colleges should also be covered and the problem which Shri Prabhjit Singh has told that the private colleges which are not following this, they should also do it.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to note this point and bring it to the notice of the Principals during the Principals' Conference.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal informed that in the case of a private College, the President of the DAV Managing Committee is facing contempt of Court proceeding because they have done it.

At this stage the Vice Chancellor said that in another case he has also received contempt of Court order.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, what has been brought to their knowledge is that for making appointment of Guest faculty or for appointment on contract basis in Colleges, teachers from the University used to go in the Selection Committees and mostly take duty leave also. At least they should be advised not to become a party to such acts of even private colleges because in this way the University has become a party in the case.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that whosoever goes in such a Selection Committee, he should not be given duty leave. Suppose some college has invited a teacher for the Selection Committee meeting of their own, but the University has not sent him as its nominee, then what for the duty leave is given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that duty is given, it is his (concerned teacher's) right.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Government has now changed the rule a copy of the same is lying with him. Now the person would not ask for duty leave, but he would go there on duty.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the teachers who go for selection committee meetings, they inform the Dean College Development Office about it and request for duty leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they can take special academic leave.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they inform their Chairperson only and not to the Dean College Development Office or not even the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said, but they are informing the Chairperson of their department.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that such leave cannot be sanctioned without the approval of Dean of University Instruction. If they perform such a duty, it is with the permission of the Dean of University Instruction.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in case there is some legal problem, the contempt would be on the Vice Chancellor, that is why he was asking.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that as per the new UGC regulations of 2018, the duty leave has been restricted upto 30 days, but on duty one could go any number of days. This is the difference in both the nomenclatures.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they follow Panjab Government rules and they have also their own rules, they do not follow the UGC rules for this purpose.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons, be re-appointed as Part-time Assistant Professor, PURC, Ludhiana, from July, 2018 for the current session 2018-19, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) against the vacant position of the Centre:

1. Ms. Vandana Bhanot
2. Ms. Sarita Paul
3. Dr. Kuljit Singh
4. Mr. Sunil Mittal

**Leave cases of teaching staff**

**8.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 04.07.2018 (**Appendix-XIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.5.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes of the Committee dated 04.07.2018 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.5.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Minutes dated 09.02.2018 of the CIIPP Advisory Committee and IPR Committee for finalization of Entrepreneurship Policy**

**9.** Considered minutes dated 09.02.2018 (**Appendix-XV**) of the CIIPP Advisory Committee and IPR Committee for finalization of Entrepreneurship Policy (**Appendix-XV**) for the faculty, students and researchers of Panjab University.

Referring to the item, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is a good effort for research.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is taking opinion of the legal expert on this issue and after that he would place it before them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a very good effort has been made to which the Vice Chancellor said that he does agree to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that some minor corrections should be done. He pointed out that at page 82, third line of the agenda papers, in place of 'IIT Kanpur', it should be 'Panjab University'.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested not to make any delay in it because it would be harmful to the faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not make any delay in it, but it should be approved subject to legal vetting. It was suggested by the members that for the purpose a Committee consisting of Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Professor Sanjeev Puri be constituted which was agreed to by the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor requested the Committee members to accomplish the job at the earliest.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 09.02.2018 of the CIIPP Advisory Committee and IPR Committee for finalization of Entrepreneurship Policy for the faculty, students and researchers of Panjab University, **as per Appendix (revised Annexure 'A')**, be approved subject to it being legally vetted. Following members were requested to assist:

- (i) Professor Keshav Malhotra
- (ii) Dr. Subhash Sharma
- (iii) Dr. Sanjeev Puri

**Confirmation of Dr.  
Upasna Joshi Sethi,  
UIAMS**

**10.** Considered if, Dr. Upasna Joshi Sethi, Professor, UIAMS, be confirmed w.e.f. 10.08.2017 i.e. due date of confirmation on completion of probation period of one year on 09.08.2017.

- NOTE:** 1. Dr. Upasna Joshi Sethi was appointed as Professor in UIAMS w.e.f. 10.08.2016 on probation of one year.
2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 31) (**Appendix-XVI**) considered the confirmation of Dr. Upasna Joshi Sethi, w.e.f. 10.08.2017 and extension in her probation period for one year i.e. w.e.f. 10.08.2017 and it was resolved that probation period of Dr. Upasna Joshi Sethi be extended for one year i.e. w.e.f. 10.08.2017.
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a request has been made by Dr. Upasna Joshi to extend her probation period till the approval for amendment in pension regulations is received, but they cannot do so. The pension regulations could be received at any time. So, he requested that the probation period of Dr. Upasna Joshi be extended for one year. In case she is confirmed at this time, then she has to leave her job at Punjabi University which is a pensionable job. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that such a provision exists in Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are a number of such cases on both sides. They are keeping on hold such cases in Punjabi University as well as in Panjab University. They would come across so many cases and there seems to be some violation in such cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had given a solution of it. This is a very strange thing that a person who is on probation is himself saying that his probation be extended. But why it is so? This is so, because they have been doing it since years together. There is one such category where the people have been working since years on deputation. The borrowing agency is the Panjab University and the lending agency is saying that they have not sent any person to them on deputation. But they say that the person is on deputation with them. There are such cases who are not appointed on probation and also not confirmed. Keeping in mind those cases, the people say that why they are denied the benefit of pension. But they say that there should be some solution to this problem as it is not their purpose to harm anybody.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what they want to do.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. Upasna Joshi herself wants to get extended her probation period and they have done it in many cases earlier awaiting the pension regulations. Many people have returned back after joining the University and many other did not join because of non-availability of pension and many people are trying to get pension. The regulations regarding pension to those who were already working on pensionable jobs are in the pipeline. Now such persons would be entitled to get pension. He is not for extending the probation period. But who stops them from not conveying that one stands

confirmed. Let them not give the confirmation letter so that she (Dr. Upasna) could say that she has not yet been confirmed. Instead of extending the probation let them should not give her the confirmation letter. Last time they had said that they would not extend the probation, but she is not confirmed. She might not be given the confirmation letter. Thus, the probation would be extended automatically.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is very clear-cut judgement of Supreme Court and High Court that if they would not convey anything to the incumbent, the incumbent automatically stands confirmed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would not go into legal debate because he could also quote hundred judgements where Supreme Court has said that until and unless positive letter to the effect that confirmation is done, one would not be deemed to have been confirmed. So, let them not go into that. That eventuality would come only when the person is not confirmed, he or she claims that he or she is deemed to be confirmed. What are they doing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while supporting what Shri Ashok Goyal said, intervened to say that when many Institutes crop up, the Central Government thought that it should be possible to move a person from one institute to other, if he wants so. To enable that, they allowed deputation for ten years. That problem was being faced due to pension. As all of them know that after 2004, nobody would be getting pension. So, their case is also somewhat similar and the approved regulations would be received soon. So, this is the benefit which was being given to the employees from time to time.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he personally does not understand what they are debating. The person is on probation which means after one year she is either to be terminated or confirmed. There is no third suggestion. He does not know why they are debating it. If anybody does not want to be confirmed, then they should terminate him. Then what about the debate is? There is a very simple logic as they have to take one of the two decisions and there is no third choice.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should understand her problem. She is Assistant Professor in UIAMS and she is doing a very good work. So, both Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal requested to defer the Item.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he does not agree to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, alright, he (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) may not agree but it is a suggestion.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Syndicate and Senate have already taken a decision on the pension issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra requested to defer the item

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is no need to defer the item.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this case is not their personal case. But why they are taking different stand? He said that the Vice Chancellor in his statement just now has talked about the rules and

regulations. What rules say? The rules say either confirm her or terminate her services. Why they are going beyond this?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is no third choice.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he also endorses the view point of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if they go beyond the rules, that means they are helping someone.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that such people have occupied the seats at two different places.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have precedents where probation period was extended up to five years. He informed that he started his service in a college. When he joined the job in the University, he got the confirmation letter after three years and thus he had to get his lien extended for three years.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the agenda item is for confirmation of her service. Had it for extension in probation, they could have the discussion on this issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if they did not allow this, the teachers who have come from other institutions, they would have to go back to their parent institution after two years.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the item is for confirmation. So, he suggested that they should add one line in the item i.e. either confirmation/extension in probation period.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested to defer the item.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is not the question of college Vs University or something. He neither belongs to a College nor to the University. Rules are rules. What the rules say? The rules do not say to defer the item. They have either to accept it or reject it. The problem is this when some item belonging to the University comes for discussion, a different view is taken.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that here the items belonging to the University would come. So, only the bearer knows where the shoe pinches. He raised a question as to why the pension policy is not made applicable during the last six years to those who have joined the University and come from borne on pension establishment. It has been lingering on since 2012 and it is now 2018. PUTA has done all this. They have sent it to the Ministry of Human Resource Development with great difficulty. He knows how many efforts they have to put in to get the pension scheme introduce. Amendment could not be got approved because no one has put any efforts for this. What they are doing for the good teachers who have come here by leaving their pensionable job. They should take care of all these things. He daily used to enquire from the HRD Ministry about this issue. They are following the file so that their teachers might not suffer. If probation period is not extended, she will have to go back to the Punjabi University, Patiala. Why she would leave her pensionable job? When they can wait for six months or a year, when they could extend benefit to others, why her probation period

cannot be extended. He informed that he himself had to get his probation period extended for three years.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if a rule is broken once, it does not mean that they could break it again.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that she is not against or in favour of it, but she wants to know the simple logic whether the extension of probation is the right of the employee or it has to be given by the employer. If they are clear on this point, then they can discuss it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said even if it is the right of the employer, then the employer should be generous to retain her. The employer should retain the good workers.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when they say that they have to follow the Calendar and go by the rules and regulations, he thinks that there is no need to be so emotional. If they have to abide by the regulations, they have to start it from the day one to which the Vice Chancellor said 'yes'.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the moment they would allow this, there would be hundreds of such cases.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that she should not be given the letter because the item has still to go to the Senate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should just remove that name, it does not matter to them, the name can be X, Y or Z. Whosoever may be X, Y or Z, they have to take a simple decision and name is not to be recorded.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan read out note 2 given under the item which states, 'the Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.5.2018 (Para 31) (Appendix-VIII Page-88) considered the confirmation of Dr. Upasna Joshi Sethi, w.e.f. 10.08.2017 and extension in her probation period for one year i.e. w.e.f. 10.08.2017 and it was resolved that probation period of Dr. Upasana Joshi Sethi be extended for one year i.e. w.e.f. 10.08.2017'. So, it has already been resolved.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are blocking the way of those who would be coming from the other institutions. He would like to clearly tell that this case would still go to the Senate and she would get time as it would take enough time to get the Senate minutes approved. So, the issuance of letter to her would take one year. It will take, if not one year, then at least six months. But it would block the way for college teachers and also those who would like to come from other institutions. If the issue of pension gets cleared, the problem would be solved.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it has no connection with the pension issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in the office note at page 89 of the agenda papers, in the last but one para, it has been stated that 'the Syndicate at its meeting held on 26.5.2018 (Para-31) has extended the probation period of Dr. Upasana Joshi for one year w.e.f.10.8.2017, under Regulation 5 page 118, P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007. However, approval of the Senate is awaited'. He asked if the approval of Senate

not been received so far. It means that the earlier decision of the Syndicate has not been approved by the Senate. If the earlier decision has not been approved, how they can consider for further extension of probation. So, he requested that let they should first have the approval of Senate, then they could consider this issue.

Professor Ronki Ram said, suppose if they consider such cases, there would be one difficulty. In case somebody comes from such an institute where there is pension and also one comes with pro rata, even then the person would not get the Panjab University Pension because the Panjab University Pension scheme was sanctioned after 2003 when the decision of 31.12.2003 was taken.

Professor Keshav Malhotra intervened to say that the pension regulations in this connection have already been sent to the MHRD and these would be received shortly.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in case the approval is given by the Ministry, then it would be possible to give pension to such persons.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested Professor Ronki Ram not to make any connection between pension and extension in probation period.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a technicality. First it should go to the Senate and then this be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he does not agree with that.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it has not been approved by the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi to read the Syndicate para of its meeting dated 26.05.2018.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he has already read it. Now the point is that the probation is due from 9.8.2017. The Senate can extend it maximum upto 2018. But ultimately, she will have to be confirmed from that date and thus there is nothing wrong with that.

Dr. Amit Joshi said if there is no decision of the Senate with them, then how they can take a decision on this today.

Continuing, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the point is that Senate has given enough time i.e. one year but no decision on the pension issue could take place. He questioned as to how many years would they wait for this. So, he said today they should either terminate her service or extend the probation on adverse ground or confirm her. There are only three choices. There is no fourth choice to defer or to wait for somebody else. They are to do one of the three choices. He was of the opinion that he is willing to defer her probation on adverse ground. Record an adverse entry or confirm her. There is no point in wasting the time and talking like school children to do this or that or to favour somebody as she wants pension. What is the connection of pension with probation?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a request has been received from Dr. Upasana Joshi.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said they cannot do anything. There are rules of the government made for this. They cannot flex it. They cannot be flexible with the rules just to favour someone.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are not pleasing her, rather she is an asset to the University. Six years have passed, but these regulations have not been got approved, who is responsible for this.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could understand his (Professor Keshav Malhotra) concern and the interest of the institution. He appreciates the feelings of Shri Ashok Goyal also that there is no doubt in their rules and regulations. The Vice Chancellor read out Regulation 5 Chapter VI(A) Conditions of Service of University Employees, at page 118, P.U. Calendar Volume-I 2007 which states, 'every appointment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or by any other method approved by the Senate, shall be made on probation for a period of one year, which may be extended by the appointing authority for a period not exceeding one year. The appointing authority may, however, grant exception in exceptional cases'.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this provision is based only on the adverse record of a person. They cannot extend the probation if his/her record is alright.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if they interpret the regulation, then it is done for adverse record.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this provision is made for exceptional cases and in the exceptional cases anything could be there.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they authorise the Vice Chancellor to take a decision on this issue.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that since the item is not properly drafted, rather it should be extension in probation period. So, it should be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are not doing anything contrary to the interest of anybody and they are not doing anything contrary to the interest of the University also and they are not violating the rules also, then where is the problem. Now leave the last line and he is not taking that into consideration. He says that they are supposed to confirm that lady. As Shri Malhi ji has said that since she is doing a good work, she should be confirmed, they are rewarding her. If by way of that reward they know for sure that she is going to quit the job of Panjab University and going back to Punjabi University, are they going to do justice with the University or the individual. Are they taking care of the interest of the Institute where she is working very good? Are they interested in brain-drain? She is ready to serve here but they are trying to create circumstances in the name of the rules that she should go and they do not need her services. That is why he has said that he does not agree with her request for extending the probation. He does not say that it is provided in the rules. But keeping themselves within the rules if they are able to retain a good teacher here, then he thinks that they will be doing service to the University. The second point is, the Vice Chancellor might ask the Registrar or the authorities, let this certificate be issued here in this House only, he would be first man to say, let it go to hell, they want to confirm her. Is he (Vice Chancellor) ready to give a certificate to all those that those who have completed one year have been

confirmed in the University. Is he ready to give a certificate that all those who have completed 1½ years of service stand confirmed? Is he ready to give a certificate that those people who were appointed on probation have not been treated arbitrarily on deputation only to help them to make eligible for pension. He is not saying that it has been done in the past, it is continuing even now as on today. So, if they say that from today onward, they are going to say they are not going to extend anybody's probation by way of request or otherwise, no problem, let they should take the decision. Then let they should take the decision about those also who are already taking the benefit even as on date. Let they should not do pick and choose. Let they should follow the rule for everyone. That is why he is saying that the item be deferred. The other cases be also taken into consideration and treat all the cases at par. There is no problem at all.

Arising out of this, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that 6 years have lapsed and requested the Vice-Chancellor to help and take up the matter with MHRD.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that Shri Ashok Goyal made two points. The point that is made is that she (Dr. Upasna) is indispensable to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not said so. He (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) said that if the probation is not extended, she would go away. If she is threatening to go away, unless they extend the probation, according to him, they should not succumb to her threats, absolutely no. If anybody threatens that he/she would go away and they succumb to his/her, they would not serve the University. It is not a matter how well done a person is.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi not to use such words as she has neither used the word threatening or indispensable.

