

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Sunday, 8th December 2013 at 10.30 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
4. Professor Anil Monga
5. Shri Ashok Goyal
6. Ms. Anu Chatrath
7. Dr. (Mrs.) Aruna Goel
8. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
9. Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop
10. Dr. Charanjeet Kaur Sohi
11. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
12. Dr. Dalip Kumar
13. Dr. Devinder Singh
14. Shri Deepak Kaushik
15. Shri Dinesh Kumar
16. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
17. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
18. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
19. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
20. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
21. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
22. Ms. Gurpreet Kaur
23. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
24. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
25. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
26. Ambassador I.S. Chaddha
27. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
28. Shri Jagpal Singh alias Jaswant Singh
29. Shri Jarnail Singh
30. Shri Jasbir Singh
31. Dr. Jagwant Singh
32. Dr. Jaspal Kaur Kaang
33. Shri K.K. Dhiman
34. Dr. Kailash Nath Kaul alias Kailash Nath
35. Dr. Karamjeet Singh
36. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
37. Dr. Kuldip Singh
38. Dr. Krishan Gauba
39. Shri Krishna Goyal
40. Shri Lilu Ram
41. Professor Lalit K. Bansal
42. Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu
43. Dr. Mukesh Arora
44. Shri Munish Pal Singh alias Munish Verma
45. Dr. N.R. Sharma
46. Dr. Nandita Singh
47. Dr. Navdeep Goyal
48. Professor Naval Kishore
49. Shri Naresh Gaur
50. Dr. Parveen Kaur Chawla

51. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
52. Dr. (Mrs.) Preeti Mahajan
53. Dr. Puneet Bedi
54. Professor R.P. Bambah
55. Professor Ronki Ram
56. Professor Rupinder Tewari
57. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
58. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
59. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
60. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
61. Dr. S.K. Sharma
62. Dr. Shelley Walia
63. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
64. Shri Sandeep Kumar
65. Shri Satya Pal Jain
66. Shri S.S. Johl
67. Dr. Satish Kumar
68. Shri Sandeep Hans
69. Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha
70. Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa alias Surjit Singh
71. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
72. Shri V.K. Sibal
73. Shri Varinder Singh
74. Dr. Tarlok Bandhu
75. Dr. Yog Raj Angrish
76. Professor A.K. Bhandari Registrar ... (Secretary)

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Professor Gurdial Singh
2. S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman
3. Shri K.K. Sharma
4. Dr. K.K. Talwar
5. Sardar Kuljit Singh Nagra
6. Shri Maheshinder Singh
7. Shri Naresh Gujral
8. S. Parkash Singh Badal
9. Shri Punam Suri
10. Smt. Preneet Kaur
11. Dr. Parmod Kumar
12. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
13. Shri Raghbir Dyal
14. Shri Sikandar Singh Maluka
15. Justice Sanjay Krishan Kaul
16. Shri Tarlochan Singh

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

- (i) Shri Nelson Mandela, on December 5, 2013, at the age of 95. Shri Nelson Mandela inspired by Mahatma Gandhi was a recipient of Bharat Ratna;
- (ii) Dr. R.C. Bhandari, former Professor of Chemistry and father of Professor A.K. Bhandari (Registrar, Panjab University and Secretary, P.U. Senate) on December 6, 2013;

- (iii) Professor S.P. Vij, former Chairperson, Department of Botany, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on 20th October 2013; and
- (iv) Ms. Aunkurita Tripathi, 2nd Year student of B.D.S. at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, who died on 29th November 2013.

We pray to the Almighty to give peace to the departed souls in Heaven and strength & courage to the members of the bereaved families to bear this irreparable loss.”

As a mark of respect to Shri Nelson Mandela, Professor R.C. Bhandari, Dr. S.P. Vij, and Ms. Aunkurita Tripathi, the Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over their passing away and observed two minutes’ silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

II.

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

1. Panjab University has been placed at the 13th position in the first ever rankings for Universities in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS) plus the 17 other emerging economies of the World by the Times Higher Education Magazine published on December 4, 2013. The Times Higher Education BRICS & Emerging Economies Rankings 2014 employ the same methodology as the 2013-14 World University Rankings. They draw on the world’s largest academic reputation survey as claimed by them (more than 10,000 academics were polled in 2013 and almost 60,000 have been involved since 2010). Fifty million citations were analysed and compared with the world average from the same field, arts, humanities and social sciences placed on an equal footing with science. Thirteen indicators across five areas have been taken into account making this the only world rankings to examine all the core missions of the modern global university – research, teaching, knowledge transfer and international activity. Indian institutions make up 10 per cent of the list including nine top 50 places. India’s institutions are led by Panjab University. The specialist Indian Institutes of Technology (IIT) take up its next six places, led by IIT, Kharagpur (30th), Aligarh Muslim University is 50th and Jawaharlal Nehru University is 57th.
2. It is a matter of pride for all of us that eminent scientist Professor C.N.R. Rao, recipient of Degree of Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*), has been designated as recipient of Bharat Ratna recently. He will visit Panjab University, Chandigarh on March 3, 2014 to inaugurate the International Conference on Nanoscience and Technology (ICONSAT-2014). Professor Rao will deliver a lecture at P.G.I.M.E.R. on March 2, on an invitation by the Chandigarh Regional Innovation Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC).
3. The Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University; Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Member of Parliament and Fellow, Panjab University; Shri Satya Pal Jain, Fellow, Panjab University and Professor Manju Jaidka of Department of English & Cultural Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, have been included in the Administrator’s Advisory Council, to advise the Chandigarh Administration on developmental issues and policy matters affecting the Union Territory.

4. The Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh was invited by the Chief Architect, Department of Urban Planning, Chandigarh Administration, to make a presentation before the Board constituted by the Chandigarh Administration regarding the suggestions on the Draft Chandigarh Master Plan 2031. I, along with Architect, Advisor Architect and Advisor & Secretary to Vice-Chancellor, appeared before the Board. We have requested for allocation of 180 acres of land to Panjab University, Chandigarh. Earlier, the Panjab University had made a presentation to the Governor of Punjab and Administrator, U.T. Chandigarh, Hon^{ble} Shri Shivraj V. Patil, regarding the same.”

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the information shared by the Vice-Chancellor that the Panjab University has been placed at the 13th position in the first ever rankings for Universities in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS) plus the 17 other emerging economies of the World by the Times Higher Education Magazine published on December 4, 2013, gives them a feeling of prestige and honour. Earlier, it happened to be one of the top Universities of the world. It had added new feather to the present and former Vice-Chancellor, teachers and students of this University, who by their efforts and contributions had made their presence felt at the world level over the academic atmosphere and the knowledge they had got from this University in the fields of Science, Arts, Languages, etc. They all took pride in it and placed on record their appreciation for the efforts and contributions made by their Vice-Chancellors both present and former, teachers, research scholars, students and non-teaching employees of this University.

The Senate placed on record its appreciation for the efforts and contributions made by their Vice-Chancellors both present and former, teachers, research scholars, students and non-teaching employees of this University.