Continuing, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that nobody including him on the earth is indispensable. When he was a small boy, he used to be told as to who would look after India after Nehru. Everyone was worried but still this country survived. So, even if she goes away, the University would survive. The third point which Shri Ashok Goyal has made is that others have also broken the law. If others have also broken the law, they would deal with that matter separately and ask the Registrar to bring all those cases and they would take action.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not said that others have broken the law but that they (the Syndicate) have broken the law earlier for others.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should not abdicate their responsibility just because of the other cases. In this case, they have to take a strong decision and they are not punishing her but saying that she is a good teacher and confirm her by following the Panjab University Calendar.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that she agrees with all the members. They could either defer it for the time being.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it should not be deferred.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that it should be deferred.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the agenda before them is very clear. Now the thing that as far as probation is concerned, they have discussed as to under which rules and regulations the probation could be extended. But now since whatever the Vice-Chancellor has read from the Panjab University Calendar, nowhere it is written that the probation could be extended only in case of 'adversities'. The rules in the Calendar are very clear about exceptional circumstances. The pension is a very big benefit for every employee. He was under the impression and initially he was also not in favour that rules should be followed but since the Vice-Chancellor has read and there is a provision in the Calendar and if a teacher could take some benefit from that line, from that exemption, they could extend it and the University could take that much decision and it is their duty also.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there is a sharp division on it. Generally, they take decisions with consensus. There is a benefit of doubt as far as rules are concerned. He said that in a game like cricket, the benefit of doubt always goes in favour of batsman as he has only one chance whereas the bowler has so many chances. There is an element of benefit of doubt and it should be looked into carefully. At the moment, the item is regarding extension. They could either approve or reject it. But there is no item regarding extension of probation. So, this item should be deferred. The rules be read carefully and the earlier precedents should also be looked into and the Vice-Chancellor should use his wisdom keeping in view the interest of the University, this item be again placed before the Syndicate. They should mention both the options, i.e., confirmation/extension of probation. They could discuss it again and take a call on that.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a good discussion has taken place. If they are talking about the rules and regulations, they could say how this case is an exceptional one and then consider as per the regulations. It is very important as Panjab University has been suffering on two counts. One is that the teachers are leaving the University because they retire at the age of 60 years and not getting the benefit of retiring at 65 years. Secondly, some good teachers do not want to come to Panjab University because of the issue of pension. Since this person has come to Panjab University to serve and Panjab University wanted her services because she is a very good teacher but they are helpless. That is why it is a very good case of exceptional circumstances and the University wanted to retain her.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that as now-a-days the appointments of the Principals are being made, these are made for a period of 5 years and the appointees are given the lien for a period of 5 years and after 5 years, they go back to the original post. Similarly, she could also go back after 5 years as a Professor is also of the rank of a Principal. So, the extension should be given.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha pointed out that the Syndicate had formed a Committee on the issue of confirmation about 2 years back because there was some gap between the confirmations being done by the Colleges and University. The Committee had made recommendation which was approved by the Vice-Chancellor that if an employee wanted, the probation could be extended to the third year also. The Registrar must be having more knowledge of that matter. There is already a decision on this issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that according to him all the members agree on it that as the teachers are retiring but they are not able to make the appointments. Since they are having good faculty and if such persons leave the job of the University, it would be a loss to the interests of the University. There is unanimity in the interest of the University to retain the person. All these things would be recorded with discussion. So, the extension should be given and the matter would be placed before the Senate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is not against anybody but the rules must be observed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to keep one thing in mind that this should not lead to opening of the floodgates. He requested Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Anita Kaushal to look into other such cases. They are not violating any rules but at the same time their priority is the interest of the University.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there is no violation of the rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would talk to the Vice-Chancellor about it later on. According to him, after a period of 6-7 months, the person would not need the extension.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the probation period of Dr. Upasna Joshi Sethi be extended for one more year, w.e.f. 10.8.2018, considering it as an exceptional case, as per Regulation 5 at page 118 of PU Calendar Vol. I, 2007.

**Resignation of Dr. Akshat Mehta, Assistant Professor, Centre for Police Administration**

**11.** Considered if, the resignation of Dr. Akshat Mehta, Assistant Professor, Centre for Police Administration, be accepted w.e.f. 29.12.2016 i.e. the date of his relieving from the University on account of sanction of leave without pay to join as Associate Professor, Police Administration, Raksha Shakti University, Ahmedabad, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Dr. Akshat Mehta, Assistant Professor, Centre for Police Administration was initially granted EOL without pay for a period of one year w.e.f. 29.12.2016 to 28.12.2017 to join as Associate Professor, Police Administration, Raksha Shakti University, Ahmedabad, by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 47 (R-i), which was extended for one more year w.e.f. 29.12.2017 with permission to retain the lien vide order dated 25.04.2018.

2. Regulation 6, page 118, Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate, may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

3. Request dated 20.06.2018 of Dr. Akshat Mehta for resignation is enclosed **(Appendix-XVII)**.
4. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XVII)**.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the person had gone on leave by maintaining the lien but now he is submitting his resignation. There is a provision that one has to give three months' notice or has to deposit the salary of three months. Now the notice has been given within the period of leave. The notice has to be given only after joining back or three months' salary has to be deposited.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this is rule as pointed out by Shri Prabhjit Singh. The person should first join and then serve three months' notice.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that in this case the clause of long leave applies. He said that it is clearly mentioned in the Note under the item that “provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required. Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.” So, it is as per the rules.

**RESOLVED:** That the resignation of Dr. Akshat Mehta, Assistant Professor, Centre for Police Administration, be accepted w.e.f. 29.12.2016 i.e. the date of his relieving from the University on account of sanction of leave without pay to join as Associate Professor, Police Administration, Raksha Shakti University, Ahmedabad, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**Request dated 04.07.2018 of certain students of MDS 3<sup>rd</sup> Year (Batch 2016), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, P.U. with regard to review the decision regarding fee hike of Rs.21,000/-**

**12.** Considered request dated 04.07.2018 **(Appendix-XVIII)** of the certain students of MDS 3<sup>rd</sup> Year (Batch 2016), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, P.U. with regard to review the decision regarding fee hike of Rs.21,000/-.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.03/21.04/29.04.2018 (Para 22) **(Appendix-XVIII)** has resolved that minutes dated 30.01.2018 of the Committee of the certain Syndics, in terms of decision of the Syndicate dated

10.12.2017/19.12.2017 (Para 32) regarding rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for P.U. Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres, for the session 2018-19 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for P.U., as per Appendix, be approved.

2. The Senate in its meeting dated 06.05.2018 (Para IV) (**Appendix-XVIII**) considered and approved the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 30.03/21.04/29.04.2018 (Para 22), with the modification that the other charges from the existing students be hiked by 5%. The examination fee be hiked by Rs.75/- per semester.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the admission to MDS courses would be treated as new admission for which 10% increase is applicable, but the students are saying that they are already the students of Panjab University and have requested for reducing the increase to 5%.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the hike is 5% which comes to Rs.21,000/- and the students are asking to reduce that.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the hike of 5% is fair one.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that MDS course is a professional one and is in demand.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should keep the increase in the fee at par with the fee which had been hiked for courses run by UIAMS.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that the fee of courses run by UIAMS was hiked by Rs.7,500/-. There is a difference between the MDS course and the courses run by UIAMS. The courses run by UIAMS are surplus whereas when MDS courses were started, these were started as self-financing courses. If they review the fee, it would adversely affect the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the increase was effected after due deliberations. If the fee of a course is Rs.5 lac, the increase of 5% comes to Rs.25,000/-. So, they have not to see the amount by which the fee has been enhanced but the percentage is to be taken into account, because if the fee of a course is Rs.500/-, the hike by 5% would come to Rs.25/-.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there is no need to review it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a lot of difference between courses run by UIAMS and the Dental Institute. For the courses of UIAMS, there is no need of any equipment, whereas for the courses

run by Dental Institute, the cost of even a dental chair is more than Rs.2 lacs.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that let them have a look on the office system, because there is neither any recommendation from any office nor any Committee has been constituted. So much so, the Principal of the College has not recommended it. There are some signatures, but it is not known whether the same are authenticated or not. The request is straightaway addressed to the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor marked it directly to the Deputy Registrar for Syndicate. Normally, any request has to be processed through the office so that the Vice-Chancellor could have some inputs. But there is nothing like that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be noted by the office that the official procedure should be followed.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the request had been addressed to the Vice-Chancellor and he should have marked it to the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the request had been marked to the Finance and Development Officer and Syndicate, then the Finance and Development Officer had no choice.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per the decision of the Senate, the hike is 10% and not 5%.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the application has been received in the office of the Vice-Chancellor who has marked it to Finance and Development Officer and Syndicate on 11.07.2018. Since it went to Finance and Development Officer, he had no choice to mark it to Deputy Registrar (General) on 12.07.2018. Nothing has been processed. If the item is being placed before the Syndicate, it means it has come through the Syndicate section.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the matter has been processed through the Finance and Development Officer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been processed through the Finance and Development Officer, having his signatures on page 103 of the agenda. The Vice-Chancellor had marked the request to the Syndicate and Finance and Development Officer, meaning thereby that it be placed before the Syndicate along with the remarks of the Finance and Development Officer. He said that the matter should have been referred to the Committee which had taken decision about the hike in fee. If the item was to be placed before the Syndicate, it should have been routed through the same process through which it came when the fee was enhanced, so that the feedback of the Committee should have been there who had recommended the enhancement. Then, what is the role of the Finance and Development Officer?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that an enhancement of 10% has been effected and not 5% whereas the students are requesting to reduce the fee which has been enhanced by 5%. He said that only a note from the Finance and Development Officer appears on page 103 of the agenda, whereas the decision of the Syndicate appears on page 101, according to which the fee of the courses run by the Dental Institute has been enhanced by 10%. The original recommendations

are available on pages 99 and 100. On page 99, point no.2 clearly says that “the tuition fee of all traditional/professional courses may be enhanced at the rate of 10% with minimum annual increase of Rs.1000/- (to be rounded off to the next tens)”. This has been reviewed and the reviewed decision is available on page 101, according to which fee of the Dental Institute has not been reviewed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is right that when the Syndicate had taken a decision, the enhancement was 10%, but when the matter was placed before the Senate on 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2018, in the proceedings of Senate appearing on page 102 it is written, “Resolved: that (i) recommendation of the Syndicate contained in Item C-39 on the agenda, as per Appendix, be approved with the modification that the other charges from the existing students be hiked by 5%. The examination fee be hiked by Rs.75/- per semester.”

The Finance & Development Officer clarified that on page 99 of the agenda papers the fee structure is regulated by the provision of self-financing courses. This MBA course is regulated by self-financing courses. The original recommendation was 5% for the self-financing courses for the ongoing students. In other cases where 10% is recommended, the Senate said ‘no’, let it be 5%.

Professor Navdeep Goyal also clarified that for the new admissions the enhancement is 10% and for the existing students the enhancement is 5%.

Continuing, the Finance and Development Officer said that though it has created a very complex fee structure for the University, but right now it is like this. The honourable previous Vice Chancellor marked this letter parallel to two different offices, i.e., one to the Syndicate Section and other to his office. They submitted a fee because this fee had been approved by the competent bodies. So, this should be filed.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to say that to his mind, it should be filed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired as to what is the status of MDS fee, whether the enhancement is 5% or 10%.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for the new admissions, the enhancement is 10%, but for the existing students, it is 5%.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it cannot be said to be filed because before filing it, the Vice Chancellor had marked it to the Syndicate. How, he (F.D.O.) could overrule the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that it means that the 5% and 10% enhancement is okay and they need not to review it to which the members said, okay.

**RESOLVED:** That request dated 04.07.2018 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of certain students of MDS 3<sup>rd</sup> Year (Batch 2016), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, P.U. with regard to review the decision regarding fee hike of Rs.21,000/- be not acceded to.

**Minutes dated 18.07.2018 of the Committee with regard to frequent violations of the rules by the University employees for writing directly to Chancellor**

13. Considered minutes dated 18.07.2018 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate held on 30.03.2018 (**Appendix-XIX**), with regard to frequent violations of the rules by the University employees for writing directly to Chancellor:

Dr. R.K. Mahajan stated that the issue contained in this item has already been approved and only a circular had to be issued, so that no one should do this in future. So, there is nothing to do.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know as to why this item has come again on the agenda. Shri Malhi said that he had presided over the meeting while this issue was discussed and the Vice Chancellor was not present. The issue has already been resolved and only a circular has to be issued.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that meeting of the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor was held on 18.07.2018. But, he does not know why the Committee was constituted when the issue was already resolved.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee might have been constituted to revisit the rules.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there was no need of the Committee.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they did not ask to constitute a Committee and the item needs to be withdrawn to which many members nodded in the affirmative.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Syndicate has already taken a decision on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a decision be taken that the item be withdrawn, which means that it is not required, but deferring means that it is required but needs further deliberations.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that earlier a decision was taken that no employee by surpassing the Vice-Chancellor would write any letter to the Chancellor directly.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a letter has already been circulated in this regard.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Registrar is right that the Committee was constituted to revisit the rules and the Committee has opined that there is no need to revisit the rules. Then, they agree with the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they agree with the Committee only to the extent that there is no need to revisit the rules, because the Committee has mentioned so many other things also, like that there is no appellate authority and Senate is the highest authority. He further said that it be resolved that the recommendation of the Committee to the extent that there is no need to revisit the rules, is accepted, notwithstanding anything contained therein. He dictated the resolved part that it is resolved that notwithstanding anything contained in the proceedings, the recommendation of the Committee that there is no need to revisit the rules is accepted.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Committee was constituted by the authority which has given its opinion. Now, they are closing the item by saying that as the Committee has recommended, there is no need to revisit the rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee has gone beyond its scope because by no way they could curtail the fundamental right of anybody. That is why a circular was issued that whatever had happened, let that be forgotten. They accept the recommendation of the Committee that there is no need to revisit the rules.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the rules are clear cut.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Committee was to revisit the rules.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the rules have been revisited and it is also clear that the Vice-Chancellor has not to be bypassed in writing directly to the Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let them see the proceedings of the Committee at page 108 of the agenda, where the Committee has summarised its proceedings in the last paragraph.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that this could be verified from the video recording that in that meeting of the Syndicate it was not decided to revisit the rules but only to issue a fresh circular.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the rules are very much clear.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee has recommended that "in view of the above it was agreed that while there is no need to make any changes in the Rules, it is necessary to issue a fresh circular drawing attention to the relevant provisions referred to above". That means that as per the above provisions, nobody through proper channel or otherwise write to the Chancellor. It was decided that nobody would directly to the Chancellor, but could write through proper channel whereas the Committee is saying that the employee could not write to the Chancellor as the Senate is the supreme authority even if anything is against the Vice-Chancellor. That is why he is saying that it is curtailing the fundamental rights. The Committee has further noted that "it was pointed out that the need for revisiting these rules as directed by the Syndicate had arisen because it was felt by some members that there should be no harm in a complaint being addressed directly to the Chancellor if, for example, the complaint concerned a grievance against the Vice-Chancellor. In this connection attention was drawn to the last paragraph of the report dated 18.12.2017 reproduced below: 'the Committee further wishes to clarify that the authority for the management of, and superintendence over the affairs of the University is vested in the Senate and there is no provision for appeal against its decision to any higher authority'. It was also clarified that adequate provisions do exist in the University Rules for dealing with all grievances, including those involving the Vice-Chancellor, as well as for appeals to higher authorities. These Rules provide for the complaints to be addressed in the first instance to the Standing Committee on Grievances. Any appeals thereafter can only be addressed to the Syndicate and the Senate, which are endowed with final decision making powers under the PU Act". It is completely

against the law of the land as it is being said by the Committee that quoting the above provisions, a fresh circular be issued but the circular which has already been issued is enough. That is why it was decided that a Committee be formed to revisit the rules and that Committee has said that there is no need to revisit the rules and they accept that recommendation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they approve only that part of the recommendation of the Committee that no change is required in the present rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee wants to say that Senate is the disciplinary and punishing authority of the Vice-Chancellor which is not a fact. The appointing authority of the Vice-Chancellor is the Chancellor, the fixation of the terms and conditions is to be done by the Chancellor, then who is the Senate. This is what the Committee wants. That is why he was saying that there are far-reaching consequences of it. How could the Chancellor be subjected to the Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they accept only the part which was the mandate given to the Committee and do not accept what the Committee has recommended beyond that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how the Senate could pass a no-confidence motion against the Vice-Chancellor. When they keep an individual in mind and not the institution, then there could be problems.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the decision of the Senate was that if there is a case against any teaching or non-teaching employee, the deciding authority would be the Senate. The question was not only that the Senate could sit for a decision on the Vice-Chancellor. But it was because the Chancellor was made a party in a Court case and a case was filed in the Court against the Chancellor. This is the reality behind this issue.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that such an occasion should not arise that a person is compelled to write to the Chancellor.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the rules in the Panjab University Calendar are sufficient.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are accepting only that part of the proceedings of the Committee where it has been mentioned that there is no need to revisit the rules. The other observations of the proceedings are to be taken into account.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is also mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar that if any employee wanted to write to the Chancellor that has to be routed through the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that rule is applicable only for the employees and not for the Senators.

**RESOLVED:** That notwithstanding anything contained in the proceedings of the Committee, the recommendation of the Committee that there is no need to change the existing rules be accepted.

**Conferment of  
Honorary Professor on  
Dr. Girish Sahni**

**14.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor at Panjab University, be conferred on Dr. Girish Sahni, Director General, CSIR and Secretary, DSIR, New Delhi.

**NOTE:** 1. Section-18 of Panjab University Act appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

18. Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the clause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes.

2. Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Girish Sahni is enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested to brief about the background of Dr. Girish Sahni.

Dr. Amit Joshi informed that Dr. Sahni had been his teacher. He was the Director of IMTECH, Chandigarh and then joined as Director-General, CSIR. He is a very renowned scientist. He is the only one who has discovered a marketable medicine 'Natural Streptokinase'. That is Rs.500 crore product of CSIR. He is also an alumnus of Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what kind of help Dr. Sahni could render to the University.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Honorary Professor has to deliver lectures and guide the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then the Honorary Professor could also guide the students about the funding agencies also. He respects Dr. Sahni who is a renowned scientist. He expects him to help in having MoUs with international labs and get funds to the University. He wants that in addition to the academics, the person should also help in funding for the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is no doubt that Dr. Sahni is a renowned person and there is no point in discussing that and he deserves to be appointed as Honorary Professor. For principle of equity and equitable justice, they should not do pick and choose. There are hundreds of renowned persons in this country. But it happens that out of those hundred persons, if one likes a person, he chooses that person and makes him an Honorary Professor. The other 99 persons are also renowned but one does not chooses from them. There has to be some principle of equity and equitable justice. Secondly, the connection to the Panjab University is not clearly brought out in the citation. If he was a student or a Professor of the

University, does he now maintain that contact or is he going to settle down in Chandigarh. Thirdly, whether he is ready to become Honorary Professor or has he given his consent for it. Fourthly, what contribution he would make to the University. Whether he would deliver a talk once a month or six months or a year. What contribution he would make to the running of the University. These points are in general.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they must be clear that Honorary Professor is not going to get any honorarium. Secondly, he is not going to get any accommodation as he would be coming to the University. Since he is a very renowned person and is the Director-General, CSIR and must be having some links and would get the University connected and help in some way. Since three Deans are recommending his name, it means that they have recommended after giving a proper thought.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as pointed out by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, he agrees with that in entirety. First of all, when the name of such a renowned person is recommended, they have no moral authority to discuss as the person is a renowned scientist. But as Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that what about other 200 renowned scientists. Are they going to appoint them as Honorary Professor in the same footing without asking them as to how they are going to contribute to the University, whether they are willing or not and how it is beneficial to the University? It has been discussed many times that some criteria should be framed. One is that those persons would be made Honorary Professor who could help the University whether in terms of academic excellence or in terms of funding or in terms of international exposure. At present, there is no criterion. They could frame some criteria. As Professor Ronki Ram has said that three Deans have recommended the name, it could also be one of the criteria that if a sitting Dean and two former Deans recommend a name, the person could be appointed as Honorary Professor or a Committee could be formed to do the screening or they could advertise and invite applications as has been done in the case of the Vice-Chancellor. So, there should be some criteria otherwise if something for or against anybody is spoken, probably it is not like honouring that person. What is happening is that one fine morning somebody comes up with the name of an IAS officer that the person had been a very good bureaucrat and he be appointed as Honorary Professor or a person has been a General in the Army, he should be appointed as Honorary Professor. If it is said that they are not giving anything to Honorary Professor, it is not true. An honorarium of Rs.5,000/- per lecture is paid along with his boarding, lodging and travel expenses and these expenses are borne by the University. As has been stated by the Vice-Chancellor as a management expert, how the University would be benefitted from that person. In the light of that, not commenting anything about this case, they should be conscious while taking some decision that when something is placed before the Syndicate, the decision is taken in unison and there is no questioning at that time. He enquired whether there is any provision for Honorary Professor that if anybody sends the name, the person is considered for Honorary Professorship. The provision is that on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate, the Chancellor may appoint an Honorary Professor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that only a teacher could be appointed as the Honorary Professor whereas in the

University some non-teachers have also been appointed as Honorary Professors.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Keshav Malhotra has touched a very pertinent point that the Honorary Professorship is only for a distinguished teacher. Let it be a separate matter for those who have been appointed. What is happening in the University is that if somebody liked by the Vice-Chancellor suggests the name of any person, the Vice-Chancellor recommends the name whereas if a person not liked by the Vice-Chancellor suggests the name, then the Vice-Chancellor does not recommend. Since there is no rule, it depends on the will of the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Subhash Sharma while referring in this context said that in one of the meetings of the Syndicate prior to the two meetings which could not be held, the case of a Professor (Dr. Neera Grover) for Honorary Professorship was placed. At that time, there was a lot of discussion that she be appointed as Honorary Professor. Her name had also been recommended by the Department. He remembers that at that time, the Syndicate had resolved that the CV be got attested.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to under which category that name was placed.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that there are two categories, one of which is Professor Emeritus. If someone has to be appointed as Professor Emeritus, he/she has to have at least 10 years standing with Panjab University. But if somebody does not have 10 years standing, then the person is appointed as Honorary Professor for which there is no such condition of 10 years standing with Panjab University and somebody from outside could also be appointed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the case of Dr. Neera Grover was placed for appointment as Honorary Professor. The discussion on that took place. He still remembers that two points came up at that time. One was that whether she was interested and has submitted any application or letter. Then it was revealed that she has not given any letter but the Department wanted her. Then another issue was that at least she should sign the CV and only then the case could be considered.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at that time it was decided that the CV should be attested at least by the Dean of University Instruction. Simultaneously, the case was approved. In the next meeting, it was informed that she did not do that.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the CV of Dr. Sahni is also not attested.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked whether Dr. Sahni is willing to accept the Honorary Professorship.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in the case of Dr. Neera Grover, there were two issues. One was whether she had shown her willingness, then it was pointed out that she had not shown her willingness. The other issue was that she should at least submit her signed CV, that was also not done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the present case also they could ask for the willingness.

Dr. Subhash Sharma also said that the willingness be sought because if they recommend the name but the person says that he does not have the time for this assignment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever Dr. Subhash Sharma is saying is right that if they recommend the name but the person does not accept, then what.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the person also could say that he is willing but does not have time to devote to Panjab University. If they start appointing two Honorary Professors in every meeting, then there could be a long list of Honorary Professors.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that as far as the issue of willingness is concerned, the case of Dr. Neera Grover was placed before the Syndicate for consideration as the same was forwarded by the Department of Music and Dean of University Instruction. The reason for withdrawing, according to him, was that the issue was politicised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case was forwarded by the Head of the Department.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that, that might not be the reason. The reason must be something else.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whatever could be the reason, he is not going into the details of that case. Dr. Sahni is Director-General, CSIR, Advisor Science and Technology to the Prime Minister and Secretary, DSIR which is unparalleled. He is a scientist of impeccable credentials and has no match.

Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened to say that they are not commenting anything on this.

Continuing, Dr. Amit Joshi said that if they want to appoint Dr. Sahni as Honorary Professor in Panjab University, one thing is sure that he would help the University, there is no doubt in it. He had been the Director of IMTECH and has already helped the University in establishing a number of departments. He was very much involved in guiding the research students. His students used to get enrolled under the faculty of Panjab University. He used to offer all the facilities of his Institute to the students of Panjab University. There has been unhindered access to all the facilities in IMTECH till date. The credit for this goes to Dr. Sahni. Before Dr. Sahni, Dr. Ghosh was in IMTECH and they faced many problems but when Dr. Sahni took over, no student ever faced any problem in utilising the facilities of IMTECH. Teachers and the scientists of IMTECH are collaborating with lot of faculty members of Panjab University. But like Dr. Subhash Sharma has said, keeping in view the sanctity of the House, an e-mail could be dropped to him seeking his consent. As Dr. Subhash Sharma has said, the credentials of Dr. Sahni are un-debatable. Whether to appoint him straightaway or by having his consent, that is the only decision that they have to take. His view is that if they send an e-mail to Dr. Sahni and take his consent, that is enough.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they approve the appointment as Honorary Professor subject to the receipt of his consent. If the consent is received, then there is no need to place the matter again before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to say that the Syndicate resolved to accept the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor to recommend to the Chancellor for appointing him as Honorary Professor as per Section of 18 of Panjab University Act subject to the condition that a communication be sent to Dr. Girish Sahni conveying him that the Syndicate on such and such date in unison decided to recommend to the Chancellor to appoint him as Honorary Professor and if he is so appointed, it would be expected from him to interact with their students and deliver some lectures. If he gives his consent, the University would move forward to send his case to Chancellor for formal approval.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Registrar could frame such a letter.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said, no doubt, the Registrar would frame it, but this condition has to be recorded here that his appointment is subject to this condition. They are only recommending authority. First they should receive his consent.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this case is now okay. But he would like to say one thing that they might receive such type of more cases in future.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has some observation that he would look into later, but they should speak about the second part of this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one thing which needs to be looked is that it is not a regulation, it is not rule, it is Section 18 of Panjab University Act to which no body has the right to interpret one way or the other, what to talk of flouting it. The Section 18 of Panjab University Act relates to Honorary Professors and it talks only of appointing distinguished teachers who have rendered eminent services to the cause of education. But in their University some non-teachers have been appointed in violation of the Act, let they not talk about that. So, at least this decision could be taken that they would follow the mandate of the Act and an enquiry needs to be done as to how by flouting the Act, the appointments have been done. Again they are responsible.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that they should bring a separate agenda item for this. A separate resolution should be brought.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he is also asking for a separate agenda.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested to form a Committee to look into the issue.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that such a thing should not be done in future.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they would take into account the observations of the members.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would take into account this thing and requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to tell as to how it is to be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they take the approval of the Chancellor first, but the concerned person refused to accept the assignment, then it would create a very odd situation. So, before sending it to the Chancellor, the consent of Dr. Girish Sahni should first be taken and as a routine, they should do it. Normally, it is very rare that a person does not give his/her consent. In this case the recommendation is also very good.

The Vice Chancellor said that he fully agrees with the views and feelings of the members. He respects this gentleman (Dr. Girish Sahni) as he is well connected and has served a lot to the system. It is the view of the members to recommend his name subject to his accepting the assignment. But he only wants that the case of Dr. Girish Sahni for conferment of the title of Honorary Professor on him should be put like that, this august House acknowledges his contribution to the nation. This august House desires that a line of consent from him may be sought. So, here they are not approving the appointment. First, they would get his consent and now they would only resolve this part.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said there is nothing wrong if the item is placed again before the Syndicate after the receipt of his consent.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should send it for approval to the Chancellor after the consent is received from Dr. Girish Sahni.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said, 'no' and clarified that after the consent from Dr. Sahni is received, the case would again be placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Dr. Girish should be honoured with the Honorary Professorship.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is also right as it has its other angle. He could take it in negative sense in spite of the fact that they have all regards for him. Notwithstanding the fact that they are having a different feeling.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they should not do it like this. Rather they should first approve it and say that they have approved and then request him to give his consent. Then it should be sent to the Chancellor for approval. This was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu was of the view that they should first take his consent and then approve it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should write to Dr. Girish Sahni that Syndicate has decided to recommend his name to the Chancellor, however, the Syndicate has desired that before his name is sent to the Chancellor, he (Dr. Sahni) is requested to please give his formal consent and they look forward towards him for delivering some lectures. However, the Vice Chancellor said that they should

not write regarding delivering lectures. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to say this, because it is written in the Act. Alternatively, they could reproduce Section 18 in the letter for his ready reference. This would include everything.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that when they confer Honorary Professorship on someone, they write in the letter that his appointment is governed by so and so regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could write that his formal consent is required to enable them to send their recommendation to the Chancellor. He requested that a very polite letter needs to be framed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the word 'required' may not be written and very polite language should be written. The Vice Chancellor further said that he would like to form a Committee on the second part, i.e., regarding formalization, on the four points. After considering the issue rigorously, there should be some parameter and there should not be pick and choose. The person to be selected for Honorary Professorship should develop their formal linkage, facilitate in getting funds, help in teaching and research which is otherwise his domain. So, the bio-data of such a person should be considered. Then, they would formalize it and after consultation with the concerned Chairperson/Dean of the Faculty, they would do all this.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Committee should also see about those persons who are non-teachers and appointed as Honorary Professors.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said those non-teachers who have already been appointed as Honorary Professor that they should not go into that issue. They should just think for the persons who are to be appointed in future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee to be constituted should also look into the issue of appointment of non-teachers as Honorary Professors.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the members agree, then he would form a Committee to which the members answered in the affirmative. The Vice Chancellor then requested Professor Navdeep Goyal (Chairperson), Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Ronki Ram and Dr. Ameer Sultana to look into the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra further requested that at least the Committee should identify the non-teachers who have been appointed as Honorary Professors to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee would see to it.

The Vice Chancellor while making it clear said that the Committee would not look into the cases of those who have already been appointed. Whatever has already been done that should not be touched.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should appoint a person after thoroughly looking into the case, but if they remove a person after his appointment, it would not look nice.

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

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if they would look into the previous appointments, it would open a Pandora box.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the appointments already made have been approved by the Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue of persons previously appointed as Honorary Professors has many aspects, though the view of the Vice Chancellor that they should not go into the previous appointments, is correct. But it is not the question of Honorary Professors who have been approved by the Chancellor, there are other Professors also who have no nomenclature in the Calendar and they are not approved by the Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they should also include this issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they might not do anything in previous appointments, but they should at least identify those persons.

**RESOLVED:** That the Syndicate in principle has agreed to confer the designation of Honorary Professor at Panjab University, on Dr. Girish Sahni, Director General, CSIR and Secretary, DSIR, New Delhi. It further recommends that Dr. Sahni be requested to give his consent to accept the Honorary Professorship in accordance with the Section 18 of Panjab University Act. After the receipt of the consent from him, the case be again placed before the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee consisting of the following be constituted to frame the guidelines for the conferment of designation of Honorary Professor:

- (i) Professor Navdeep Goyal  
(Chairperson)
- (ii) Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi
- (iii) Shri Ashok Goyal
- (iv) Professor Ronki Ram
- (v) Dr. Ameer Sultana
- (vi) Secretary to Vice-Chancellor  
(Convener)

**Recommendation  
dated 16.07.2018 of  
the Board of Finance**

**15.** Considered recommendation dated 16.07.2018  
**(Appendix-XXI)** of the Board of Finance.

Dr. Amit Joshi while initiating discussion on the recommendations dated 16.07.2018 of the Board of Finance wanted to know whether the departments submit the specifications for each item or they just mention the price only.

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that the departments do submit the specifications, but since it is a very big record, so only the price has been mentioned.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been done after proper scanning and requested the members that they should see this item thoroughly as this relates to finances. He requested the members to give some good suggestions on this issue and there should be no hurry in passing the item and they should see all the items one by one. This is a very important item and their observation should be in detail.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they have already seen these items thoroughly. The department-wise allocation of funds has been made which includes constituent colleges and departments as per their strength. Funds have been allocated as per their requirement. So, nothing is wrong in it.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to give their advice how they could make improvements.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in the University they do department-wise auditing and also prepare income and expenditure statement department-wise. He wanted to know the list of departments which are running in profit or in loss.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that two departments i.e. UILS and UIAMS are in profit.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Registrar to send a list of the departments running in profit or loss to all the Syndicate members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are some items, for example, he (Vice-Chancellor) had given Rs. 5 Crores to languages departments and USOL. That item was sent to Senate, whereas its competent authority is Syndicate which has already approved it. So, the implementation has got late. He asked as to when they would get the money.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra was requested (by the Finance & Development Officer) to send a proposal for this.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (F.D.O.) should send a letter to them for sending the proposal.

Referring to **Item No.10** of the Board of Finance relating to issue of Commemorative Postage Stamp on Professor Ram Chand Paul, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he has a question as to why they have decided to have hundreds of stamps. How did they reach on this figure?

It was clarified (by the Finance & Development Officer) that this is the minimum requirement of stamps which they have to purchase.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that actually they do not need stamps because they stamp the envelopes with brass stamp of Government of India.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they do not use this system, but they use stamps only.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if that is the case, then it is not the expenditure.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even if they stamp the envelopes with brass seal of the Government of India words, because it involves expenditure.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if it is so and if they use the stamps, then it is okay.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whichever articles are being purchased, all are for use. This was also endorsed by Professor Keshav Malhotra.

The members said that this item is okay and they should pass it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not do anything in hurry.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this not a very big amount to which the Vice Chancellor said whatever it may be, they should look into the financial matters thoroughly.

Shri Ashok Goyal while talking about the background said that it is good that now the money is being allocated. Some new and additional demands are also included in the revised estimates. When they think about how to generate the revenue, then their first target are students because they have no any other way out, as sometimes they increase the tuition fees in the departments or sometime the hostel fees. While they are sitting in the Syndicate or Senate and increase the fee, they talk about very big things. They make so many promises to the students that they would be provided so many facilities. But when the fees are increased, after the protests by the students, they forget all those promises like politicians. But when the protest is over then the University forgets the issues. That is what they have been doing in the case of Hostel funds also. In the meetings of the Syndicate they take pride in saying that they would make the campus and hostels wi-fi enabled and they collect the money from the students in the name of wi-fi facility. But they never check whether the facility is there or not in the hostels or department. If the facilities are not being provided, then they should try to improve it and become more responsible.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 16.07.2018 be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

At this stage, some general discussion took place and after that Item No. 16 (Ratification items), Item No.17 (Information items) of Syndicate dated 27.08.2018 and Item No.C-16 of Syndicate dated 10.06.2018 were taken up.

### **General Discussion**

Some general issues were also raised by the members while discussing different items, which have been included in the General Discussion.

1. Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as the issue of non-teaching staff is concerned, he is of the opinion that they should give the same attention to the non teaching staff also as they give attention to the teaching staff. In the non teaching category, more attention is required to be given to the class 1V employees because they are the least paid employees. They are asset to the institution. Even in the Class IV category, more attention is required to be given to the daily wages employees who are working on temporary basis and have very meagre means and who are not able to make both ends meets but they are serving the institution. They talk in crores but it is very painful when they do not pay salary to the daily wages staff continuously for 9 months. So he feels that he has no right to sit in the Syndicate if such a thing is happening here. Who are those employees who are not getting the salary, these are the people who are working in the hostels. Earlier the working system of the hostels was separate from the University but after the intervention of Government of India and also after the decision of the Syndicate and Senate, now all the employees of the Hostels have come under the pool of the University whether daily wagers or regular employees. But there are so many employees who are working under the old system and getting the salaries on DA/DP basis and when the DSW was their appointing authority then they were getting the full salaries regularly but now they are so many employees who are working in the same manner but they do not getting the salaries. The Vice-Chancellor might wonder that such type of a case has come to his knowledge after 8 months. He spoke to the DSW and he spoke to other officers also and he was completely taken aback by the reply. He is not blaming anybody individually, he is blaming himself also and this is the attitude of the University. He cited an example that if a person avails the facility of swimming pool and takes the services of lifeguard on their own and asks for the salary of the lifeguard, the University would not pay for it. He was given a reply that the authorities (DSW) who had appointed those persons would pay the salaries. So they should have the moral duty to ask such an employee that the University would not be able to pay the salary and he/she should stop working. The person is still being asked to work. This issue was brought to his notice after 8 months and now it has been 9 months, at that time only four persons were in his notice. When he further enquired then it was informed that there are so many employees who are not getting the salaries since last few months. After making so many requests he was able to get the salary released for three months, but 4 months' salary is still pending. He further said that if they are not able to pay the salaries to the employees then they should ask them to stop working. On the one hand, they are not