RESOLVED: That felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to –

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on his inclusion in the Administrator’s Advisory Council, to advise the Chandigarh Administration on developmental issues and policy matters affecting the Union Territory;
2. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Member of Parliament and Fellow, Panjab University, on his inclusion in the Administrator’s Advisory Council, to advise the Chandigarh Administration on developmental issues and policy matters affecting the Union Territory;
3. Shri Satya Pal Jain, Fellow, Panjab University, on his inclusion in the Administrator’s Advisory Council, to advise the Chandigarh Administration on developmental issues and policy matters affecting the Union Territory; and
4. Professor Manju Jaidka, Department of English & Cultural Studies, Panjab University, on her inclusion in the Administrator’s Advisory Council, to advise the Chandigarh Administration on developmental issues and policy matters affecting the Union Territory.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the information given by the Vice-Chancellor in his statement at Sr. Nos. 1, 2 and 4, be noted.

Items C-1 and C-25 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together.

Professor R.P. Bambah was not present when following Item C-1 on the agenda was taken up for consideration.

III. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-1 and C-25** on the agenda were read out, viz. –

C-1. That, in accordance with Section 23 of P.U. Act at page 9 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, it be recommended to Senate and the Chancellor that honorary degree of Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*) be conferred on Professor R.P. Bambah, Padam Bhushan awardee, former President, Indian Science Congress and world renowned Mathematician, on the ground that he, in the opinion of the Syndicate, by reasons of his eminent position and attainments, is a fit and proper person to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*).

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 9)

C-25. That, in accordance with Section 23 of P.U. Act at page 9 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, it be recommended to Senate and the Chancellor that honorary degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*Honoris Causa*) be conferred on Professor Gurdial Singh, the eminent writer from Punjab, on the ground that he, in the opinion of the Syndicate, by reasons of his eminent position and attainments, is a fit and proper person to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*Honoris Causa*) of Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 5.12.2013, Para 2)

The Vice-Chancellor stated that a few days ago, Professor R.P. Bambah had communicated to him that he is overwhelmed by the kindness of the Syndicate in recommending conferment of an *Honoris Causa* degree on him. However, as a sitting member of the Senate, he (Professor Bambah) is feeling uncomfortable to receive this award and has requested the Syndicate to withdraw the recommendation. The Syndicate has considered his request and reiterated its earlier decision and has requested him (Vice-Chancellor) to request Professor Bambah to accept their request. After the meeting of the Syndicate, he had talked to Professor Bambah and he has expressed his desire that he would not like to be persuaded to accept this degree.

Shri S.S. Johl stated that they all appreciate Professor Bambah's humbleness. In fact, Professor R.P. Bambah deserved more than this award as he is an outstanding Scientist and is not being awarded just because he is a member of the Senate, but because of his personality and achievements in life. Therefore, they must impress upon him to receive this award, as it is an honour to this University.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that Professor R.P. Bambah is not being conferred *Honoris Causa* Degree because of his being a member of the Senate, but because of he being a renowned Scientist. Earlier, Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon, the then Lok Sabha Speaker, and Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal, were conferred *Honoris Causa* Degree and they were also members of the Senate at that time. Professor R.P. Bambah is known for his knowledge, capability and respect, which he has earned not as Vice-Chancellor of this University, but as a teacher and his contributions to the entire world. They were fortunate that Professor Bambah is amongst them as a Senator. Members of the Senate, whether elected or nominated, are eminent persons. If the Syndicate or Senate decided to honour them, they must agree to their request. He, therefore, suggested that they should unanimously persuade Professor Bambah to accede to their request to accept the conferment of *Honoris Causa* Degree.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that when this information was shared by the Vice-Chancellor in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, the entire Syndicate unanimously resolved that Professor R.P. Bambah be requested to accept this honour. At the same time, the Syndicate appreciated his sentiments and gesture. Professor Bambah has set and established high standards, which they all appreciate. But they wanted to make him understand that even if he (Professor Bambah) was not a member of the Senate, he would have been conferred this *Honoris Causa* Degree. In fact, it would not be an honour to Professor R.P. Bambah, but an honour to the University itself.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Satya Pal Jain.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he had talked to Professor R.P. Bambah after the meeting of the Syndicate. Professor Bambah still called me up late yesterday evening saying that his personal viewpoint should be reiterated in the Senate. He (Vice-Chancellor) also told him several historical facts, including that in the golden jubilee year of the University several persons were conferred *Honoris Causa* Degrees and some of them were serving Professors & one of them was a sitting Vice-Chancellor and another Dean of University Instruction (Professor Shiv Ram Kashyap) of the University. Thus, the University recognizes great persons, serving teachers and Officers, who had made significant contributions and had high stature. He told him (Professor Bambah) all these things, but Professor Bambah insisted that his personal views and sentiments should be conveyed to the members of the Senate.

Professor D.V.S. Jain suggested that those, who knew Professor Bambah personally, should try to persuade him and request him not to decline this honour.

Dr. Yog Raj Angrish suggested that they should approve the conferment of *Honoris Causa* Degree on Professor R.P. Bambah and he should be persuaded to accept it.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that they all knew the achievements made by Professor R.P. Bambah. Recently, he got a book by the present Vice-Chancellor on Panjab University, Lahore. In that book, not only a reference, but paragraph/s on the achievements of Professor R.P. Bambah, have been given. Professor Bambah is connected with the University from Lahore. Meaning thereby, he is connected with the University since Maha-Punjab. Honouring Professor Bambah would definitely add new feather to Panjab University, which would be an honour to the University itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had told him all these things.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that Professor R.P. Bambah should be told that they are not honouring their own man, but a renowned Scientist.

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Section 23 of P.U. Act at page 9 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, it be recommended to the Chancellor that –

- (1) honorary degree of Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*) be conferred on Professor R.P. Bambah, Padam Bhushan awardee, former President, Indian Science Congress and world renowned Mathematician, on the ground that he, in the opinion of the Syndicate, by reasons of his eminent position and attainments, is a fit and proper person to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*) of Panjab University; and
- (2) honorary degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*Honoris Causa*) be conferred on Professor Gurdial Singh, the eminent writer from Punjab, on the ground that he, in the opinion of the Syndicate, by reasons of his eminent position and attainments, is a fit and proper person to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*Honoris Causa*) of Panjab University.

IV. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-2** on the agenda were read out, viz. –

C-2. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Virender Kumar Negi (w.e.f. 03.09.2012)	Assistant Professor in Law Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur
2.	Mrs. Vinay Sharma (w.e.f.19.09.2012)	
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(i))		
3.	Dr. Shashi Chaudhary (w. e. f. 27.11.2011) (i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 26.11.2011)	Human Genome Studies & Research
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(iii))		
4.	Dr. Meenu Aggarwal nee Gupta (w. e. f. 03.11.2009)	English & Cultural Studies
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(ix))		
5.	Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra nee Sophia Alphonse (w.e.f. 25.12.2010) (i.e. the date one day after completion of Orientation Course on 24.12.2010)	P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(xi))		

Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu said that since the U.G.C. has already extended the last date for doing Refresher/Orientation Course up to 31st December 2013, the date of promotion of Dr. Shashi Chaudhary and Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra nee Sophia Alphonse, who had been recommended for promotion w.e.f. 26.11.2011 and 24.12.2010, i.e., the date one day after completion of Refresher and Orientation Course, respectively, needed to be changed.

Dr. Jagwant Singh suggested that the promotion cases of above-said candidates should be approved, subject to correction of date of promotions, for which the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-2** on the agenda, be approved, with the modification that the date of promotion of Dr. Shashi Chaudhary and Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra nee Sophia Alphonse be finalized by the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Senate, keeping in view the last date for doing Refresher/Orientation Course extended by the U.G.C. up to 31st December 2013.

At this stage, Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that members of the PULTA (Panjab University Laboratory and Technical Staff Association) have handed over a memorandum to the members of the Senate. He pleaded that their item should be placed before the

next meeting of Board of Finance. He added that if the University authorities did not carry their people along, how would they be able to run the University efficiently.

Shri Deepak Kaushik informed that it had already been decided by the Syndicate and Senate that the Laboratory and Technical Staff would be given parity with the Ministerial Staff.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that there are certain posts in the University, the pay-scales of which are not determined by the Punjab Government and the pay-scales of those posts are decided by the University itself. In 1992, the Senate had taken a decision to give them pay-scales corresponding to their counterparts in the Clerical cadre. This time, the problem arose when the item pertaining to grant of Pay-Scales/Grade Pay to Laboratory and Technical Staff, which was approved by the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Board of Finance, was placed before the Board of Finance, and the representative of Punjab Government had said that they be given these benefits w.e.f. the date of decision taken by the Board of Finance and not with retrospective effect. Dr. Jagwant Singh pleaded that the Laboratory and Technical Staff should be granted these benefits from the date these have been given to their counterparts in the Ministerial cadre.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the matter would be placed before the Board of Finance.

V. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-3, C-4 and C-5 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-3. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Kewal Krishan (w. e. f. 28.01.2013)	Anthropology
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(ii))		
2.	Dr. Vikas (w. e. f. 02.06.2013)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(iv))		
3.	Dr. Prabha Vig (w.e.f. 03.03.2009)	Life Long Learning & Extension
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(v))		
4.	Dr. Jatinder Grover (w.e.f. 19.07.2012) Assistant Professor in Education	University School of Open Learning
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(vi))		
5.	Dr. (Mrs.) Renu Thakur (w.e.f. 26.09.2011)	Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(vii))		

6.	Dr. Gaurav Verma (w.e.f. 01.03.2013)	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(viii))		
7	Dr. Chanchal Narang (w.e.f. 06.07.2013) Assistant Professor in English	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(xi))		
8.	Dr. Navneet Kaur Arora (w.e.f. 06.07.2013) Assistant Professor in Sociology	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 2(xii))		
9.	Dr. Sasha (w.e.f. 06.07.2013) Assistant Professor in History	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(v))		

C-4. That Dr. Jagtar Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4) in the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions), with effect from **01.04.2013**, 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.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(ix))

C-5. That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (Subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) in the pay-scale of ₹37400-67000 + AGP ₹10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Gauri Sharma Professor of History w.e.f. 19.03.2012 (i.e. from the date of fulfilment of API score)	Evening Studies
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(iv))		
2.	Dr. Seema Vinayak (w.e.f. 05.08.2010)	Psychology
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(vi))		
3.	Dr. Yograj Angrish (w.e.f. 17.07.2010)	Punjabi
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(vii))		
4.	Dr. Harmesh Kumar (w.e.f. 06.06.2013)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(viii))		
5.	Dr. Devinder Singh (w.e.f. 20.07.2012)	Laws
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(x))		

NOTE: The letter of promotion to the above appointees (under item C-2 to C-5) have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

VI. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

C-6. That –

- (1) since the posts were advertised on regular basis, the appointments of both the persons, i.e., Dr. Puneet Kapoor, Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia and Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, be treated as regular on probation; and
- (2) the condition/s imposed by the Selection Committees on the appointment of Dr. Hemant Batra and Dr. Arun Garg as Professor and Reader/Associate Professor respectively, be waived off and their appointment be treated on regular basis from the date of their eligibility.

NOTE: 1. That a small Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider and recommend the terms & conditions, including payment of HRA and other allowances, for persons appointed and to be appointed on *ad hoc* basis.

2. The decision at Sr. No. (1) and (2) above has been implemented in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 4)

Initiating discussion, Dr. Krishan Gauba stated that the University regularized the services of two Doctors, namely Dr. (Ms.) Puneet Kapoor, Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia and Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics at Dr. Harvash Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, which was a very good decision taken by the University authorities. Though these posts were advertised on regular basis, the Selection Committee appointed them on contract basis only for a period of one year. According to him, the Selection Committee could not change the status of the advertisement. If the Selection Committee did not find any suitable candidate, it could recommend re-advertisement of the posts. He, however, suggested that since there are other similar cases, those persons who had been appointed on contract/temporary basis on the recommendation of the Selection Committees despite the fact that the posts were advertised on regular basis, all such cases should be looked into and decided accordingly.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath stated that the University authorities could not regularize the services of these Doctors as they were appointed on contract basis only for one year on the recommendation of the Selection Committees, which comprised of highly qualified Doctors, such as Professor V.P. Kamboj (Chancellor's nominee), Professor Tarlochan

Singh Punia, Head, Department of Anaesthesia, Government Medical College, Patiala, Professor (Mrs.) Jyotsna Wig, Head, Department of Anaesthesia, PGIMER, Chandigarh, Dr. Raj Bahadur, Dean, Faculty of Medical Science and Director-Principal, Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, and Dr. Ashish Jain, Principal-cum-Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital (for Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia) and Professor B.L. Chakoo (Chancellor's Nominee), Dr. O.P. Kharbanda, Centre for Dental Education & Research, All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), New Delhi, Professor A.K. Utreja, Oral Health Sciences Centre, PGIMER, Chandigarh, Professor Sridhar Kannan, Professor of Orthodontics, Sudha Rastogi Dental College, Faridabad. Only single candidate appeared in the interview for both the posts. After interviewing the candidates and taking into consideration their academic record, teaching & research experience, publications and other academic contribution, the Selection Committees recommended appointment of both Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta as Professor in Orthodontics and Dr. (Ms.) Puneet Kapoor as Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia on contract basis and *ad hoc* basis, respectively, for one year. The Selection Committees did not find any person suitable for appointment on regular basis. Hence, they recommended appointments on contract and *ad hoc* basis, that too, for one year. The items relating to their appointments were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 8.9.2012/6.10.2012, which were approved and endorsed to the Senate for approval. Ultimately, the Senate approved the recommendations of the Selection Committees and the Syndicate in its meeting on 22.12.2012 and appointed Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta as Professor in Orthodontics and Dr. (Ms.) Puneet Kapoor as Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia on contract basis and *ad hoc* basis for one year, respectively. In that very meeting of the Senate, Professor B.S. Bhoop had raised the issue of A.P.I. score on the basis of taking into consideration the qualifications, experience, etc. obtained by the candidates up to the last date of submission of applications instead of up to the date of interview, which led to appointment of Sub-Committee. The scope of consideration for the Sub-Committee was to assess the candidates as per the qualifications, experience, publications up to the last date of submission of applications and not up to the date of interview. The Vice-Chancellor was authorized to modify the recommendations of the Selection Committees accordingly. She did not know how the services of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta appointed as Professor in Orthodontics and Dr. (Ms.) Puneet Kapoor appointed as Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia on contract basis and *ad hoc* basis, respectively, for one year, had been regularized in the regular pay-scales. She pleaded that the matter should be got investigated from an independent agency, like C.B.I., Vigilance, etc. When a person is appointed on contract/*ad hoc* basis for a period of one year, how his/her services could be regularized? As per Regulation 6.1 at Page 112 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume 1, 2007, the Syndicate could either accept or reject the recommendations of the Selection Committees, but had no power to convert appointment from contract/ *ad hoc* basis to regular basis. She, therefore, pleaded that these posts should be re-advertised; otherwise, it would bring frustration amongst the faculty members who have been appointed on contract/*ad hoc* basis and continuing as such. Secondly, it might lead to litigation against the University. She reiterated that all these posts should be re-advertised and the persons, who have been appointed on contract/*ad hoc* basis, should compete with other competitors. To avoid frustration amongst the staff, this item should not be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these posts were advertised on regular basis, but the Selection Committees appointed these persons on contract/ *ad hoc* basis. Therefore, what is correct is correct. However, the Syndicate had reasons for converting these contract/*ad hoc* into regular ones.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that these two appointments are not comparable. As far as the appointment of Dr. (Ms.) Puneet Kapoor is concerned, there is a technical hitch as her thesis was cleared by the Syndicate on the last date. As far as the appointment of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta as Professor in Orthodontics was concerned, he was shown 'not suitable' for appointment as Professor in Orthodontics on regular basis by the Selection Committee and was recommended for appointment on contract/*ad hoc* basis for