paying the salaries due to some administrative problems and the other hand they are still utilizing their services so that the work should not suffer. It does not behove them to talk about like this. He had raised the same issue in the last to last Syndicate meeting also. He further said that the same situation is prevailing in the constituent Colleges also. In these Colleges many Clerks and Peons have been appointed, but they are not paying salary since last 7 months and they are posted at far flung areas of Punjab in constituent Colleges. They are facing many problems and they are not able to meet both ends. He feels that it is not their responsibility to pay the salary in time. Such employees are getting a salary of Rs.7,000/- p.m. only. He felt ashamed that while sitting in air conditioned room, they are talking about big things. Those employees who are not getting the salaries think that the Syndicate discusses big issues and theirs. But today, those employees were thinking that their matters could also be resolved today. He requested the Vice Chancellor to enquire as to who is responsible for this type of exploitation as they are utilizing their services but they are not able to pay the salary of such employees. If they are collecting the wifi charges who are residing in the hostels so it is not their responsibility to provide the facility of wifi to the students. He says that those who are taking care of wifi even those employees are also not getting the salaries.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that two or three persons had already been appointed for taking care of wifi even before he took over as Dean of Student Welfare. Those employees were appointed by previous Dean of Students Welfare on his own level on part time basis and there were some funds allotted for the purpose from the hostel money and they were paid out of that. Those people were actually working full time in the University on contract basis and they used get between eight to nine thousand salary from their contractual appointment. An issue was also cropped up whether they could be appointed for part-time or not and the matter was deliberated upon, but finally it was emerged that since these people are working on a very meagre salary, so it would help them to some extent. What when the case was sent to the establish branch, an objection was put by the establishment branch that the rules do not permit to appoint a person to work at two places. He does agree that if they are working, they must be paid for that. As stated by Shri Ashok Goyal that if they are not to be paid, then they should not appoint them for that work. But somehow, that system is running like that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to supplement in it. Professor Navdeep Goyal has perhaps explained partially right, but he has also some information. There are four people working and out of these four, two are permanent employees who cannot be appointed for this work. They were appointed on part time basis to take care of hostels in the evening which was not permitted under their rules because they are covered

under the definition of employees. Now from rest of the two, one is daily wager and he is not regular employee of the University and other person is not at all employee of the University. He is engaged only for this purpose as part time in the hostel. These are the three categories. He had said that if the person whose unlawful appointments has been made, he was told that he would not get salary, but what about that person who has made wrong appointments. They could say to such appointees to stop coming as they cannot pay them for this job. As far as the work which they have done earlier, they would look into that issue. But they are working even today. If they are not eligible to work on part time basis, then how they are continuing? Now they should come to the other two persons who are on daily wages. He has suggested that the regular employees are easily making both ends meet, but they should at least pay the salary of other two persons. Why they are being compelled to die of starvation. It was said that their case is linked with the regular employees. But if the problem has created, were they not required to at least find a solution to that problem. They have to think whether they could be paid by giving honorarium or after calculating it on overtime basis etc. But they have to do something. But they cannot just sit on the files. He has enquired and told that the file is lying with such and such office. Shri Ashok Goyal said if his salary is not credited in his bank account till 5<sup>th</sup> working day of the month, he would become impatient, though he does not need that salary but he would want that his salary should be credited in his bank account on time. But, what they think about those people who are fully dependent on their salary to meet their expenses. So, he requested the Vice Chancellor that there is need to bring attitudinal change towards the staff starting from the lower category. He further requested the Vice Chancellor to ask from the Registrar as he wants to give some inputs. They also be enlightened as to where he has gone wrong in studying the cases. Secondly, whosoever, he spoke, he simply expected to tell him as to what has been done in this case. This expectation was not too much, but no information was given to him. Then he was spoken to by another member of the Syndicate as to what is going on in their University. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that he has come to know about it from him. If this is the situation even after pointing out by a member of the Syndicate or Senate, he is surprised, what would be the plight of those persons. Who would be to listening to them?

2. Professor Ronki Ram said that he would take up three-four sections of the employees. First, he would talk about the labour section. In the University Nursery, there is good number of employees. These people lift garbage from the roads. They used to pick up the garbage in trolleys during whole of the day. The salary being paid to them is not in any system of the University. They are not paid the salary with DA/DP, but they are not even paid a salary of Rs. 18000/-. They are paid a very less salary and these people have been working since the last 15-20

years. He has been advocating their case continuously to enhance their salary. Though the Registrar has helped him in this task, but it is said that these employees are working under different scheme. He has also talked to the Finance & Development Officer about it. When he saw their plight he feels hurt and tears come to his eyes. They work in summer, winter and in humid conditions. They are not even given leave. Even on the Independence Day they used to pick the garbage. They are the best workers of the University.

3. Professor Ronki Ram said that that the staff which comes under the second category is the staff which undertake the work of white-washing and paint. There was a time when these persons used to get pant-shirt and a pair of shoes, because their clothes used to get spoiled in white-washing work. These people come to him time and again to request him to get pant-shirt and pair of shoes sanctioned for them.
4. Professor Ronki Ram said that that the other category is their security staff. The security staff people have been working for the last many years and they work day and night. They are not given any rest. They get rest with great difficulty even on Sundays because the number of security staff is very less and they are put on continuous duty for days together. Earlier they were given uniform, but now they have started to appoint them on daily wages. Now they are not given any uniform and shoes etc. Sometime they have to face the misbehaviour of the people. So, they are very much disappointed, the number of security persons is very less and they cannot outsource the security service as the security persons do not get sufficient salary.
5. Professor Ronki Ram said that that the other category of employees is daily wagers who are working since many years. He requested that these employees should be given salary with DA/DP. The case is lying with the Registrar/F.D.O. Out of all these category, the labour class who are paid out of some schemes, may be paid out of the University budget on the pattern of daily wager.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that as stated by Shri Ashok Goyal has raised a very particular point that the some daily wager employees are not getting salary.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested to make a Committee to sort out the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should be paid salary, what the Committee has to do and he requested that the issue should be discussed here.

6. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would also like to give some input as regards the issue concerning hostel. A Committee was formed and he has been the Chairperson of the Committee. It is about a year ago

when it was said that they have to change to the new system. Initially, it was decided that their three months salary has to be paid as it was being paid earlier. After that their documents were sent to the establishment branch and they were time and again requested to send a person. One year has passed and he has been holding the meeting after every two months and extend their salary.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor who are in the Estt. Branch, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the non-teaching section.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that those persons could not complete their documents.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that those persons are not being paid salary.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is what he is saying. The reason is that the establishment branch says that they have completed the documents, but since the papers are not found to be complete, he has to extend it.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, has this Committee got the salary released of four persons mentioned by him?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this case has come recently.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that those four persons have not been paid salary since December.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that what Shri Ashok Goyal has talked about, it is very serious. Shri Ashok Goyal might have the knowledge about it, but it has come to the notice of the Syndicate today to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that he also came to know of it only sometime back.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Syndicate members took it very seriously and requested the Vice Chancellor that their salary must be released tomorrow or day after tomorrow by all means.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has got the point and requested Shri Ashok Goyal to update about the issue and then he would look into it.

7. Dr. Ameer Sultana pointed out that in the MTS service, the persons who were hired, they are also not paid salary for 3-4 months since the time they were hired.
8. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Vice Chancellor) has joined as a new Vice Chancellor. He is open minded and kind hearted. He said their Class-IV employees, Malis, labour class, cleaners etc. get a salary of Rs. 7000/- only per month. He said that the persons have completed 7 years of service have been given a lollipop that their services would be regularised. So, he requested that till the time they are not regularised, they

should be given salary with DA/DP. The God has given him (Vice Chancellor) a very prestigious position. Such a position is given by God only if one does some philanthropist activities.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is very happy that a teacher is talking about the welfare of the non-teacher.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Vice Chancellor) might take some time in granting something to the teachers, but these persons should be paid immediately. Sometimes, he thinks that he has to do a lot of expenditure, but how these people used to make both ends meet.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to explain about the issues raised by the members about non-payment of salary.

9. While thanking the Vice Chancellor, it was clarified (by the Registrar) that first he would touch the issue of the four persons (appointed in the hostels). Shri Ashok Goyal had spoken to him about all these four persons. He apprised him (Shri Ashok Goyal) about the status. Along with them there were large number of Attendants, Helpers and there are so many other people, who are given salary from the hostel fund. The MHRD had given the diktat that they have to merge the hostels fund account with the University Account and they have to pay the salary of everybody as per the University rules. So, he requested the Dean Student Welfare to give him a list of all such persons duly verified by him who have been employed by them. By that time, he requested him (DSW) to form a Committee and verify that these people have been employed by some means i.e. walk-in-interview, what was the system, how they have appointed, with whose authority, whether some permission has been taken, please give him these things, so that they can regularise them and start paying salary from the central head, because the fund has now been merged. They need to pay from the University budget. So, he requested to give him the information. Despite his regular interactions with them, he was not getting these inputs from the DSW Office. So he spoke to Professor Navdeep Goyal and he also agreed with it that these documents must be followed in correct manner. After long interaction he could get it and these four gentlemen have been allowed. It is only about a week or ten days back that Professor Nahar has given him the confirmation that these people have been employed and the authority for employment was vested with the Dean Students Welfare only. So, the Dean Students Welfare has appointed them and they have accepted it and accorded/allowed the extension and most probably their salary would have been released by now. It is about a week or ten days back situation. Secondly, as regards their employment, there is a requirement of some procedure. That procedure has to be vetted by a Committee by D.S.W. and Wardens. So, they have completed everything and they never stopped it. That

statement is incorrect to some extent that they were stopped. It may have been delayed by a month or so in between. They were extending it for every three months time and again and they were of the view their salary should not be stopped. But they were not still getting reports from the Dean Students Welfare that these people have been employed by them under such and such provision. They were not getting it. But *fate accompli* they are working, they need to do it. So, they have been allowed the payment for every three months. As far as the question, which he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has referred about the Constituent Colleges is concerned, it is stated that the enrolments made there have come through a Committee which had appointed them. There were certain observations. It was done hurriedly and certain audit objections were also there by which it got a little delayed. But, there was, however, no intent to stop anybody's salary. The moment Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and others gave him a call and informed that the salary had not been released, it was immediately processed and they have been given salary. So, there was no such intent at any time and he assured that first the salary is to be given from the lower most, then it should come on the top.

10. As regards the MTS workers as referred to by Dr. Ameer Sultana, the Registrar said that MTS workers are paid salary by the Contractor and they (University) have not hired them directly. They are not being paid directly from the University. They are giving the payment as is being claimed by the Contractor. He has, however, given a notice to the Contractor that complaints have come to him (Registrar) from the employees who are working as MTS workers and have not been paid salary.

Dr. Ameer Sultana intervened to say that there is not even a single earner in the family of those MTS workers to which the Registrar said that he agreed to it and he has taken note of it.

11. Shri Ashok Goyal said that he can say with guarantee that the salary of these four persons (appointed in hostels) has not been released even today at quarter to nine. To say that it has been allowed ten days back and it must have been released, he does not agree with it. Secondly, he expects that the Syndicate meeting is taking place today, he is not sure whether the employees of Establishment Branch are there or not, let the file be called and see whether it has been allowed or not. Let them see that. As far as the issue of payment of salary by extending it for every three months is concerned, why this procedure was not adopted in the case of these four people, why these people have not been paid salary for nine months. Coming back to his (Registrar) concern, he does not want to name any official to whom he talked on telephone, it is Registrar who told that he had telephoned him. He told him that he wants to know as to what has been done. The only response he got for that is that the D.S.W. has been told and that they have asked for some information and when the information would be received,

he (Registrar) would do it. He does not want to tell that many days have passed when he talked to the Registrar, but he could say with conviction that it has not been done even today. Just to say that it has been allowed ten days before, it does not mean that it has been done. He further said that to say that they do not want to touch the salary of Constituent Colleges, but he would touch that issue as to how the appointments have been made. He would also tell about those people who have not been given even a single penny till today. It is his nature that as and when he talks, he thinks, whatever he has said that should not be a lie. There may be hundreds of issues in his mind, but he talks only about those which are true and it always remains in his mind that whatever he is saying that may not proved to be a lie. He had been usually telling this, before talking in the Syndicate and Senate, it is his habit to talk to the concerned person first, to which the Vice Chancellor said 'right', so that it might not become mockery. He talks in the Syndicate or Senate only when an issue gets out of control. He requested the Vice Chancellor to get their salary released. He has to say it with a very heavy heart that if the pending salary of two persons amounting to Rs. 1,26,000/- is not paid, then he is going to pay them from his own pocket on 1<sup>st</sup> of September.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is necessary and the salary should be paid.

The Vice Chancellor said there is no question of necessity, the salary should be definitely paid to them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they all would be paid. This was also endorsed by Professor Keshav Malhotra also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the salary to these persons would be paid tomorrow and he requested the members to do the work which has been entrusted to them. The Vice Chancellor further said that 3-4 issues are very urgent to which some members said there is no urgency.

The relevant file was brought from the office and it was shown to Shri Ashok Goyal wherein the Registrar had allowed the release of salary one week ago

12. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that to discuss some issues, Committees are constituted. He requested that the resolve part should be done and got approved from the Vice Chancellor at the earliest, so that these resolved parts should be sent to the concerned persons and action could be started immediately. This is very urgent to which the Vice Chancellor said, 'right'.
13. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that ratification items are left and he requested the Vice Chancellor to take up the ratification items also so that it would become a record that whatever items were there in the current

agenda of first meeting of the Vice Chancellor, those all have been taken up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are certain items which need to be discussed only today on emergent basis and they cannot postpone these items.

14. The Vice Chancellor said that there are four items which need to be discussed. One relates to the vigilance reports. The second issue relates to security where 2-3 alternatives could be explored and he requested the members to see to it to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would not decide about it today, but they could see to it. The Vice Chancellor said that they need security to address issues immediately. Though the MHRD has put a ban for making appointments, but he would get it cleared phase-wise from them and he is not worried about that. As pointed out by Professor Ronki Ram that the security persons have to perform duty continuously for many hours without any break. Moreover, the outsourced staff does not listen to the University authorities because they are working under the service provider. Since the outsourcing would take a lot of time and the students election are going to be held shortly, he requested the members to suggest some immediate measures to tackle the security issue as to how the security persons could be hired for some days through outsourcing as there seems to be no alternative. He thinks that with the present security strength, they would not be able to control the situation. He informed that when he went for morning walk towards Hostel Number 3, he found the security persons sleeping to which Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is but natural that they would sleep because of continuous working hours. The Vice Chancellor enquired from Shri Ashok Goyal as to whether he has any power to outsource security persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not possible to outsource the security persons for a month and it is also not possible to take a decision on this issue because there are so many things which need to be looked into. From their experience it has been observed that the outsourced security persons do not even listen to the University authorities, then it would not make any difference even if they are appointed. However, he said that the immediate alternative is only hiring the security through outsourcing.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the election do take place every year.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what could be done and further said that outsourcing seems to him the only immediate alternative at the moment.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to what is the position of the security today if they compare it with the last year, whether the strength has increased or decreased.

The Vice Chancellor informed that 98 persons have reduced as compared to last year.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Registrar as to how 98 persons have reduced from the last year.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that now outsourcing has been stopped from the PESCO since 1<sup>st</sup> August, 2017.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to how they outsource the security persons. Is it done through tendering?

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the tender has been floated and that item has been placed as item 3 of Syndicate agenda of 10.6.2018.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked to whom this tender has been allotted.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the tender was allotted to Isha Security, Bhopal.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked, do they have the license?

It was informed (by the Registrar) that they have the license and the rates quoted by them are the lowest. The Registrar further informed that the Board of Finance has said that the University can do outsourcing, but before that, They should also see the financial repercussions that whether outsourcing is better or direct recruitment is better. When they took that data, they found that outsourcing is costlier by 24 to 25 lacs.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that they should write a letter to the SSP to provide security.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that for filling up the posts, they have to take permission which will take at least 6-7 months. By the time they would take permission, advertise the posts etc. it would take 5-6 months. If in this period, they could do that it would save Rs. 12 lacs.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there was a time when only one Chowkidar had been there at one gate and the security had been better. Now five persons are deployed on one gate, but they remain busy in gossiping.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the rider is for appointing permanent security persons, but they could employ security on contract basis.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that the ban is on contract appointments also.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the issue of security which they are discussing is for a long term solution of the problem. But the question which the Vice Chancellor has raised is in view of the students' elections which are scheduled to be held after a week. He requested the members to give a solution to this problem.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that nothing would happen and the elections would be held peacefully. This was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor said that election would not be any problem, he would get it done.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they would do it later on after having a thorough discussion on it as it is a very ticklish issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have to float tender for this.

15. After the completion of the discussion on Item C-16 of the agenda of Syndicate dated 10.06.2018, Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired the inspection of the DAV College, Chandigarh for grant of MBA course has been done or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has not been done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that an enquiry should be conducted on this issue.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is very strange. If the DAV College is making the admissions like this, then other Colleges would also follow the suit and the University would have no control over the Colleges. The Affiliation Committee has 9 members of the Syndicate and the meeting of the Affiliation Committee has not been held and the College has not been granted the affiliation. He has also come to know from some sources that the report in respect of the College is also negative whereas the College has already admitted the students. The College has inserted very big advertisements in the newspapers. He requested to stop these things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a letter from the Dean College Development Council should be issued to the College as to how in the absence of any affiliation the College has given the advertisement.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that a letter be issued to the College to withdraw the advertisement.