a period of one year. The Syndicate had accepted the recommendation of the Selection Committee in its meeting held on 8.9.2012/6.10.2012. He pleaded that in case these appointments were regularized, it would open a Pandora's Box and would also be a disrespect to the Selection Committee. Moreover, it would also be a favour to certain persons, which might be a stigma to the Syndicate. He, therefore, pleaded that the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in the item under consideration should not be accepted and the posts should be re-advertised.

Dr. Mukesh Arora enquired who and why item pertaining to conversion of appointment of Dr. (Ms.) Puneet Kapoor and Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, who were appointed on *ad hoc* and contract basis, respectively, into regular basis was placed before the Syndicate? He said that the Syndicate could either accept or reject the recommendations of the Selection Committees but could not alter the same.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, if he recalled correctly, there was a recommendation of the Selection Committee. First of all, the Selection Committee had made recommendations, which appeared to be at variance with what was advertised. So when they considered, they said that the Syndicate would take a call on it. Whatever was recommended was placed before the Syndicate and the Syndicate unanimously decided that the recommendation of the Selection Committee were at variance with the advertisement, they should stick to what was advertised. As such, the Syndicate had a viewpoint. Now, the Senate is the final authority and if it thinks that the viewpoint of the Syndicate is not acceptable to it, the Senate could take a call on it. However, the Syndicate had not done anything which was not in its prerogative. Now, they are at the end of one year. The Syndicate had exercised its prerogative and now, they could exercise their prerogative.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the letters regarding conversion of these appointments from contract/*ad hoc* basis to regular basis as per decision of the Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 should not have been issued to the concerned persons in anticipation of approval of the Senate. They should have been issued letters after the approval of the Senate.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Mukesh Arora.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur said that since the Selection Committees had recommended these appointments on contract/*ad hoc* basis, nobody has the authority to convert these appointments into regular ones.

On a point of order, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that if the post is advertised on regular basis and only one candidate appeared in the interview, but the Selection Committee did not find him/her suitable, it could recommend him/her for appointment on contract/ *ad hoc* basis keeping in view the shortage of teaching staff. There are about 30 such cases in this University. As such, they had done this in large number of cases, especially in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, wherein single person, who appeared in the interviews, was not found suitable. For appointing persons on regular basis, the posts are required to be re-advertised. Secondly, the recommendations of the Selection Committees were accepted by the Syndicate and the Senate. Now, nobody had the authority to issue letters regarding conversion of appointment from contract/*ad hoc* basis into regular basis, in anticipation of approval of the Senate. Thus, issuance of orders/letters to the persons, in anticipation of approval of the Senate, was a serious matter.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that when the posts were advertised on regular basis, the Selection Committees had no authority to recommend appointments on contract/*ad hoc* basis. Even if suitable candidates were not found, the Selection Committee should have recommended re-advertisement of the posts, instead of recommending appointment on contract/*ad hoc* basis. If they had done something wrong, they had every right to correct it. Since the contract/*ad hoc* basis was wrongly

written in the minutes of the Selection Committee, the Syndicate had rightly corrected it, though later on.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur suggested that clear-cut instructions should be given to the Selection Committees, whether they could recommend contract/*ad hoc* appointments to teach the students where there is a shortage of teachers if suitable candidate/s for appointment on regular basis is/are not found.

Dr. Krishan Gauba stated that Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital was established and started in the year 2006 and he was there as Director-Principal till 2011. He had seen many appointments wherein advertisements were made for appointing Doctors on regular basis and the candidates also appeared in the interviews before the Selection Committees, but since suitable candidates were not found, they made appointments on contract/*ad hoc* basis in view of the fact that they wanted to get approval from the Dental Council of India. Now, if they wanted to regularize their services, they should evolve a mechanism for regularizing the services of all such candidates provided they are qualified/eligible, instead of adopting pick and choose policy.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that when they examined this issue in the Syndicate meeting dated 8.10.2013, it was felt that since the posts were advertised on regular basis, they decided to treat the appointees appointed on regular basis instead of contract/*ad hoc* basis. As per Regulations, all appointments are subject to the approval of the Senate and the regulations clearly define the role of the Syndicate and Senate. Whatever decision is taken by the Syndicate, the Senate had every right to change it. But he took a strong exception to the plea made by Mrs. Anu Chatrath that the matter regarding conversion of these appointments from contract/*ad hoc* basis to regular basis, that too, in anticipation of approval of the Senate, should be got investigated from an intelligence agency, like Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI). He would like to recall that when this item was discussed, he did not participate in it most of the time. But he would like to tell that the person/s concerned is/are eligible for the posts. The Selection Committee should have made recommendations according to the advertisement as it had no right to go beyond the advertised conditions. Were they laying a policy that the post should be filled as advertised and the Selection Committee should go according to the advertisement? The nature of appointment/post should not be changed by the Selection Committee. Everybody said 'yes' and accordingly the policy was laid down that if the post is advertised on regular basis, appointment should also be made on regular basis. However, if the Selection Committee did not find anybody suitable, in case of urgency of appointing a teacher for teaching the students, there should be a separate recommendation from the experts or the Vice-Chancellor that such and such person should be appointed on *ad hoc*/contract basis for the specific period. He added that if there are any more such cases, all these must be treated equally and the same policy should be applied in their cases also.

Shri Dinesh Kumar stated that exactly the impression which one could draw is that all the members of the Syndicate tried to frame a policy as told by Dr. Jagwant Singh, but unfortunately there is no mention of any policy in the resolved part of the proceedings. Rather, this is a decision taken in certain individual cases, which created doubt in his mind and minds of certain other members. He did not know under which provision of the Calendar, the contract/*ad hoc* appointments of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta and Dr. Puneet Kapoor for a period of one year has been converted into regular appointment. Secondly, how and under which provision Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, who was appointed Professor of Orthodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital on contract basis for a period of one year, was allowed to act as Head of the Department despite there being a regular Associate Professor in Orthodontics. This again created doubt in their minds. Dr. Krishan Gauba has rightly informed that 50% of the staff at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital has been selected following the same criterion. If they wanted to frame any particular policy, they have to constitute a Committee to finalize the terms and conditions for regularizing

the services of all of them. As far as this case is concerned, it is not a policy decision and has led to discrimination. He, therefore, pleaded that the recommendations of the Syndicate should not be approved.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that the contract/*ad hoc* appointments of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta and Dr. Puneet Kapoor for a period of one year was placed before the Senate and the same were approved. At that time, a Committee comprising Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, Shri Satya Pal Jain, and others was constituted for framing a policy for regularization of services of non-teaching employees, who have been working in the University on daily-wage/contract basis for the last 10-20 years. The Committee had taken a decision and framed a policy and had recommended for following the said policy. Instead of implementing the said policy, legal opinion had been sought on it from the University Legal Retainer. One year had already lapsed, but nothing had been done in this regard. He, therefore, pleaded that the recommendations of the afore-said Committee, including the policy framed, should be placed before the Senate today itself and the decision be taken.

At this stage, Professor R.P. Bambah entered the House to attend the meeting of the Senate. He was welcomed by all the members by thumping of desks.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that may he convey the sentiments of the House regarding conferment of *Honoris Causa* Degree on Professor R.P. Bambah. The members had expressed that the House would feel honoured if he (Professor Bambah) gives his consent to accept the *Honoris Causa* Degree in the year to commemorate 150 years of Higher Education in Punjab. The University would be honoured if he consented to the plea of the Senate.

On a point of order, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath and certain other members said that, in fact, the consent from Professor R.P. Bambah is not required.

Professor R.P. Bambah agreed to accept the offer of conferment of *Honoris Causa* Degree on him.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that a Committee had already framed a policy for regularizing the services of Daily-wage/contract basis employees. It was a matter of interpretation only. In the meeting of the Committee, the Registrar had given the assurance on record that nobody needs to go to Court as the employees who had put in more than 10 years or more service in the University, their services would be regularized. Nobody had gone to the court and they had not terminated the services of any employee. The Court had wanted only one thing that a policy should be framed for regularization of the services of persons working on contract/daily-wage basis for more than 10 years. He was surprised as to why this issue has been lingering on?

Shri Munish Verma stated that they should not take decision keeping in view a particular person. Instead they should follow the Regulations and Rules of the University. Since these persons were appointed on contract/*ad hoc* basis, their services could not be regularized. He suggested that the posts should be re-advertised and the persons could apply again and compete with other candidates.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that the Selection Committee could not change the nature of the post. In fact, the Selection Committee had to recommend filling up of the post as per the advertised conditions. If the University did not follow this, the Managements of the Colleges would fill up all the teaching positions either on contract or *ad hoc* basis.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that the issue should be got legally examined from all aspects and in the meanwhile, the consideration of the matter be deferred. He added that two issues are involved in it – as per University Calendar, the Selection Committee could either make recommendations as per advertisement or make recommendation for

re-advertisement of the post, but cannot change the nature of the post. If no suitable candidate is found, the Vice-Chancellor could make recommendation for appointing a person on *ad hoc*/contract basis, but the Selection Committee could not. Though there was no provision for making contract/*ad hoc* appointment, the Syndicate and Senate had approved the appointments of these persons on contract/*ad hoc* basis for a period of one year. That was why the Syndicate reconsidered the issue and recommended conversion of their appointment from contract/*ad hoc* basis to regular basis. In the end, he suggested that legal opinion should be sought on the issue and the matter should be placed before the Senate in its next meeting.

On a point of order, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that in the 80's, Dr. Gurpal Singh Multani was appointed Lecturer in Chemistry in one of the affiliated Colleges for a period of one year. Later on, the University treated him on probation and regularized his services.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that the question was how they were practically following regulations and rules. Many times when they go to the affiliated Colleges as members of the Selection Committees, it happens that the post has been advertised on regular basis but since no suitable candidate is found, the Selection Committee recommends that the post should be re-advertised. At that point of time, the Principal of the concerned College, keeping in view their problem, often insists that they should select someone on contract/*ad hoc* basis, so that the teaching of that subject does not suffer. She had been personally facing this problem repeatedly. She had been asking the Management of the College concerned to do it at their own level. Though every College appoints persons on *ad hoc*/temporary basis against the regularly advertised posts, there is no such policy. As such, different Selection Committees follow different yardsticks and variations existed there. If they open up previous cases, they would find all kinds of examples. She, therefore, suggested that for having uniformity, clear-cut instructions should be issued to the Selection Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that instead of giving general suggestions, the members should make specific suggestions. The Senate has to take specific decisions and frame specific policy, as general policies are already there. He, therefore, suggested that they should find solution to this problem and should not open general discussion. The issue is that the Selection Committee had done something which *prima facie* was not acceptable. The Syndicate had examined it and made recommendations, which had been implemented in anticipation of the approval of the Senate. Now, it looked that the majority of the Senate members are not in favour of approving the recommendations of the Syndicate. If somebody has anything additional to say, he/she should proceed.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi observed that to tide over a particular situation, the Selection Committee had recommended appointments of these persons on contract/*ad hoc* basis. If they convert these contract/*ad hoc* appointments into regular ones, they would be undermining the assessment of the Selection Committees.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it is crystal clear that these posts were advertised on regular basis and the duly constituted Selection Committees had recommended appointments on contract/*ad hoc* basis instead of regular basis. The Selection Committee was headed by the Vice-Chancellor which felt that the candidate concerned was not suitable for appointment on regular basis. Here comes the question that the Selection Committee had no right to recommend appointments on contract/*ad hoc* basis, but they had seen many a times that wherever the Selection Committees did not find suitable candidate for regular appointment, they recommend appointment on contract/*ad hoc* basis. This had also been narrated by Professor Rajesh Gill. The Colleges pleaded with the Chairmen of the Selection Committees to allow them to appoint teachers on contract/*ad hoc* basis to teach the students wherever they did not find any suitable candidate. As Chairman of the Selection Committee, they ask them to do so at their own level. Somehow, in the instant cases, it had not happened. They could not accept this logic for regularizing these contract/*ad hoc* appointments under any circumstance.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that when the posts were advertised on regular basis, the Selection Committee should not have recommended the appointments on contract/*ad hoc* basis. In fact, it is a great injustice to the candidates. The Dean, College Development Council should be instructed to issue clear-cut instructions to the members of the Selection Committees as per the provisions of the University Calendar. If the post is advertised on regular basis, the same should be filled in on regular basis and not on contract/*ad hoc* basis. Sometimes something is done by mistake and sometimes mistake is made intentionally.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that in the instant cases, the fault lays with the Selection Committees and not with the candidates. He was of the view that if the post is advertised on regular basis, it could not be filled in on contract/*ad hoc* basis.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that when the issue was considered in the meeting of the Syndicate, it was found that there were two similar appointments. In one case, the person was recommended for appointments on contract basis and in the other, the person was recommended for appointment on *ad hoc* basis. During discussion, there was a contention that when the decision was sent to the office, the office had prepared a note stating that there was no provision for making appointments on contract/*ad hoc* basis. When they could change the appointment from *ad hoc* basis to contract basis, why can't from contract/*ad hoc* to regular basis. The Selection Committees were not clear about their jurisdiction and made different recommendations in two similar cases, which was confusing and wrong. But the candidates were not at fault at all.