Shri Ashok Goyal also endorsed it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should send a letter to all the colleges who do not fulfil the conditions.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that now the same thing has happened which he was saying. Now the ambiguity has come.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it is the case that the letter should be sent to all the colleges, then he withdrew his consent for granting affiliation to the Government College. This is not the way. They are not sitting here just to grant affiliation to all the colleges.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that then there would not be any control of the University on the colleges.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this is what he was submitting. Now there are two decisions in one minute.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a specific communication had been sent to that college that they would not make any admission till they are granted affiliation. In spite of that, to his understanding, they have already admitted students, affiliation is yet to be granted and an advertisement has come in the newspapers that there are still some vacant seats and the students can come upto such and such date to seek admission. The University is sitting over it.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that in the issue of DAV College, last year they have committed the same mistake and they are committing the same mistake this year also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate has specially decided that the admission would be made through CAT examination. It was also written in their letter of affiliation. But in spite of that they made admission on merit and they wrote that since the seats were vacant with them, they made the admission on merit. They did not bother anything about what the University says.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have lowered the level of their MBA.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if they are to be allowed admissions without affiliation, then the affiliation committee should be disaffiliated, because, then there would not be any need of that Committee. Why the members should waste lot of time on this.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said what has been talked to him is that the Inspection Committee would visit the college and the Inspection Committee would send a report to the Affiliation Committee. Then the Affiliation Committee would say to the college that they would give them such and such time to complete their deficiencies and they would be approving their admissions till then. They have taken different decisions for different cases on different basis. It depends on the position of the college,

whether the college is a habitual defaulter or not. Every case needs to be dealt with differently. This is not a permanent parameter that if one college is given time, then they would deal with all the college in the same. Affiliation Committee deals with every case separately. If they have received the cases of 80 colleges, then after taking into account their old record, what is their present record, how many deficiencies are there, all the cases were given different times. It is not necessary that if some rule is applicable on this college, the same would be made applicable on the DAV College also. The case of DAV College is separate and the Affiliation Committee has given a different decision on it and that decision should be followed strictly. In this case, the Affiliation Committee would take a different decision and they would be given time and it would be asked to them to file the return within the fixed time. The decisions of the Affiliation Committee are different from case to case. The Affiliation Committee has the mandate of the Syndicate as it has been made by the Syndicate. So, whatever is decided by the Affiliation Committee, it is the responsibility of the college to strictly follow it. The Colleges cannot question the decision of the Affiliation Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in this way whatever decision is taken, that is the decision of the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the decisions of the Affiliation Committee vary from case to case and per merit. The decision is different for each college.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not given them approval for making admissions, rather they refused them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said if this is the matter then he would like to submit it. He never wanted to speak, but now let him put on record everything. Many colleges have been granted affiliation on phone calls. The Dean College Development Council is sitting here. He does not know what was the reason, where was the Affiliation Committee, was it sleeping. Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri Ashok Goyal were the members of that Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he (Dr. Subhash Sharma) was also a member.

Dr. Amit Joshi said *“koi jage na jage uska muqader, hamara kaam hai awaz lagate rahna”*. So he could just raise the voice, decision has to be taken by the members. He said that all the colleges which were there, they were given affiliation on telephone by pick and choose.

The Vice Chancellor asked to which college the affiliation was given.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked the Dean College Development Council about this to which he (DCDC) nodded that he does not know.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked Dr. Subhash Sharma, does he not know about it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked if it is that case where it was said that the affiliation was taken a day before.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it happened two times and this was also endorsed by Principal Surinder Singh Sangha.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that perhaps it was given by Shri Satish Kumar Sharma.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it may have been given by anyone, Shri Prabhjit Singh has raised a question and said that the Affiliation Committee should be disaffiliated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now he (Dr. Amit Joshi) is trying to attack on the Committee as a whole, whether the Committee was sleeping.

Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened to say that this is not the way.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is not attacking on the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said then what else it is. Shri Prabhjit Singh is not a member of that Committee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, that is why he did not become a member because he knew that he cannot dilute the norms. That is why he is not the member and he also does not want to become a member.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Dean College Development Council is sitting here, they can ask if he (Dr. Amit Joshi) has made any recommendation for affiliation in respect of any college. For this thing, he can vouch for Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma. Four members of the Committee i.e. Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha and he himself are sitting here. He asked if anybody could say that any of them have asked for granting affiliation to a college.

At this moment Principal Anita Kaushal said that they are also sitting here to which Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is narrating the names of everyone.

Continuing Dr. Amit Joshi asked, when no one vouched for it, then how the College was given affiliation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said Dr. Amit Joshi is aware about the whole issue. One of their Fellows has given assurance to the Chairman of the Committee that for

some particular time, there was an emergency and requested to grant affiliation owing to that emergency. That Fellow said something to the Chairman of the Committee and to Shri Satish Sharma and they did it in good faith/trust. They used to do things on trust. They might have requested to do it because there had been time limit and the meeting would be held late. In good will, they granted their approval after having an affidavit from them. He requested not to generalize it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is one part of the issue. In first meeting it happened. The meeting was to be held at 10.30 the next day, but the approval was given on the previous day at 5.30 p.m. At this point of time on being asked by Dr. Subhash Sharma, Dr. Amit Joshi told that the affiliation was given to G.M.T. College, Ludhiana. They submitted everything afterwards, whatever was the procedure. Continuing, Dr. Amit Joshi said that when the issue was raised next day, Principal Anita Kaushal was also there, then an assurance was given to them that it was done because of an emergency. It was said that there was some portal issue, leave it, whatever be the issue, he does not want to go into its details. That was past. But there was an assurance that it would not be repeated. But after that another meeting of the Affiliation Committee was held. In the first meeting, an assurance was given that such a thing would not happen again. Earlier the affiliation was given to one college, but in the next meeting affiliation was granted to four colleges. Before the meeting, Shri Ashok Goyal is sitting before him, DAV College was included. He is not for the DAV College. A decision was taken that they will not admit students. Was that decision honoured? It is okay that for first time a Fellow has requested for granting affiliation. There are two things. They are talking from transparency.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is also saying the same thing that the DAV College has done wrong and they should adhere to the decision.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in first instance one college was granted affiliation, but after that the number increased from one to four.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to when four colleges were granted affiliation.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said it was done in the next meeting.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said last time they did not grant approval to any such case. He informed that they did approve 85 cases and in some cases they gave time to submit the documents upto 31<sup>st</sup>.

The Vice Chancellor said that really it is very unfortunate. If the things go like this, then how the system would run.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it did happen like this. From the last five years, every time the colleges do not fulfil the deficiencies, but even then they get affiliation.

The Vice Chancellor said that then how it could be improved.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he would tell how it would improve. If it is not stopped now, then a letter could be sent to the Chancellor, it would appear in the news papers, the reputation of the institution would be maligned, then they would form a Committee to look into as to how it should be done. Such things happen when they close their eyes. Then someone would make a complaint, someone would file an RTI to ask when the college was granted affiliation, when the faculty was appointed, would ask for the report of the Inspection Committee, then all such things would happen. This is the problem.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that those who have been granted affiliation, they would admit the students and those students would go to the Court.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there are some colleges which do not apply for affiliation.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they send Inspection Committees consisting of even twenty members and grant them permanent affiliation. Now after five years, can they disaffiliate those colleges now on the ground that they do not fulfil the conditions. The rule is to give permanent affiliation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that since they are not penalizing, the Colleges, the Colleges are habitual defaulters since six years as they do not complete the deficiencies.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is very unfortunate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now Dr. Amit Joshi is feeling pained. When the Affiliation Committee was constituted in the Syndicate, on that day he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had told him (Dr. Amit Joshi) that he would see what happens in the Affiliation Committee. He had objected to it by saying that whatever would happen, they would see to it. But now he is saying, see, what is happening in the Affiliation Committee. He further said that the Chairman of the Committee okayed it on telephone. For the second time, though he does not remember the name of the college, to his knowledge, the Chairman of the Committee after talking to all the members on phone including himself, he was under the impression that he (Chairman of the Committee) had consulted all the members of the Committee. Shri Ashok Goyal said that when he came to attend the meeting the next day, Principal Sangha and Dr. Amit Joshi met him and they told that this has been done. They were very

disturbed, they had already walked out of the meeting. He tried to prevail upon them and asked that they should go in the meeting and talk there. It is wrong if they have not talked to all the members, it is wrong. But anyway, they were very disturbed and not preferred to come to the meeting. Then he came to this room (Syndicate Room) where the meeting was going on and he asked as to why they have consulted all the members. He asked those two persons are disappointed, why they have allowed those persons to leave the meeting. Why they have walked out and asked to call them. The members said that Principal Sangha and Dr. Amit Joshi had told them that they would be coming back. This was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he connected to them from his own phone and the members talked to them and requested that they should come and then talk. The two persons perhaps were of the opinion that it would not serve any purpose because they have committed the same thing two times. Principal Sangha and Dr. Amit Joshi said on phone that their dissent be got recorded, probably, they have also sent an email to this effect. Now Dr. Amit Joshi is feeling hurt because it was his first occasion to face such a situation, but he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has become used to it. They have been seeing this from many years that they say something else and do something else. Something else should happen but something else is happening. Now one thing more has emerged. There is no such thing like Affiliation Committee. It is the prerogative of the Syndicate and in the Syndicate, the members used to say that such and such cases be taken care of by such and such members. In this way a Committee was formed. For the second time he also became a member of that Committee. But he was not allowed to work even for four months. The cases for affiliation used to come in the month of May/June, but the Affiliation Committee was formed in the month of January to consider the earlier affiliation cases only. In the third year, a note was put up to the Vice Chancellor to consider constitution of the Affiliation Committee as if it is a mandatory Standing Committee which is to be made every year. That is how the Affiliation Committee came into existence and he told as to what is to be done there, they would come to know of it. It was opined that how it would be done. But now when it has happened, it is sure that they would be hurt. As stated by Dr. Subhash Sharma that some Fellow had assured, as it has now been assured by the D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab. The decision they took today, they did not do it because of Punjab Government, but this has been done because of the D.P.I. who is honourable member of the Syndicate and Senate. Probably, in this case he can say that the Chairman did this on saying by a member of the Syndicate and Senate, but they were under the bona fide belief that he has taken all the members of the Committee in confidence and he was the one who has said that it is not fair if they have not taken Principal Sangha and Dr. Amit Joshi into confidence and for that matter any member into confidence because they single handedly and arbitrarily

cannot take decision at the back of all the members of the Committee.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that after that they had resolved that there could not be any decision without a meeting, whatever may be the urgency.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there is no use of talking here because they are the members of the Committee. Sometime, there is one person and sometime there is another person. But they want and if they follow the rules honestly it could be done properly. If a person is going as a member of the Affiliation Committee, then it is questioned why he is going, if he is not going, then it is said why he is not going. Maximum wrong and politics is done in the Affiliation Committee. The members go to the Colleges because they have to meet the members there because the members have their votes in the colleges. All these things are there. They have to contest the elections. But if they could understand that it is their duty, there could not be any problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would vouch. For the last many years, at least four or five years, he could say that only the honest people had gone in the colleges as members of the Selection Committees and Inspection Committees. The fraud people have been kept away from these Committees. Such allegations have not been levelled on any person. No such person has been sent on these Committees who commit wrong doings.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they could see the situation of the last 40-50 years when the people sat on dharnas. Charges were levelled against the Dean College Development Council etc. Files were misplaced.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they take strong exception to the allegations levelled by honourable member Professor Ronki Ram.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he has not made allegations against anyone.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that slogans against him were raised because he had said that the teachers should be given full salary.

Since there emerged some commotion, the Vice Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Ronki Ram to cool down.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said why he (Professor Ronki Ram) is exceeding his limits.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said slogans were raised because he had said that regular Principals should be appointed and teachers should be given full salary.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should not see the record of five years only, but they should see the record of twenty years. Only then it would be clear.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let they should not go into the past, but if it is desirable, then he can give him (Vice Chancellor) a capsule not only of 20 years, he can give him a capsule of 30 years.

The Vice Chancellor requested to forget all those things, he does not like it.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has stated with proud that during the last five years, no fraud person has gone for the Inspection and Selection Committees. If Professor Ronki Ram has gone, then he is praising him.

The Vice Chancellor said, he would like to tell him (Shri Ashok Goyal) on behalf of the House that such personal comments should not be made and requested him to stop it. He said that he reposes trust in this House. Whatever has happened intentionally or unintentionally, they should forget it. If they talk targeting someone personally, it pains him. They should address the Chair, why they are talking amongst themselves.

Professor Ronki Ram said that some honourable members who had now gone, they have also said that they should forget the past.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they would go to the past, there would be some commotion. He does not know why they are going in the past.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice Chancellor if anybody has talked about the past except Professor Ronki Ram. He is himself talking about the past. Professor Ronki Ram has himself said that the members who go on Inspection and Selection Committees they do such things. Rather, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has said that no such person has ever gone for Inspections and Selections during the last five years. Professor Ronki Ram has himself talked about the past and then saying why they are talking about the past.

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested to leave this and said that he has just pointed out that the advertisement which is coming tomorrow, they should write a letter.

At this juncture there was cross talking amongst the members and a din prevailed. The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra and other members to address to him (Chair) only. He would not allow this. The Vice Chancellor said that all the members are well

educated persons. What kind of image of the Syndicate will be sent to the society. The Chair is always ready to listen each and everything and at every moment he is giving them honour and respect. Here, once again he underlined that whatever decision would be taken, that would be taken with consensus. He has come here with a very big dream. In case, they indulge into such things, it would be very difficult. On the one hand, he is thinking about the status of Heritage University and dreaming of getting 200 Crores or 150 crores, if they do such things, there would be a great problem.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are with him (Vice Chancellor).

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that these are very small issues and there is nothing serious in it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice Chancellor to take up the remaining agenda items and said that they would finish the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice Chancellor if there is any important item which needs to be considered.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested to take up Item No. C-14 (agenda item Syndicate meeting 7.7.2018).

16. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he has to make one point more. He said that he (Vice Chancellor) has made a Committee and requested that the point which he would like to make may also be entrusted to the same committee. This is a problem in many colleges. He said last year a Committee was formed and it has decided that a student who has compartment in 10+2 examination be given admission in B.Sc. Agriculture.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever has been decided earlier he would not go into that as this decision was taken by an earlier Committee.

17. The Vice Chancellor requested the members to look at Item No. C-12 of Syndicate meeting agenda dated 10.6.2018. This item is very urgent and it has been taken into cognizance.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, who has taken it into cognizance?

The Vice Chancellor said that the formality in this is complete.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that this issue needs a lot of discussion which was also endorsed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Prabhjit Singh and some other members said that it would need a lot of time to discuss.

The Vice Chancellor said that the required action has been completed on this issue. The Committee which was formed to discuss the issue, has submitted its report. So, they need to do something on this issue urgently.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked, where is the report?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should take up this issue in the next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to do it at the earliest.

### **Routine and formal matters**

**16.** The information contained in Items **R-(i) to R-(xxxii)** on the agenda was read out viz. –

**(i)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of Academic Council (item no. XVIII dated 26.6.2018) (**Appendix-XXII**) and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has allowed to introduce the following two courses in the Govt. College of Education, Sector-20-D, Chandigarh w.e.f. Academic session 2018-2019 along with the modalities, no. of seats etc:

- (i) Post Graduate Diploma in Life Skills and Education for Human Excellence- (PGD-LSEHE) (one Year Regular Course) (Credit Based Semester System) (I to II Semester)
- (ii) Post Graduate Diploma in Educational Technology (PGDET) (One Year Regular Course) (Credit Based Semester System) (I to II Semester).

**(ii)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed following Three Demonstrators, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary/contract basis (whose present term of appointment for the academic session 2017-2018 expired on 30.06.2018) w.e.f. 03.07.2018 to 30.06.2019 for the academic session 2018-19, after one day break on 02.07.2018 (01.07.2018 being Sunday) or till a regular selection is made, whichever is earlier at the minimum of the scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions. The persons possessing Medical/Dental qualifications i.e. M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practising Allowances (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic Pay + NPA shall not exceed Rs.85000/- p.m. in the terms of Senate decision dated 29.09.2013 (Para LX) Item No. 20 (III):

1. Dr. Harkirat Sethi, Department of Pharmacology
2. Dr. Anupam Vijayvergia, Department of Physiology
3. Dr. Ravi Kant Sharma, Department of Biochemistry

- NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 10/24.09.2017 (Para XXIX) (Item C-19) (**Appendix-XXIII**) had re-appointed the above demonstrators purely temporary basis be re-appointed further w.e.f. 03.07.2017 to 30.06.2018 after one day break on 01.07.2017 & 02.07.2017 being Sunday or till a regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions. The persons possessing Medical/ Dental qualifications i.e. M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practising Allowances (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic Pay + NPA shall not exceed Rs.85000/- p.m. in terms of Senate decision dated 29.09.2013 (Para LX) Item No. 20.
2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-16 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.
3. The appointment of above persons has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, which is reproduced below:
- ‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations of the Committee dated 16.07.2018 and 30.07.2018 (**Appendix-XXIV**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has permitted the students from Law Courses provisionally (**As per annexures ‘A’ & ‘B’**) to attend the classes/transfer from one institution to the other within Panjab University System of Institutions.

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the minutes of the committee dated 17.07.2018 (**Appendix-XXV**) with regard to the amendment in sub-clause 9.5 of clause 9 of amendment in Ph.D. guidelines, 2017 (**Appendix-XXV**) for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree (which are in conformity with U.G.C. Minimum Standards and Procedure for the award of Ph.D. degree) Regulation 2016.

**NOTE:** A letter No. ST 8957-9156 dated 24.7.2018 (**Appendix-XXV**) has already been issued to the Department in this regard.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the proposal dated 19.07.2018 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry, Associate Director, Research Promotion Cell and Professor Parveen Rishi, Department of Microbiology that the BMS Blocks I and II South Campus P.U., Chandigarh be named as “Venki Ramakrishnan Block and “Hargobind Khorana Block” respectively.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed Dr. Zareen Fatima as Assistant Professor, Department of Urdu, P.U. on contract basis at fixed emoluments of Rs.30400/- p.m. w.e.f. the date she starts/started work, for the session 2018-19 i.e. upto 31.05.2019, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which she worked previously for the last session.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-2 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Ms. Twinkle Bedi, Assistant Professor in Computer Engineering, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, purely on temporary basis (with one day break) upto 30.06.2018, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier for the session 2017-18; and
- (ii) re-appointed (afresh) Ms. Twinkle Bedi as Assistant Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, purely on temporary basis, w.e.f. 09.07.2018, for the academic session 2018-19, or till the posts

are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-4 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor has:

(i) extended the term of appointment of following persons as Assistant Professor (temporary) for the session 2017-18 at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U. upto 30.06.2018, with one day break on 01.05.2018, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of person</b>	<b>Branch</b>
1.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Mathematics
2.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Management
3.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Management
4.	Ms. Geetu	Physics
5.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE
6.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE
7.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE
8.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT
9.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT
10.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Chemistry
11.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE
12.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Biotech.
13.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Mathematics
14.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Biotech.

15.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Biotech
16.	Dr. Jyoti Sood	Physics
17.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
18.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
19.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
20.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
21.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
22.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
23.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
24.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Biotech
25.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro Electronics
26.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
27.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
28.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
29.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Applied Physics
30.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Applied Mathematics

- (ii) further re-appointed the above persons (Sr. No.1 to 29), as Assistant Professor (temporary) at UIET, P.U., for next academic session 2018-19 w.e.f. the date they start work, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which they have worked during the session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

'Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.'