On a point of order, Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that when one of the members, referring to contract appointment of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, made a query, the Vice-Chancellor had, at that point of time, replied that these were the recommendations of the experts and not the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Selection Committee had done something which was not in accordance with the advertised conditions. The matter came to the Syndicate, which considered the issue keeping in view its special nature and the regulations of the Dental Council of India (DCI). Dr. Krishan Gauba, who had remained Director-Principal of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital for quite some time, had told that such things had been happening in the Dental Institute. At the end of one year, the Syndicate took a call and made recommendations to the Senate. The office should not have put up the note and if put up by the office, he should have stopped it. As such, he had erred in his judgement. Now, the sentiment of the Senate is that they should re-advertise the posts and make selections accordingly. He, however, added that they were dealing with the professionals, who are highly qualified and respected. They should not put their career at stake. As such, they have to find a practical way out of the situation.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that the Syndicate has decided to regularize the services of these persons keeping in view that these posts were advertised on regular basis. The Selection Committees had committed a mistake by recommending these persons on contract/*ad hoc* basis. As per the regulations, the Selection Committee could only select or reject the persons, but could not change the status of the appointments. The Syndicate has taken this decision keeping in view the larger interest of the teachers working in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital on contract/*ad hoc* basis and they were facing lot of problems as far as payment of HRA and certain other allowances are concerned. If they framed a policy, it would open a Pandora's Box and taking a cue from it, the affiliated Colleges would also start doing this. He, however, said that the feelings/sentiments of the Syndicate are not fully narrated in this House. He pleaded that the consideration of the item should be deferred and should be placed before the Senate in its next meeting along with all other similar cases which are pending since the establishment of this Institution. He added that Regulations for appointing persons on *ad hoc*/contract basis do not exist in the University Calendar.

Certain persons are working in the Dental Institute as Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors on contract/*ad hoc* basis for the last 5-6 years and they were not being given certain allowances, including HRA.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the recommendations of the Selection Committees regarding appointments of these persons on contract/*ad hoc* basis were placed before the Syndicate for the first time in its meeting held on 6.10.2012. He would like to correct Mrs. Anu Chatrath to the fact that at that time Professor R.C. Sobti was not the Vice-Chancellor of the University, but Professor Arun Kumar Grover was. The selection though had been made under the chairmanship of Professor R.C. Sobti. She has referred to a particular question, which is a part of the proceedings, posed by him to the Vice-Chancellor that is it within the purview of the Selection Committee to change the nature of the post as advertised? His question was, is it within the purview of the Selection Committee to change the template then and there, that too, by adopting a template which was not approved by the Syndicate and Senate or for that matter any other body of the University? The Vice-Chancellor must be remembering that he had replied that since these interviews were conducted before his joining the University as Vice-Chancellor, it was his duty to place the recommendations of the Selection Committees before the Syndicate and he would not comment as far as what and how the things had happened. Dr. Mukesh Arora had also expressed similar opinion in that meeting because allegations were levelled as if they were against somebody.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he was only trying to explain the background. When the item was approved by the Syndicate, he had recorded his dissent with the remarks that the Selection Committees had flouted the procedure of the selection process laid down by the University. Though he was not against approval of appointment of any candidate, at the same time, the Selection Committees had no right to change the template. As told by Dr. Krishan Gauba, it was brought to the notice of the Syndicate that it is not for the first time that the posts were advertised on regular basis and the appointments were made on contract/*ad hoc* basis. To this, he had responded by saying that they are not against anybody, especially those, who are appointed at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital as Assistant Professor on regular basis and thereafter appointed as Associate Professors on contract basis, as they were losing certain benefits, including payment of HRA and residential accommodation at the Campus. On the one side, they were offered higher ranks as Associate Professor/Professor and on the other side, they lost certain benefits. Ultimately, it was decided by the Syndicate that all such appointees, who have been appointed/promoted against regularly advertised posts, should be considered eligible for all the benefits, including payment of HRA and allotment of accommodation at the Campus. At that time, it was also discussed that such an exploitation was not done even by the private Institutions. As per norms of the Dental Council of India (DCI), they needed to fill up the vacant posts at the Dental Institute on regular basis. But instead of appointing persons on regular basis, they prefer to appoint them on contract/*ad hoc* basis just to seek approval from the DCI. The Dental Institute was established in the year 2006 and in the initial phase the Selection Committees recommended appointment on contract/*ad hoc* basis against the regularly advertised posts, and they were still continuing with the same policy. To the regularization of such persons, some members were saying that it would be illegal, whereas they had already committed an illegality by appointing them on contract/*ad hoc* basis against the posts, which were advertised on regular basis. It was decided by the Syndicate that all such cases where such an excess had been committed, should be looked into and, in future, no appointment on contract/*ad hoc* should be made where the posts were advertised on regular basis. However, if they feel that they might be denying best talent, it should be incorporated in the advertisement that in case suitable candidates is/are not found, the post/s would be filled on contract/*ad hoc* basis, so that the candidates, who wanted to apply in the University know this fact while seeking No Objection Certificate (NOC). Dr. Krishan Gauba knew better that Private Dental Colleges/Institutes did not issue NOC easily. Sometimes, the persons concerned have to resign their job for appearing in interview for a regular post and if they are appointed on contract/*ad hoc* basis, it would be a great

injustice to them. In the light of this, he did not oppose their appointments and also does not oppose now. Whatever decision they wanted to take, their motive should be to protect the act of the Syndicate.

Shri Munish Verma informed that when these posts were advertised, Professor R.C. Sobti was the Vice-Chancellor of this University and only single candidate appeared in the interviews for both these posts.

Shri S.S. Johl suggested that since the term of the incumbents was one year, it should be extended for another six months. In the meanwhile, these posts should be re-advertised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these posts would be advertised on the same pattern and conditions as were advertised in 2011.

RESOLVED: That the term of appointment of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta as Professor in Orthodontics and Dr. (Ms.) Puneet Kapoor as Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital appointed on contract and *ad hoc* basis, respectively for a period of one year, be extended for a period of six months in the first instance. In the meanwhile, these posts be re-advertised on the same pattern and conditions as were in 2011.

At this stage, Professor Naval Kishore stated that in a similar case in the year 2008, he was a nominee of the Vice-Chancellor in one of the Selection Committees for making appointment in Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh, against the post which was advertised on regular basis. The Selection Committee made appointment of Dr. Purnima on temporary basis but likely to be continued. She worked against that post for 3-4 years. Then suddenly, the College Management appointed another person as Lecturer and Dr. Purnima filed a writ petition in the Court. The issue of her appointment was raised by Dr. Pritam Singh Gill, former Syndic and Senator for 3-4 times and enquired as to why the girl was being exploited by the College by appointing another person, especially when she was appointed on temporary but likely to be continued basis. Ultimately, there was consensus in the Senate that the matter should be looked into and her appointment should be approved on regular basis.