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-15 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.
3. The person at Sr. No. 30 at (i) Shri Munish Kansal has left the job w.e.f. 30.06.2018 (A.N.).

**(ix)** The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, purely on temporary basis, upto 30.06.2018 with one day break on 01.05.2018, under Regulation

5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and

- (ii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor (temporary), Department of Biochemistry w.e.f. the date he start/started work, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible as per University rules, against the vacant post or till the post is filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, for the academic session 2018-19, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-6 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Harsimran Kaur Boparai as Assistant Professor in Anaesthesia, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 02.06.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 01.05.2019 with one day break on 01.06.2018 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and condition on which she was working earlier.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as

consideration Item C-7 but no business was  
took place on 07.07.2018.

- (xi)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Richa Rastogi Thakur as Assistant Professor (temporary) in Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, w.e.f. the date she starts/started work, purely on temporary basis, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, for the academic session 2018-2019, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, on the same term & conditions according to which she has worked during the session 2017-2018.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-47 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

**(xii)** The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor, Centre for Stem Cell and Tissue Engineering, purely on temporary basis upto 30.06.2018 for the academic session 2017-2018, with one day break on 01.05.2018 on the same terms and conditions.
- (ii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor (temporary) in Centre for Stem Cell and Tissue Engineering w.e.f. the date he start/started work in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, for the academic session 2018-2019, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he

deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.'

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-5 but no business was taken place on 07.07.2018.

**(xiii)** The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Mr. Varun Maini, as Assistant Professor in the subject of Computer Science (purely on temporary basis) at Shaheed Udam Singh P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur w.e.f. the date he will start work for the academic session 2018-2019, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007.

**NOTE:** Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

'Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.'

**(xiv)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. Constituted College, Sikhwala, Distt. Sri. Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. the date they start/started work for the academic session 2018-2019 i.e. upto the start of summer vacations of 2019, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2017-2018:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Subject</b>
1.	Ms. Navdeep Kaur	Assistant Professor in English
2.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
3.	Ms. Mamta Rani	Assistant Professor in Commerce
4.	Dr. Sumit Mohan	Assistant Professor in Hindi
5.	Dr. Ram Singh	Assistant Professor in Commerce
6.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Assistant Professor in Economics
7.	Dr. Rajesh Chander	Assistant Professor in History
8.	Dr.(Ms.) Lakhveer Kaur	Assistant Professor in Physical Education

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-49 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

**(xv)** The Vice-Chancellor has:

(i) re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Assistant Professors at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary w.e.f. 17.7.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 16.6.2019 with one day break on 16.7.2018 (break Day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

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

(ii) re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Sr. Assistant Professors at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 17.8.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 16.7.2019 with break on 15.8.2018 (Holiday) and 16.8.2018 (Break day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007 on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1.	Dr. Prabhleen Brar	Sr. Assistant Professor
2.	Dr. Rosy Arora	Sr. Assistant Professor
3.	Dr. Vivek Kapoor	Sr. Assistant Professor

4.	Dr. Ruchi Singla	Sr. Assistant Professor
----	------------------	-------------------------

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-11 but no business was taken place on 07.07.2018.

**(xvi)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following persons as Assistant Professor at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, purely on temporary basis, on account of having their worked up to 31.05.2018 for the Academic session 2017-2018, with one day break as usual against the vacant posts of the centre or till the posts are filled on regular basis, whichever, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances under Regulation 5 at pages 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Branch
1.	Shri Kanwal Preet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
4.	Ms. Monika	ECE
5.	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
6.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
7.	Shri Gurbinder Singh	I.T.
8.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.
9.	Rikika Arora	I.T.
10.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.
11.	Shri Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
12.	Shri Gurwinder Singh	Mech.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-9 but no business was taken place on 07.07.2018.

**(xvii)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed Ms. Rajni Chauhan, Assistant Professor in Commerce (purely on temporary basis), University School of Open Learning against

the vacant post of the Department, from July, 2018 for the academic session 2018-2019 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances under University Regulation, 5 at page 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-3 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

**(xviii)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed following persons as Assistant Professor at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, purely on temporary basis, for the academic session 2018-19 w.e.f. the date they start/started work, against the vacant posts of the Institute or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances under Regulation 5 at pages 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch</b>
1.	Shri Kanwal Preet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
4.	Shri Gurbinder Singh	I.T.
5.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.
6.	Ms. Ritika Arora	I.T.
7.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.
8.	Shri Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
9.	Shri Gurwinder Singh	Mech.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-50 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

- (xix)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed the following persons as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. Constituent College Nihal Singh Wala, Distt. Moga, w.e.f. the date they will start/started work for the session 2018-19, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules under Regulations 5 at Page 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. 2007, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2017-18:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>
1.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology
2.	Dr. Shahi Kant Rai	Hindi
3.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English
4.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce
5.	Ms. Monica	Commerce
6.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics
7.	Ms. Simranjeet Kaur	Computer Science
8.	Ms. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics

- NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

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

- (xx)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed Dr. Parminder Singh, Assistant Professor (purely on contract basis), P.U. Constituent College, Karyal, Dharmkot, Distt. Moga, w.e.f. the date he will start/started work for session 2018-19 in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules under Regulations 5 at Page 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. 2007, on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier for the session 2017-18.

- NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

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

- (xxi) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed Mr. Pawan Kumar as Assistant Professor (Non-NET) (purely on contract basis) at Shaheed Udham Singh P.U. Constituent College Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur w.e.f. the date he will start/started work for the odd semester of session 2018-19, against the vacant post or till the regular post is filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier at a fixed salary of Rs. 30400/- on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier for the session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

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

- (xxii) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed following persons as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis)/Assistant Professor (Part-time) in the Department/Institute in the pay scale/emoluments, as mentioned below against each, for the session 2018-19, on the same term and conditions according to which they have worked previously:

**I. Assistant Professor (Temporary)**

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Dept. /Institute	in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP
1.	Dr. Abha Sethi	University Institute of Legal Studies	Rs. 6000/- + allowances. w.e.f the date they start/started work, under regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1. 2007
2.	Ms. Shafali		
3.	Mr. Harvinder Singh		

**II. Assistant Professor (Temporary)**

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Dept. /Institute	in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP
1.	Mr. Gaurav Kashyap	University Institute of Hotel Management and Tourism	Rs. 6000/- + allowances. w.e.f the date they start/started work, under regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1. 2007
2.	Mr. Abhishek Ghai,		
3.	Ms. Lipika Guliani		
4.	Mr. Amit Katoch		
5.	Mr. Manoj Semwal		

**III. Assistant Professor (Part-time)**

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Dept. /Institute	on an honorarium of Rs. 22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week) w.e.f. the date
1	Ms. Nancy Sharma	University	
2	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar		

3	Ms. Amrit Pal Kaur	<b>Institute of Legal Studies</b>	they start/ started work
4	Ms. Supreet Gill		
5	Ms. Harman Shergill		
6	Ms. Shivani Gupta		
7	Ms. Alamdeep Kaur		
8	Ms. Shikha Dhiman		

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. An item in respect of Assistant Professors (temporary) at Sr. II above was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-10 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

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

**(xxiii)** The Vice-Chancellor has approved the re-appointment of Ms. Shaffy Gidhar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science (purely on contract basis), P.U. Constituent College Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. the date she will start/started work for the odd semester of session 2018-19, against the vacant post or till the post is filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier at a fixed salary of Rs. 30400/- on the same term and conditions on which she was working earlier for the session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

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

**(xxiv)** The Vice-Chancellor has:-

(i) extended the term of the appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. 2.5.2018 to 30.6.2018, purely on temporary basis, for the session 2017-18 (with one day break) i.e. on 1.5.2018, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2017-18:-

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

2.	Sh. Hardip Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
----	------------------	--------------------------------

- (ii) re-appointed (afresh) the above mentioned persons (Sr. No. 1 & 2) as Assistant Professors at P. U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 9.7.2018 for the academic session 2018-19 or till the regular posts are filled in through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2017-18.
- (iii) Dr. Rajnish Mutneja has appointed as Assistant Professor at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib on part-time basis w.e.f. 9.7.2018 for the academic session 2018-19, or till the regular post is filled in through regular selection whichever is earlier, on an honorarium of Rs. 22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week), on the same terms and conditions on which he was working earlier for the session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-13 but no business was taken place on 07.07.2018.

**(xxv)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at Shaheed Udam Singh P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur w.e.f. the date they will start/stared work for the academic session 2018-2019, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, on the same term and

condition on which they were working earlier for the same 2017-2018:

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

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-8 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

**(xxvi)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Assistant Professor (Purely on temporary basis) at Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt. S.B.S. Nagar w.e.f. the date they will start/started work for the session 2018-2019 against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. 2007, on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2017-2018:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Subject</b>
1.	Dr.(Ms.) Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi
2.	Ms. Sukhjit Nahar	Sociology
3.	Shri Hari Krishan	History
4.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi
5.	Dr.(Ms.) Poonam Dwivedi	English
6.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics
7.	Shri Inder Bhagat	Computer Science
8.	Dr. Hari Nath	Hindi
9.	Shri Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce
10.	Shri Deepak	Computer Science

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

'Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.'

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-48 but no business was taken place on 07.07.2018.

**(xxvii)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. 09.07.2018 to 30.04.2019, for the academic session 2018-2019 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. 2007, on the same terms and condition on which he was working earlier for the session 2017-2018:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1.	Dr. Gurjit Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Mr. Surinder Singh	Assistant Professor in Political Science
3.	Ms. Seema	Assistant Professor in Physical Education
4.	Mr. Saumyadeep Bhattacharya	Assistant Professor in English

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

'Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.'

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-12 but no business was taken place on 07.07.2018.

**(xxviii)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation (Item XL) of the Academic Council dated 26.06.2018, has allowed the introduction of new course namely M.A. Administration and Public Policy (Honours), in the Department of Public Administration, P.U. Chandigarh, from the academic session 2018-19, , alongwith Rules and Regulations

**NOTE:** The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as

Syndicate Proceedings dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

consideration Item C-58 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

**(xxix)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation (Item XLV) **(Appendix-XXXII)** of the Academic Council dated 26.06.2018, has allowed to introduce new course namely M. Architecture in the Chandigarh College of Architecture, Sector-12, Chandigarh w.e.f. academic session 2018-19 along with Rules and Regulations.

**NOTE:** The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-57 but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.*	Ms. Devinder Kaur Deputy Registrar PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur	05.02.1977	30.06.2018	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Anita Bansal Deputy Registrar Examination Branch	06.08.1980	31.08.2018	
3.	Shri Dhara Dutt Assistant Registrar Accounts Branch	07.03.1977	31.08.2018	
4.	Ms. Malinder Kaur Superintendent R&S Branch	02.04.1984	31.08.2018	
5.	Shri Sunil Kumar Superintendent USOL	08.12.1982	31.08.2018	
6.	Shri Sachendra Singh Rawat Superintendent Establishment Br.-II	14.w02.1983	31.08.2018	
7.	Ms. Swarn Kaur Walia Senior Assistant Account Branch	23.03.1984	31.08.2018	
8.*	Shri Tirlok Chand Senior Assistant Department of Evening Studies	11.06.1979	31.07.2018	
9.*	Shri Dina Nath Senior Technician (G-II) Department of Zoology	08.07.1985	31.07.2018	

Syndicate Proceedings dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

10.*	Shri Moti Ram Work Inspector (Chargeman G-I) P.U. Construction Office	06.09.1985	31.07.2018	
11.*	Shri Ram Dhan Head Mali Department of Botany	14.01.1981	31.07.2018	
12.*	Smt. Rama Pati Peon General Branch	04.07.1985	30.06.2018	

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

\* The items in respect of Sr. No.1, 8, 9, 10, 11 & 12 were included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-17, 18, 19, 20, 21 & 56, respectively, but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

**(xxxii)** The Vice-Chancellor has granted extension in service to the following class 'C' employees under Regulation 17.2 at page 132 of Panjab University, Chandigarh Calendar Volume-I, 2007 w.e.f. the date/s mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Designation	Branch/ Deptt.	Date of Extension w.e.f.
*1.	Sh. Raj Mal	Peon	Evening Studies	01.07.2018 to 30.06.2020
*2.	Smt. Lajo Devi	Peon	Architect office	01.06.2018 to 31.05.2019
3.	Sh. Mohan Singh Bisht	Security Guard	Boys Hostel No. 6	01.08.2018 to 31.07.2020
4.	Sh. Shiv Chand Lal	Peon	UBS	01.07.2018 to 30.06.2020
*5.	Sh. Shankar Dass	Daftri	Accounts Branch	01.07.2018 to 30.06.2020
6.	Sh. Labhu Ram	Daftri	General Branch	01.08.2018 to 31.07.2020
*7.	Smt. Baggio Devi	Record Lifter	USOL	01.06.2018 to 31.05.2020
*8.	Sh. Mahant Raj	Head Mali	Construction office	01.08.2018 to 31.07.2019
*9.	Sh. Ram Chander	Mali	Bio-Physics	01.09.2018 to 31.08.2020
*10.	Sh. Nalla Mathu	Mortar Mate	Construction	01.06.2018 to

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Designation	Branch/ Deptt.	Date of Extension w.e.f.
			office	31.05.2020
*11.	Sh. Bhagirathi	Beldar	Construction office	01.06.2018 to 31.05.2019
*12.	Smt. Kesma	Beldar	Construction office	01.07.2018 to 30.06.2020

\* The item in respect of person enlisted at Sr. No.1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 & 12 was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-55, but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.

During the discussion on **R-(xxviii)**, some general issues were also raised by the members, which have been included in the General Discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to take up Item No. R(xxviii). If they do not take up Item No. R(xxviii) then there would be a great problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should take up only that item which is utmost necessary without with the work would hamper. He is thinking to hold the meeting of Syndicate on 21<sup>st</sup> or 22<sup>nd</sup> September.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that all the ratification items are passed and only one item R(xxviii) should be discussed.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu also requested to consider these two items.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Item C-14 (in the Syndicate agenda meeting dated 7.7.2018) relates to re-appointment of certain persons as Assistant Professor, Department of Biotechnology. On a query by the Vice Chancellor, Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is talking about that item which has not been withdrawn as mentioned in a first page attached to current agenda papers. He said that this item is necessary as the rules have violated completely. He requested the members to look into it.

The Vice Chancellor said it is within his knowledge and they will talk on this issue to which Dr. Amit Joshi said okay.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Item R(xxviii) has been brought by the Chairperson arbitrarily. All the colleges are against it. It has not been approved by the Faculty of Arts.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, however, said that it has been passed in the faculty as well as in the academic council.

Dr. Amit Joshi said before holding any discussion, they should first ask if the admission has been done. If the admission has been done, then this would be the biggest problem. It was informed that this course has already started. So, now what discussion they would have on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor that if he allows, then he would start discussion. He said, first of all, if somebody is trying to give the input that it has come through the Faculty of Arts, that should be shown.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Faculty has authorised the Dean to which Shri Ashok Goyal said, then that should be shown.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the provision is that before it is brought before the Senate, faculty can refer it back to the Board of Studies. After reconsideration of the decision, the Board of Studies has to send it back to the faculty and then it is to go to Academic Council and then it would come to the Syndicate and the Senate. Now this matter has not been referred back by the faculty to Board of Studies and straight away taken as recommendation of the Dean, Faculty of Arts to the Academic Council. The Faculty of Arts has been by-passed and secondly, straight away it has been done by Academic Council and the Vice Chancellor in anticipation, for which he is not empowered, started the course which is not a part of the Hand Book of Information of Panjab University. This course is not existed in the list of UGC and he (Vice Chancellor) knows mandate of the UGC that any course, the nomenclature of which is not listed in the UGC cannot be started by a University. They had to change the nomenclature of so many courses in their University after the mandate of UGC. But here, they have not only flouted the statutes of Panjab University, they have flouted the mandate of UGC also. That is why it is not routed through properly. Now somebody says that it is the recommendation, at page 114 of the agenda papers (Syndicated dated 27.8.2018) (Ratification & Information Items), it is written, "RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Dean, Faculty of Arts that the outlines of tests, syllabi and courses of reading for M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy (Honours) Ist & 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester for the academic session 2018-19 (as approved by PGBOS in Public Administration dated 14.06.2018) be approved, as per Appendix." Two persons have given their dissent against this and one abstained from the decision in the Academic Council. As far as admission of students is concerned, he (Vice Chancellor) should go and see, when there was no application form in the Hand Book of Information of Panjab University for the course named this (Public Administration and Public Policy (Honours)), how somebody can say that they have taken admission in this course. The Course mentioned in the Hand Book of Information is M.A. in Public Administration. The course which has no mention in the prospectus of the University, how the students could take admission in that course. So, in this case, they have not to do anything. It is nothing, but for all practical purposes, change in the nomenclature of same course which was running in the department, that was in the name of M.A. Public Administration and they simply want that this change of nomenclature which is against the norms of the UGC cannot be accepted and the course will run only as M.A. Public Administration, what is wrong in it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have sent the case in 2016 to the UGC for approval for running two courses in University School of Learning. The UGC has now in 2018 sent their approval. He informed that many of their courses discontinued because they were not in the nomenclature of the UGC. The University had changed the names of MBE, Executive MBA, because

their funding agency is UGC. He suggested that they could send it to the UGC and seek their permission whether they can run these courses or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as far as the nomenclature is concerned, it is the same in one or two Central Universities.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it is not there in the UGC, and they have nothing to do with the Central Universities.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it has been got it approved forcefully. This was also endorsed by Professor Keshav Malhotra also. Dr. Mahajan said that they have told that it is not allowed by the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever have been done, the decision has also been taken under regulation 14. Now can anybody tell, what was the emergency that the regulation 14 was used. Heaven was not going to fall if the course would be started in 2019-20. Why it is 2019 only. It was nothing, but to show the people that to hell with the use of Syndicate and Senate, if they want to do something, they will do it and forget about the procedures which are laid down. Faculty of Arts has been by-passed. So, he requested the Vice Chancellor and said that this cannot be ratified.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that even in the last Syndicate meeting he has handed over some paper in the presence of the House to Professor Arun Grover because he has got a representation from the Research Scholars, teachers and from some colleges relating to this course. Some teachers of the University asked him to handover these papers to the Vice Chancellor and do not discuss this matter. Their decision seems to be wrong and he would rectify it. He (Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu) handed over those papers to the Vice Chancellor in front of the House in a closed cover. He (the Vice Chancellor) had promised him that in case there is any other discrepancy, he will also sorted out. He had pointed it long back. Then also, this thing was done, he does not know what is the reason behind it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there are many other things. It has been recorded at page 111 (minutes of Academic Council June 26, 2018) that five guest faculties were enrolled and the four do not belong to the subject of Public Administration. The appointments were not approved and another semester started in January. They have raised very serious doubts. It is also written that now a new course is being floated and there is a design behind it. If a course is started just to accommodate people, then this is a very serious allegation and it is already recorded in the proceedings.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, that is why he has said in the last item as to why this has been done by, by-passing all the procedures. If it is not corruption, then what is this, it smells corruption.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the teachers of commerce, economics and managements are being appointed where as the course is that of Public Administration subject.

Shri Parabhjit Singh said that all the Syndicate members want that as stated by Shri Ashok Goyal, this course is not to be passed.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to what is to be done of the students who have been admitted in this Course.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the students have taken admission in M.A. Public Administration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said it is correct that they might not take a decision, but let the Vice Chancellor talk to the Chairperson of the Department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not going to surrender the authority which is vested in the Syndicate. They are not going to surrender the authority which is vested in the faculty. Chairperson is not important here. It is clearly written that it has not been routed through the faculty of arts. Is there any mandate in the Calendar for this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was present in the meeting of Academic Council. What was discussed there was that the Dean was authorised and that is why the Dean recommended that and it came to Academic Council. In the Academic Council, there was lot of discussion and ultimately, it was approved.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he was in the Academic Council meeting where it was discussed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that all the colleges are against it, the faculty is also against it.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what is to be done to the students who have been admitted in this course.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the students have taken admission in Public Administration.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that only the nomenclature has been changed. They changed the M.A. Public Administration to that of M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy (Honours).

Dr. Amit Joshi said it is written in the recommendation of Board of Studies that 95% of the syllabus is overlapping.

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

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the students admitted in this course be asked to do M.A. Public Administration as it is only change of nomenclature.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to think of all the eventualities. First of all it is a fact that they should check it from the Hand Book of Information whether any course is existing in the Hand Book of Information, if not, then those students who have taken admission, they have taken admission only what is mentioned in the Hand Book of Information.

Professor Ronki Ram said that whatever decision would be taken, they would agree to it. The case was received from the department. The case was received from the Chairperson of the department and three other faculty members and placed before the Academic Council. The issue was discussed. It was discussed that if this course is introduced, there would be two M.As. i.e. Public Administration and the other Public Administration and Public Policy. A decision was taken and a Committee was formed consisting of Dean Social Sciences. He (Professor Ronki Ram) was also a member of that Committee. It was a very large Committee. A meeting was held and it was discussed whether these are two Courses of M.A. It was informed that it is only one M.A. The Committee talked to the Chairperson and other members and asked them if they want to start this Course to which they said 'yes'. It was told to them that many colleges have opposed it. They were asked, why this course be started. They said that the Panjab University always lead in such things, the M.A. Public Administration is a very old course and the M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy (Honours) is a new course, it would enhance the status of the University. They would be competing with the University at the world level. Senior persons like Professor Monga was also sitting there.

The Vice Chancellor that it is alright, but they should tell as to what has to be done now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, the course is very good, it is one of the best course of the world, this is what they would like to say. But he would like to say, even if it is the best course, should it not route through the Faculty of Arts or not, he asked from Professor Ronki Ram to which Professor Ronki Ram said 'yes'.

Professor Ronki Ram said after that it was done through the Arts Faculty.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked to tell him to show the documents where it was passed by the faculty.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it is correct that it should be passed by the faculty. But when Professor Ronki Ram started to read the item (R-xxviii) Shri Ashok Goyal intervened. Professor Ronki Ram then said that he would speak the truth, come what may. He then read out the proceedings of Academic Council meeting dated 26<sup>th</sup> June 2018 available at pages 105-106 which states as under:-

**“Item XL**

To consider the recommendations of the Dean, Faculty of Arts that the outlines of tests, syllabi and courses of reading for M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy (Honours) Ist & 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester for the academic session 2018-19 (as approved by PGBOS in Public Administration dated 14.6.2018) be approved, as per Appendix.

Initiating the discussion, Dr. Manoj Kumar said that many College people have given their resentment against this course.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is to be implemented only in the department on the campus.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they should allow the University to start this course and if the Colleges are not willing for this, let them not go for it.

Professor Mohammad Khalid said that if the Colleges are willing, they could also start the course.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this item was placed before the Faculty of Arts in its meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> May, 2018. After the discussion, it was deferred. Then probably, the Board of Studies in its meeting discussed this course and she did not know as to how many members were present in the meeting. It should have gone back to the Faculty of Arts, but did not go. She did not understand as to what is the secret behind this course. Why are they in such a hurry to push it through despite the fact that the College teachers, students and the faculty have resentment against it and the Faculty of Arts did not approve it. Why could not they wait as for the other courses? That is not fair. She would also like to submit her written representation.

Professor Mohammad Khalid said that this item was discussed in the meeting of the Faculty of Arts and it was deferred. Then the Dean formed a Committee which discussed the issue. In the meeting of the Faculty, there was an impression that there are two different courses – one is M.A. Public Administration and other is M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy. Later on, it was informed that the Department wants to start a new course which is a new experiment with the title M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy. He had told that it would be reviewed after a year or two. There was an objection that this course did not come through the Board of Studies, but later on it had gone through the Board of Studies also. As he had said in the meeting of the Committee and the Faculty of Arts, this Course should be allowed. As far as Colleges are concerned, it was said that the previous M.A. Public Administration would continue. If the colleges have the faculty, they could also start this.”

Continuing, he said that as far as the staff is concerned, they can also get the record from the department that those faculty members were teaching the course in the M.A. Public Administration. That staff was not appointed by anybody, but by an authorised committee. So, there was a provision and he does not know where was the problem. Why there is so much opposition in the department? The department should be asked to find an amicable solution of this problem. The colleges and departments should talk and nobody would stop them. The question is that if some problem comes up it should not be blown. Since this item is very important, he requested to approve it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has not been told anywhere the Faculty of Arts has referred it back to the Board of Studies. It means

the case would come back again to the Faculty of Arts. But it has gone from the Board of Studies to the Academic Council directly. These are mandate of the regulations of the University Calendar. He said that he is saying why it has been by-passed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said the he has document of Punjabi University where the UGC has passed the nomenclature of the subjects of M.A. English, Hindi and M.A. Public Administration.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the rules say that if the UGC permit any course, then it could be started, otherwise it should be stopped.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on the basis of the papers which are contained in the file it is clearly laid down that the item which was referred back to the Board of Studies has not come back to the Faculty of Arts. They have a practice in every faculty, after taking all decisions, that in case of any left out agenda, this agenda was, after discussion deferred and it was referred back to Board of Studies. It cannot be included in the list of left out items. They, for the smooth functioning, authorise the Dean of the Faculty to take decision in case of left out items. It has been written in this also, the faculty of Arts at its meeting held on so and so has authorised the Dean. Before that, it has been written, 'has unanimously decided to refer back the item to the Post Graduate Board of Studies in Public Administration'. After that it has been written that the faculty of Arts in its meeting held on 5.5.2018 has authorised the Dean Faculty of Arts to take appropriate action on the recommendations of the Board of Studies/Board of Control regarding left-out subject/s, if any, for the examinations of 2019 and session 2018019 and other related recommendations to avoid any complications in regard to printing of syllabi, admission etc. The course was not approved and sometime they say that if some subject is left or if there is any change in the syllabi and the Board of Studies has sent its recommendation after that, the Dean is authorised, but in the instant case, let this file show any such thing.

He further said that the hand written portion is written by the Dean, Faculty of Arts.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is written by the Dean.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is what he is saying that this is recommendations of the Dean and not of the Faculty. He read out the resolved part of Academic Council Meeting of June 26, 2018 which states 'That the recommendations of the Dean, Faculty of Arts that the outlines of tests, syllabi and courses of reading for M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy (Honours).....' The Dean is approving the syllabus of the course, it is okay, but where is the approval of starting the course to which the Vice Chancellor requested him to read the complete resolved part. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the allegation which he is levelling, they have written the same thing themselves which states that the outlines of tests, syllabi and courses of reading for M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy (Honours) as recommended by Board of Studies in Public Administration for 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester for the academic session 2018-19 along with regulation be sent to the Academic Council for approval.

The Registrar said it was then sent to the Academic Council.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, then where is the Faculty of Arts which was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that the recommendations of Board of Studies were sent directly to the Academic Council directly whereas it should have been gone first to the Faculty of Arts. If they want, he could read out the relevant part of the Calendar. The students would claim degree also.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has read the syllabus of all the Universities in this subject and he did not find the nomenclature such as M.A. Public Administration and Public Policy (Honours). It is Masters in Public Administration everywhere.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested that it should be rejected. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that this authority is not with anybody to by-pass the various bodies.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the nomenclature, by and large, is the autonomy of the University, there are many courses which are not there in the UGC, but there are many such courses where the UGC give them authorization, but as Shri Ashok Goyal has said that whatever is prescribed flow chart for this, they have to go through it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the issue was that the Chairperson would like to do it. There is nothing wrong in it and something new should be introduced. They put up this case in the Faculty of Arts, but no consensus could be arrived at there and it was opposed by many people. Then they thought that since they could not arrive at any consensus, they should get it passed in the Board of Studies. If they would bring it again in the Faculty of Arts, there was a fear that it may not be rejected again. So, they sent it through backdoor to the Academic Council directly and got it approved. So, this is an ego issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that if they now approve it, it would amount to undermining the authority of the Faculty of Arts, which they cannot.

Continuing, Dr. Subhash Sharma said what they should do was that they should form a consensus and bring the issue in the next year.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the issue was that the meeting of the Board of Studies was held and it should go to the Faculty of Arts. But before the meeting of Faculty of Arts, the meeting of the Academic Council was to be held. So, if the meeting of the Faculty of Arts had been held, only then it could go there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then they could start it from the session 2019-20.

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

Dr. Inderpal Singh requested that it should be rejected.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the students who have been admitted in this course, they should be admitted in the M.A. Public Administration course.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are already admitted in M.A. Public Administration.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that in case they would like to introduce this course, they should bring it through the Faculty of Arts.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to why this has been referred to the Faculty of Arts.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should get it approved from the faculty of arts to introduce this course from the session 2019-20. But for 2018-19, this is not recommended. The Course would run only as M.A. (Public Administration).

Professor Ronki Ram said that the problems arisen because the meeting of Faculty of Arts was held. In case they like to bring this item through the Faculty of Arts, then the special meeting of the Faculty should be called.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it cannot be sent now to the Faculty of Arts, which was also endorsed by Professor Keshav Malhotra. Shri Ashok Goyal said that cannot do it now.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should refer it back and then they would see to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot do it. The can do it only for 2019-20, but, what about 2018-19? It will not be ratified, and the course would run as M.A. Public Administration only.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they are giving the degree of M.A. Public Administration to the students, but if the Chairperson wants to do it, then the Chairperson could be asked to follow the proper procedure.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be done this year.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the meeting of the Arts Faculty would be held in December and they should place this matter at that time.

At this stage the discussion which took place regarding admission in B.Sc. Agriculture has been made part of the General Discussion.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should come after getting a clarification from the UGC.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should come through the Faculty of Arts.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

Professor Ronki Ram said that a new course was going to start in the University, if there is some technical problem that should be solved and the course should be continued because they would like to equate this course with the Tata Institute of Social Science and Ashoka University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said they would do it in the next year.

The Vice Chancellor said as to why they by-pass the academic bodies.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for this it cannot be done. The M.A. Public Administration would run to which the Vice Chancellor said okay.

**RESOLVED:** That -

- (1) the information contained in Items **R-(i) to R-(xxvii) and R-(xxix) to R-(xxxi)** be ratified;
- (2) the information contained in Items **R-(xxviii)** regarding introduction of new course namely M.A. Administration and Public Policy (Honours), in the Department of Public Administration, P.U., Chandigarh, from the academic session 2018-19, alongwith Rules and Regulations approved by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate be **not** ratified and the students admitted for the session 2018-19 under the said course be treated as students of M.A. Public Administration already running in the Department.

**Routine and formal matters** 17. The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(iii)** on the agenda was read out, viz. -

- (i) To note the notification No. VPS-15/02/2018 dated 21.7.2018 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) received from the Secretary to the Vice President of India, New Delhi that "In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10 of the Panjab University Act, 1947, the Chancellor of Panjab University, Chandigarh is pleased to appoint Professor Raj Kumar, Banaras Hindu University as the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University for a term of three years with effect from 23.07.2018 or from the date he assumes charge of his office as Vice-Chancellor.
- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Class 'B' employees beyond 30.06.2018 for further period i.e. upto 31.08.2018, on the previous terms & conditions:-

Sr. No.	Name	Designation	Department
1.	Shri Birender Singh	Driver	D.U.I.'s Office
2.	Shri Bikram Singh	Driver	Vice-Chancellor's Office

- NOTE:** 1. Shri Bikram Singh and Shri Birender Singh, Drivers, Vice-Chancellor's Office and D.U.I.'s Office were retired from the University services on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 31.08.2013 and 30.11.2016, respectively.
2. They were re-employed and their term of contractual appointment has been extended from time to time.
3. Their last term of appointment was extended upto 30.06.2018 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 48 (xiv)).

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Shri Pardeep Kumar, Deputy Librarian, USOL, P.U. (upto age of 60 years i.e 31.07.2016) and his services after 31.07.2018 be treated as ceased in the University, under Regulation 14 appearing at page- 36 of PU Cal. Vol. -1 2007.

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 amended at page 131 of P.U., Cal. Vol. I, 2007.
2. Furlough for six months as admissible under Regulation 12.2 (B) (iii) at page 125 of P.U., Cal. Vol. I, 2007 with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during furlough; and
3. Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days as admissible under rule 17.3 at page 96 of P.U., Cal. Vol.III, 2009.

**NOTE:** No complaint/Enquiry is pending against him.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Items I-(i) to I-(iii)** be noted.

After the completion of the consideration items of the current agenda (27.08.2018), the following left out item No. C-16 of the Syndicate meeting dated 10.06.2018 was up for consideration.

**Grant of temporary affiliation to Government College, Ludhiana and Malout**

**16.** Considered D.O. No. 39 dated 29.05.2018 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) received from Director, Department of Higher Education, Punjab with regard to grant of temporary affiliation to Govt. College at Ludhiana (East) to start B.A.-I and Govt. College, Malout, to start B.A.-I & B.Com-I for the academic year 2018-19.

Initiating the discussion on this item, Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to what was the objection on this item last time.

It was explained (by the Controller of Examinations) that the Punjab Government has decided to open 11 new colleges. Out of these 11 colleges, some of the colleges were affiliated to Punjabi University, Patiala and some to Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. Two colleges were under the jurisdiction of Panjab University, one was at Malout and the second is at Ludhiana. They

were to start the academic session from this year. But as per the procedure of Panjab University they were not entertained because as per the Calendar they are submit the application by 30<sup>th</sup> of September for opening of new colleges. The main issue was that whether they have applied in time, when the Syndicate meeting is to be held, whether they have given the proforma or not. They gave those objections to the State Government and told them things which are required as per the Panjab University Calendar. They have submitted the proforma and the D.O. letter was written by the Chief Secretary to the then Vice Chancellor Professor Arun Kumar Grover with a request for considering it as State Government agenda. The Government nominee came on two times to the Syndicate meetings i.e. 10<sup>th</sup> June and on the 7<sup>th</sup> of July also. But since the meetings could not took place, therefore, this agenda stood deferred.

Dr. Subhash asked the Controller of Examination if the State Government has replied what they have written.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that on that day he had attended the meeting and he had not agreed to it. There were two points, the main point was that they were far beyond the deadline. There was six months delay or it was one year delay and there was no way that they can go beyond that. Secondly, somebody said on that day that facilities are not there. The facilities which are required to start a degree college were not there. These were the main points.

The Vice Chancellor again asked the Controller of examination to tell about the whole thing.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that after that the Registrar, he himself and X.E.N. of the University went to see whether the proper land is purchased or not. There was no land, but they had only the proposal. The Punjab Government Officers and Punjab Government S.D.M. of that area and the M.L.A. of that area of Ludhiana accompanied them. They showed them a Community Centre at Ludhiana to start classes for one year.

The D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab said that as stated by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that facilities were not there, so they dropped that.

Continuing, it was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that at Malout, it was one of the club. They had a strong objection that this is a public club and it cannot be considered as educational institution even if it is on temporary basis. That was there observation which they gave to the Punjab Government. Then they came to Ludhiana. At Ludhiana some stopgap arrangement was required. They gave in writing about the requirement of Panjab University, then the report would be submitted to the Syndicate with that rider, the delay has to be condoned.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested the Vice Chancellor to scrutinize the two things himself. One is that it is far beyond the deadline and if they excuse the delay of one year, the private colleges would also come, somebody else would come, the rules would be same for everybody and more so for the government. But if the Vice Chancellor says that he recommends it, then he would go with his recommendation. Secondly, the facilities must be checked, the whole thing should not be done for the sake of opening it, that is a political announcement. He is not against it as this is a government agenda, but he requested the Vice Chancellor that firstly, he should satisfy

himself that this is within the timeline. Secondly, that the land actually belongs to the college, the land is not fake, that it is not only a political announcement and basically the infrastructure exists there. The rules must be the same whether it is a private college or a public college. If the Vice Chancellor is satisfied and recommends it, then he should tell them and they will go with it.