VII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-7 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-7. That, in principle, the basic Pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor, UIAMS, be re-fixed at ₹19630+6000 (AGP) on account of increment given by her previous employer, mentioned in the revised LPC submitted by her w.e.f. the date of her joining with the P.U. on 19.8.2008, subject to clarification from her previous employer.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 6)

Initiating discussion, Shri Lilu Ram said that since there were more similar cases pending, all those should be looked into and taken care of by the Vice-Chancellor and, thereafter, reported to the Senate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that though the Vice-Chancellor has given benefits to the incumbents by counting of previous service as authorized by the Syndicate in 2007, the RAO had raised objection to that.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath clarified that the U.G.C. had made the things clear that the teachers appointed in the Universities are entitled to get benefits of their past service. Accordingly, they had granted this benefit to certain persons.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-7 on the agenda**, be approved.

VIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-8 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-8. That the following Personal Assistants be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch/Department	Date of Promotion	Date of Confirmation
1.	Shri Mahinder Pal Office of the Vice-Chancellor	17.04.2009	20.09.2010
2.	Mrs. Urmil Gupta Office of the F.D.O.	15.06.2009	21.09.2010
3.	Mrs. Meena Vij Department of Physics	29.06.2009	01.03.2011

NOTE: The date of confirmation of these Personal Assistants is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 7)

IX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-9, on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-9. That the appointments of the following persons be approved:

1. Shri Rattandeep Chawla, Assistant Professor in Computer Science at Ramgarhia Girls College, Ludhiana;
2. Shri Ram Pal, Assistant Professor in Music Vocal at Guru Nanak National College, Doraha (Ludhiana); and
3. Shri Varinder Kumar, Assistant Professor in Bioinformatics at G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32, Chandigarh.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 10)

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the item related to approval of appointment of teachers in the affiliated Colleges. To his mind, the issue is related to eligibility of persons for the post of Assistant Professors in different subjects. He, therefore, pleaded that it should not be approved; rather, it should be noted as an information.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar pointed out that there were four cases and only three cases were placed here. He enquired as to why the fourth case, viz. the case of Mr. Manjit Singh in whose case, the Dean, College Development Council, was authorized to verify if the candidate had already acquired M.Phil. degree at the time of advertisement of the post, has not been placed before the Senate.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Dinesh Talwar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the fourth case, viz. the case of Mr. Manjit Singh, Assistant Professor in Computer Science at Malwa College, Bondli - Samrala, would be examined.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that the recommendations of the Committee should have been accepted at the level of the Syndicate and should not have been placed before the Senate for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the observation made by Dr. Kuldip Singh is well taken.

Shri Dinesh Kumar stated that the University had constituted a Committee to look into the problem and find a solution for appointment of Assistant Professors in the subjects in which the University Grants Commission did not conduct NET, e.g., Police Administration, etc. In this subject, they made eligible the candidates who had done M.A. in Public Administration. He added that a post of Assistant Professor in the subject of Public Administration at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, had recently been advertised. Since several subjects are taught in the Law course, the persons who had NET in the subject of Public Administration or M.A. (Police Administration) with LL.M. should also be made eligible for this post. As Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, is a newly established Institute, they did not require a full-time teacher in the subject of Public Administration. If the person having LL.M. and M.A. in Public Administration is appointed, they could utilize his/her services for teaching the students of LL.B. 5-Year Integrated Course. Further, a Committee had already been constituted by the Vice-Chancellor comprising teachers only from affiliated Colleges for such inter-disciplinary posts. He suggested that a few teachers from the University should also be associated in the said Committee.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that the Committee referred to by Shri Dinesh Kumar was constituted by the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Dinesh Kumar should give a note to him on the issue.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item C-9 on the agenda**, be noted.

X. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-10 and C-11, on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-10. That Shri Sandeep Chopra be appointed Senior Law Officer in the Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.7400/- (initial pay of Rs.31,120/-) plus allowances as admissible under the University rules.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(i))

C-11. That Shri Sushant Batish be appointed Law Officer in the Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- (initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) plus allowances as admissible under the University rules.

WAITING LIST

Ms. Shagun Sachdev.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(ii))

XI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-12, on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-12. That the following persons be promoted as Reader in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (Old Scheme) (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.12000-420-18300 (unrevised) now revised to Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

1. Dr. Navleen Kaur - 01.10.2006 (on account of Senior-Scale as Project Officer).
2. Dr. Anuradha Sharma - 01.10.2008 (on account of Senior-Scale as Project Officer).

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 29(xi)).

XII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-13 and C-14 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-13. That Shri Arun Raina S/o Shri B.N. Raina be appointed Technical Officer (Biotechnology Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+Grade Pay of Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules and his pay be fixed as per University rules.

WAITING LIST

Shri Sukhpal Singh S/o Shri Mohinder Pal Singh

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 32)

C-14. That Mr. Jai Kumar S/o Shri Prem Chand be appointed Technical Officer (Electronics & Communication Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + Grade Pay of Rs.5000/- plus allowances as per University rules and his pay be fixed as per University rules.

WAITING LIST

Mr. Sanjeev Bhatia S/o Shri Ramesh Bhatia.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 34)

NOTE: The letter of promotion/appointment to the above appointees (under item C-11 to C-14) have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

XIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-15. That sum of ₹8,00,000/- and ₹50,53,500/-, be sanctioned out of the 'Estate Fund Account' (Non-Plan) for renovation of Law Auditorium and English Auditorium respectively, be approved, in principle. An appropriate Committee comprising Professor Keshav Malhotra and Finance & Development Officer be constituted to see the actual requirement for this renovation job and oversee the renovation work.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 13)

XIV. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-16, C-17 and C-18 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-16. That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to D.M. College, Moga, for Certificate Add-On course in Fashion Designing & Insurance Business, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2013-14.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 20)

C-17. That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur (Hoshiarpur), for Foundation Course (2-3 months) and Certificate course (3-6 months) Political Science, under the Scheme of Human Rights Education under Plan, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing course, for the session 2012-13.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 21)

C-18. That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to A.S. College for Women, Khanna, for Certificate Add-On courses in (i) Communicative English and (ii) Computer Based Accounting, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2013-14.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 22)

At this stage, Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, stated that they in Chandigarh have some Government Colleges, which are facing problem because of different nomenclature on record. Way back in the year 2010, the Chandigarh Administration had changed the nomenclature of all Government Colleges situated in U.T. Chandigarh after seeking approval from the competent authorities and the name of the Colleges were suggested as Post-Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, Post-Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh, Post-Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh and Post-Graduate Government College, Sector 46, Chandigarh. The information was sent to the Panjab University, University Grants Commission and the NAAC. But the Syndicate had approved the nomenclature as Government Post-Graduate Colleges, etc. Now, the Administration is facing a lot of problem while getting grants from the University Grants Commission and also at the time of accreditation from the NAAC. He, therefore, pleaded that the nomenclature of all the Government Colleges in Chandigarh be approved as proposed by the Administration earlier, i.e., Post-Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, Post-Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh, Post-Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh and Post-Graduate Government College, Sector 46, Chandigarh.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar suggested that all the privately managed Colleges wherein the postgraduate classes are being run, should also be allowed to change the nomenclature on the pattern of Government Colleges situated in Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the request/s come from the Managements/Principals of the Colleges, which wanted to change the nomenclature of their College.

RESOLVED: That the nomenclature of the Government Colleges situated in Chandigarh be approved as under:

1. Post-Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh;
2. Post-Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh;
3. Post-Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh; and
4. Post-Graduate Government College, Sector 46, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take a decision on the request/s of Managements/Principals of the affiliated Colleges, if received, for change of similar nomenclature, on behalf of the Senate.

XV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-19. That –

- (1) permanent affiliation granted to the Colleges by the University does not grant immunity to such Colleges w.r.t. the subsequent deficiencies and shortage and such Colleges cannot arbitrarily refuse inspection as the Colleges have to undergo for inspection and the University could send Inspection Committee/s to any College at any time and any number of times. Further, the Colleges have to follow the norms laid down by the University under any circumstance and if at any moment, the University has any doubt, the University could send Surprise Teams;
- (2) the Colleges, which did not meet the deficiencies/conditions imposed by the Inspection Committees, be issued show cause notices as to why action be not taken against them;
- (3) the replies received to the show cause notices be placed before the Syndicate for consideration;
- (4) the cases of the Colleges, replies from which are not received within the stipulated time, be placed before the Syndicate and their cases for affiliation for the session 2014-15 be **not** considered; and
- (5) all the affiliated Colleges, including Colleges of Education, be asked to put the names of the faculty members working in their respective Colleges on their website, so that the University/ members of the Inspection Committees could know as to which faculty member is working at which College.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu stated that when this item was discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate, he had on record said that he would like to know the names of the Colleges, which refused inspections by the University and told that no College had refused for inspection. He, therefore, pleaded that the words “such Colleges cannot arbitrarily refuse inspection” should be deleted. In fact, the Colleges were asked to get inspection done for extension of affiliation whereas they were already granted permanent affiliation.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that in the last meeting of the Senate, it was decided that the minimum number of regular teachers for Colleges of Education should be reduced from 6 to 5 and accordingly the report would be placed before the Senate in its next meeting. For temporary affiliation the minimum number of teachers should be reduced from 6 to 4. But nothing has been done so far in this direction.

Professor Naval Kishore clarified that these are the conditions of the National Council for Teachers Education (NCTE) and the power to give any relaxation rest with the Chairman of the NCTE and none else, that too for the State of Jammu & Kashmir.

Principal S.S. Sangha pointed out that even in the University teaching departments, the strength of the teachers was up to 50%. Why they did not apply the norms of the NCTE in the case of University teaching departments?

Professor Naval Kishore observed that even if they decided to reduce the minimum number of regular teachers from 6 to 5 or 4, the decision of the University would be challenged and there would be a number of cases in the Court on the issue. He added that, earlier, it was decided that the Inspection Committee would have to submit its report on the same day. Later on, it was pleaded in the Syndicate that since it is not possible to submit the report on the same day, it was decided that the report be submitted within a period of five days. Reports were not being submitted by the Inspection Committees for months together. Now, allegations were levelled against the Dean, College Development Council.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the Colleges, which fulfilled only 20% of the conditions and had deficiencies to the extent of 80%, are shown good in the record of the University because they showed everything in their papers. The sword hanged on those Colleges, which fulfilled 80% of the conditions and have only 20% deficiencies, because they did not make manipulations in their papers.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to suggest him a practical solution.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that earlier a Committee was constituted to deal with such situations. They have to divide the issue in two categories, i.e., temporary provisional affiliation and permanent affiliation. In the case of permanently affiliated Colleges, they have the right to hold the inspections only if the College concerned wanted to have affiliation for the new/additional course/s. If the course happened to be of 4 years duration, the inspection should be done for first three years only. If they found the work of the College up to the mark during this period, the College should be included as if it is a part of the permanent affiliation. Since he had been associated with this University for the last 48 years, he had observed that some of the problems had arisen because of establishment of the Council at the Central level. They have to distinguish between the two types of institutions, i.e., the institutions which are running for commercial purposes and are earning profits and those institutions which have

been established for the welfare of the people/society. They should help to grow those institutions, which are established for the welfare of the society.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired what is the difference between big defaulters and the small defaulters? Why should they not devise ways to protect institutions which are similar to the University?

Professor Naval Kishore said that they must ensure that whichever decision is taken by them, must withstand with the scrutiny of the law. He had with him the latest judgement of Allahabad High Court. According to this judgement, requisite number of qualified teachers is required in the institution before grant of affiliation and start of teaching. The very purpose of inspection is that the affiliating University is supposed to ensure that the College had requisite number of teachers and sufficient infrastructure. Principal Sangha is right that some of the Colleges submit manipulated papers and got affiliation from the University.

Shri K.K. Dhiman suggested that the University should ask each and every affiliated College/Institution to have a biometric system installed in the College/Institution, through which they would easily know which person is on the roll of which College/Institution.

Principal Puneet Bedi stated that like NAAC, they should have specific parameters for categorization of the Colleges, i.e., A-Grade Colleges, B-Grade Colleges and C-Grade Colleges. She, therefore, suggested that they should evolve specific parameters and clear-cut procedure for grant of affiliation and the same should be made known to the Colleges, so that the Colleges could prepare themselves accordingly; otherwise, different deficiencies to be pointed out by the Inspection Committees would continue to cause confusion.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that there should be similar parameters for similar courses irrespective of the fact whether the course is offered in the University or in an affiliated College. If the University did not fulfil the conditions itself, how could it ask the College to fulfil the same as the University did not have any moral and legal right?

Dr. Yograj Angrish and Principal Gurdip Sharma endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Kuldip Singh.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that, as per norms of NCTE, if any College of Education did not have 2/3 regular teachers, the Inspection Committees of the University pointed out the same as a deficiency.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that since there is a ban on recruitment of teachers in the State of Punjab, they could not compare themselves with other Universities and Colleges situated in other States/Union Territories.

Dr. Devinder Singh said that they were discussing the issue relating to filling up of teaching positions in the affiliated Colleges. What is the mechanism to gauge that there are vacant teaching positions in the University teaching departments because the University had appointed adequate number of teachers on regular basis, temporary/*ad hoc*/contract basis and had also engaged persons as Guest Faculty.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that if the University could not reduce the minimum number of regular teachers from 6 to 5/4, at least the recommendation should be sent to the NCTE for consideration.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19 on the agenda**, be approved with the modification that the words “such Colleges cannot arbitrarily refuse inspection” in recommendation (1) be treated as deleted.

XVI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-20 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-20. That the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate are videographed just to ensure that the minutes of the meetings are recorded correctly. Thus, it is not a public document and be not provided to the public.

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor said that since the decision pertaining to videographing of the proceeding of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate was earlier approved by the Senate, the recommendation/s of the Syndicate have to be placed before the Senate for approval.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 24)

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that the Syndicate in its decision had elaborated that proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate are videographed just to ensure that the minutes of the meetings are recorded correctly. Thus, it is not a public document and be not provided to the public. According to him, it is not proper as they are living in the world of information & technology wherein the public is aware of each and everything which is happening around them. The Government both at the State and the Central level had appointed/designated certain persons just to reply to the RTI queries. On what basis the Syndicate had declared that the DVDs of the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings are not a public