The D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab said that he would like to respond to the observations made by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi. One, why the delay was there. In reply to it, he said since it is a government project, the Government has decided to open fifteen college and not only five or ten. Five have been announced last year and ten have been announced this year and thus there are fifteen colleges. For all these colleges including these two colleges, land has been acquired. This may be put on record. Land in around 7-8 cases has been transferred in the name of the Higher Education Department. The administrative approval for the construction of this college and rough cost estimate of around Rs. 12 Crores have been received and it is in the pipeline most probably with the Education Minister for administrative approval which will be granted within two-three days. So, for all these colleges, the Government is very-very serious. Now why the delay occurred. Frankly speaking they were not interested in starting the colleges this year, but public pressure forced them to take this decision to start the class with some temporary arrangement because the local MLA and local representatives came and met the Minister and all. They requested to start the classes from this year so that the students could know about it that a college has been opened in this area. So, accordingly, they had planned to open five colleges in the last year. Kalanour and Jadla are with Guru Nanak Dev University. They granted affiliation within a day and both these colleges have started working. They dropped the idea of Malout because they had certain problems and students were not coming, land issue was there. They do not want to put the Panjab University in any embarrassing position. But at Ludhiana, what they have done is that they have gone a step further to provide all the facilities to the students. Now instead of having a makeshift arrangement they have decided to start the classes in the SCD Govt. College which is the most recognised college of the Punjab State. So, all the facilities are there. It is because of public pressure that they had to come up with this thing and accordingly it is in the government interest.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that as stated The D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab made it clear that it is the intention of the Government. Land has been acquired and money would be sanctioned. In the government colleges, the fee is very less and for the poor students it would be an asset if a government college is opened and that would be of a great help. So, sometimes they have to ignore some things and they should grant them affiliation. There should not be any delay. With the opening of this college at the earliest, the poor students would be benefitted and requested that it should be approved.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Ronki Ram if he agrees with this proposal to which Professor Ronki Ram said that he fully agrees with the proposal.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is not against the proposal. The D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab said that the B.A. classes will be held in SCD Government College this year. He said that since there is bar on the number of seats in B.A., then why they are giving affiliation to that

college. He again said that he is totally in favour of opening the college, but his only concern is that the classes will be held in SCD Government college to which The D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab said that it for the time being and for this session only. He said that there exists a Government College. The students would deposit the fee in the same College as per their fee structure and would be studying in the same College as all the sections and roll numbers have to be allotted in that College itself.

DPI (Colleges) said that they have earmarked a separate part of the building for the newly proposed College for which a separate website has been created where the fee would also be deposited.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there would be two B.A. courses running in the same College.

DPI (Colleges) clarified that it is a separate College. Since the facilities, which the University officials had seen, would be completed within 2-3 months in proper form in which the University wanted and did not want that the same is inspected time and again.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that this College is known as Government College for Girls, Jamalpur. It would take 2-3 months to fulfil the discrepancies which have been pointed out. At the moment, there are only 60 students, the charge of which has been given to the Principal, SCD Government College. Ultimately, those students would come to Jamalpur and would appear from that College itself.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that now they are going to approve a College at a place but that College does not exist. There is another College at another place and the classes are also being held there. Then why they are approving a College. It is very confusing. Secondly, the classes had already started on 7<sup>th</sup> July and today is 27<sup>th</sup> August. Then why they are approving it and condoning the delay. It could be a case that tomorrow any Tom, Dick and Harry could also take the same plea of holding classes at any other place as that person does not have any building. Why they are violating the deadline and other principles? It could also be said that the drawings and other such requirements have been approved, but where is the building.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it has been a tradition that whenever a new College is opened, even in some cases the Colleges have been allowed in the rented buildings also. He informed that when DAV College, Phillaur was opened, it was opened even in the building of a hospital and the affiliation was granted. The College had purchased the land after 3-4 years. There are many such instances.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that they should allow the opening of the College, it being a Government College. The girls of that area have also some issues because they could not go far off places for study.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if the Vice-Chancellor satisfies himself, then it is okay.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since 60 students have been admitted, who would teach those students.

DPI (Colleges) said that separate posts and budget have been set aside for this purpose. Everything has been approved. The process is already on.

Professor Anita Kaushal enquired whether the students of Jamalpur would be admitted in the College or from other areas also.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the contention of the DPI (Colleges) is that it is a service for the students, then they could sanction 60 more seats to the already existing College. He said that they are ready to sanction even more seats, but the formalities should be fulfilled.

DPI (Colleges) requested that the College be allowed to be opened.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the teachers are paid a salary of Rs.21,600/- and even Rs.15,600/- and these teachers teach such students who come to the College in a BMW car costing Rs.58 lacs.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is a political issue and the Government has announced to open the Colleges. The College is to be opened at Ludhiana where there are already Government Colleges for Women and Men. The proposed College is also within the municipal limits. So, it is just an excuse that there is no Government College at Ludhiana or the poor students would be studying in the proposed College. He also wants that the College should be opened. But when they give laxity to one College, then other Colleges would also ask for the same and the aided and unaided Colleges could not equated. The faculty is temporary whereas there is a requirement of permanent faculty for opening a College. So, they are in a hurry that the College is to be opened this year itself. They are ready to condone the delay but step by step they are diluting the conditions. First it was asked to condone the delay. Then it is being said that the conditions would be fulfilled within three months, the classes of the students would be held there, it means that the College would not exist in real terms. This is totally a political decision. No poor students would be harmed if the College is not opened. It is just an announcement by the Government that it has opened a new College. There are already Government Colleges for Men and Women separately within the very municipal limits of Ludhiana city. He said that if the Vice-Chancellor thinks proper that the College should be opened, he is with the proposal. They authorise the Vice-Chancellor on the issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Vice-Chancellor could be authorised to take a call on it.

DPI (Colleges) said that it is on record that they have given conditional approval to the private Colleges also. So, if those Colleges could function, then why the Government Colleges could not function.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he agrees with Shri Prabhjit Singh that opening the Colleges is a political decision. It is very difficult for the Panjab University also to take a call this or that side because after all they are part of the society and also being watched. The DPI (Colleges) is right that if they take a decision to follow the rules for future, then it would be their accountability as to why they have violated the rules earlier and what is the reason that today they are

not violating the rule. But in this particular, a Survey Committee visited the College. He pointed out as to at what stage the Survey Committee visited the College. The application was not received from the College, even then the Survey Committee visited the College. He has been told that the then Vice-Chancellor had said that it was within his jurisdiction to send the Survey Committee. So, he sent the Survey Committee and the Committee visited the College. Once the Survey Committee has already visited the College that means that the delay for submitting the application already stands condoned. Now, what they could consider. After the visit of the Survey Committee, it was expected that the building and infrastructure would be ready but the same has not been completed. Slowly, the Government has come down to and precisely want that the Government College, Jamalpur could act at SCD Government College, Ludhiana. That is what they are discussing now. It is simple that whether the students reach there or not, whether they belong to Jamalpur or not, does not matter. An entity in the name of Government College, Jamalpur is required to be shown on the geographical area of Ludhiana, that a College has been opened. While taking a decision they have to be very conscious of the fact that they should not expect that after two months, the students are going to shift to the newly proposed College at Jamalpur. He pointed out that the Regulations could not be framed in violation of the Act. Similarly, rules could not be framed in violation of the Regulations. But what is happening is that they are violating the Act and the Regulations. In addition, the rules violating the Regulations have also been incorporated in the Panjab University Calendar. As has been pointed out by a member about the College at Jalalabad, that College was also opened under peculiar circumstances. Now, these are also peculiar circumstances. Regarding the appointment of faculty, let them not expect the appointments because the situation of the Government Colleges would remain the same as it is today. The DPI (Colleges) is right that the budget provision has been made and the posts have been sanctioned. Suppose, if they agree in principle for opening the College, the Inspection Committee would visit the College. He wondered as to what would be inspected by the Inspection Committee, whether it would be SCD Government College, Ludhiana or of the infrastructure which would take 2-3 months to be completed as has been said by the DPI (Colleges). So, the inspection would be merely a formality. There is a provision of Inspection Committee in the Regulations. The Survey Committee had been sent. The Survey Committee has also to see whether there is another College in the vicinity whereas here another College is being opened in the same College. So, they have to take a decision that the rules are not violated. They have to fulfil the requirement of the Government and to meet that if they close their eyes, only then the College could be allowed to be opened otherwise not. To say that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised and leave the decision on his satisfaction, it is escaping the responsibility. That is not good. Therefore, if they want to do it, then whatever maximum assurance the DPI (Colleges) could give, take that assurance and send the Inspection Committee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the whole Syndicate is of the unanimous view that the College should be opened. He said that he is shocked to see an advertisement in the newspapers of a College that some seats of MBA are vacant and the students could take the admission. He called one of his friends to ask whether the meeting of the Affiliation Committee has been held who in turn that it has not

happened because Dr. Satish Kumar (Chairman of the Committee) is out of station. He pointed out that the College does not have the affiliation for MBA. It is one of the biggest Colleges of Chandigarh and is inserting a public advertisement in the leading newspapers which is a very serious issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to clarify that it is in the knowledge of the University also.

Continuing, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that whenever the meeting of the Affiliation Committee would be held, there are 99.9% chances that the Committee would refuse the affiliation. Then the College, in the interest of the students, would ask to shift the admitted students to the University. This has been an ongoing practice. It is very wrong and he has brought it to the knowledge of the Vice-Chancellor. As far as Government College is concerned, as per the Panjab University Calendar there is no provision to open a College. The procedure is that the Inspection Committee would visit the College and submit its report which would be considered by the Affiliation Committee. If the Government wanted to open a College and there is a pressure on the Vice-Chancellor, then they are with him.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that as has been informed, since 60 students have been admitted, then why such an agenda has been placed. There is a prescribed procedure.

DPI (Colleges) said that the sincerity of the Government is unnecessarily being doubted. He assured the House that within a month, the transit facility would be operational. The Government has sanctioned 5 posts for the College as also the money. As Shri Prabhjit Singh has served as a Superintendent in Education Department, he knows everything very well that there is a ban on recruitment. It is because of that reason that permanent faculty could not be recruited. A budget provision has been made for the faculty and the faculty is to be paid salary @ Rs.21,600/-. The advertisement for the faculty would also be issued within 2-4 days. The Government is trying to run the classes at SCD Government College so that some public money could be saved by way of paying an honorarium of Rs.1,000/- per lecture to the already working teachers of the College. This is the only interest of the Government.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Government has taken a decision to open the Colleges. As they are talking about the violations, earlier also violations of the Panjab University Calendar have been committed and Shri Ashok Goyal is right in saying that. If there is a request from the Government to open a College and now they are saying that they would not further violate anything and whatever violation has earlier been done let that be bygone, then according to him, as earlier they have been accepting such requests, then this request is also acceptable.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the affiliation to a College at Jalalabad was given overnight by this very House.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it has been accepted by the House that the violations have been committed. If such a request is received by the University from a private College, then that should also be treated in the same manner. He said that there is a

prescribed procedure that the last date for receiving the applications is 31<sup>st</sup> October. However, that condition could be waived off with the permission of the House. He did not know whether this power lies with the Syndicate or not. If that is a part of Regulation, then it could not be done. As regards the 60 students which have already been admitted, those could be taught in a Government College already functioning and they could say that the College be opened in the next year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has got the point raised by Dr. Amit Joshi. The DPI (Colleges) is one of the hon'ble members of this august House and he is doing something in the matter and has assured that they would start the facilities within a month.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that whatever the House says is right.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that two more procedures are yet to be completed. One is that the Inspection Committee would visit the College, the report of which would be put up before the Affiliation Committee. It is right that the rules and regulations do not permit. The Inspection Committees visited the Colleges and in some of those Colleges, the Inspection Committee pointed out certain deficiencies which the Colleges could not fulfil up to the deadline. Then the Affiliation Committee had two options. One was to ban the admissions in those Colleges which the Affiliation Committee decided. But then the Colleges approached that if the admissions are stopped, then one academic session would be wasted. Then a way out was thought of that the Colleges could make the admissions by extending the deadline up to 31<sup>st</sup> August. If the Colleges did not fulfil the conditions up to 31<sup>st</sup> August, then the University would not accept the returns of the students from those Colleges. So, in this case also, they could think of a way out like this that the permission be granted to the College and send an Inspection Committee which should submit its report to the Affiliation Committee. In the meantime, the College may admit the students. If the deficiencies are not fulfilled by a deadline to be fixed, then the return of the students would not be accepted and the examination of the students would be conducted in the other College.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in future they would not accept any such proposal of Government College at the last moment.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that by this way, the rules and regulations would also be corrected and the College would also get the time to fulfil the conditions. This could be done.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Government has announced to open 15 new Colleges.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that a time of 15 days be given in addition to whatever the DPI (Colleges) is asking for.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that the last date for receipt of returns of students is 30<sup>th</sup> September and at the most additional 15 days' time could be given. As suggested by Dr. Subhash Sharma, let them complete the process.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Government would not be able to appoint the faculty by 15<sup>th</sup> September.

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired whether they could extend the last date of return of students.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that they could not extend the deadline but there is another plan. The returns of the students are to be received and the University could receive the returns of those students with the returns of Government College, Ludhiana as a special case.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if the permission is granted to the College, the teachers to be appointed there would have to be paid a minimum salary of Rs.21,600/-. But it should not be a case that the teacher is paid Rs.21,600/- and then the teacher is asked to return some money out of that because such a thing is happening in the private Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there would be some practical difficulty. The last date of receipt of returns is to be kept in mind and if by the deadline, the Government is not able to fulfil the requirements, then the University would have to keep a provision that the returns would come SCD Government College, Ludhiana and they would have to grant some time to SCD Government College also. Otherwise, they could say that if by the deadline, the conditions are not fulfilled, then the returns should be filed from the SCD Government College instead of the new proposed College.

DPI (Colleges) said that everything is accepted. He thanked everybody for accepting the request of the Punjab Government and a heartfelt demand.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that after having done this, this decision at least could be taken that if 31<sup>st</sup> March is the last date, it means that it is 31<sup>st</sup> March. From the year 2019, they should obey the deadlines and circular should be issued in this regard by the Dean College Development Council.

DPI (Colleges) said that such a letter should go to the Government also.

**RESOLVED:** That temporary affiliation to Govt. College at Ludhiana (East) to start B.A.-I for the academic year 2018-19, be granted and the College be instructed to fulfil the requirements within one month.

Arising out of the discussion on Item C-16 of the agenda of Syndicate dated 10.06.2018, some general discussion took place which has been made a part of general discussion.

At this point of time, the Vice Chancellor requested the members to look into Information **Item I-(iii)** (Syndicate meeting 7.7.2018) regarding, to note action taken report submitted by Chief Vigilance Officer, PU, in respect of Professor Om Prakash Katare.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it should be considered in the next meeting and suggested that the next meeting of the Syndicate may be convened at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor requested that they should consider it at the earliest as the Centre has taken cognisance of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal read out the item **I-(iii)**: to note action taken report submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U. in respect of the decision of the Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 regarding prosecution sanction against Professor Om Prakash Katare, Panjab University, Chandigarh. It means that the C.V.O. has given the report on the decision of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no decision was taken in the Syndicate. The Syndicate had said that there is nothing in this case. Professor Goyal said that he has seen the whole file.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is ready to sit upto 2.00 at night to discuss this case, but they should be told as to what is the emergency in this case.

The Vice Chancellor said that the emergency is this that a letter has been received from the C.B.I.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if a letter has been received from the Central Bureau of Investigation, then it is for the fourth time. Actually, they are seeking sanction to prosecute Professor O.P. Katare, which is a mandate, as employer they have to give. After considering the case, they have declined this three times.

Shri Prabhjit Singh asked if this case is received again.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has been told that they have now received it again.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two issues in it. One, they are saying that a report has been made, but no copy of report is there in the file.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that when the file was handed over to him (Professor Navdeep Goyal) on 11.6.2018, it means he is telling what has happened after that, to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said, naturally, it is after that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he saw the complete file. Some papers were the same which were attached time and again.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether he has done its reporting to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that its reporting has not been done. The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Goyal to do it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one thing is that they say that they have received a report from the C.B.I., but that is not available in the file. Secondly, the papers show that the Court has already decided the matter. Virtually, the case was against the main promoters of the College and it was decided in their favour. When the case was decided in favour of the main accused, then what is the issue?

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to submit the report.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though the update is with Professor Navdeep Goyal, but the Registrar on 13.6.2018, put up the case to the Syndicate. So, he wanted to know as to what the Syndicate has to do.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, what is the emergency in this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the information, it is not written anywhere that the C.B.I. has taken cognisance and they have to grant sanction for prosecution or any action is called for on the part of Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this is the C.V.O. of Panjab University and not of Central Government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for the knowledge of the Vice Chancellor he would like to tell that their C.V.O. is not appointed as per the guidelines of C.V.C. They have made the C.V.O. a domestic advisor for every petty issue, but he/she has been named as Chief Vigilance Officer so that it should look as if there is a vigilance case. But CVC guidelines have been followed. It has been told to him by the Registrar that all the reports of CVO go to the CVC. So, the CVC tells from which angle the case is not a vigilance case. Every case does not go to the CVO. The case which has some vigilance angle, only that case would go to the vigilance.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if there is any personal grudge with anybody, it is sent to the CVO or a standing Committee. Enough has happened. This is not an urgency, this is a personal grudge case.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has got the point and it could be considered in the next meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what has to be done in the next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Navdeep Goyal would first tell and give update about it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is nothing in the case.

Professor Ashok Goyal said if there is not any paper in the file, then tell him, he would tell everything verbally as to what has happened.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to send all the documents to him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he and Shri Ashok Goyal would prepare everything.

The meeting concluded at 10.40 p.m.

( G.S. Chadha )  
Registrar

Confirmed  
( Raj Kumar )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR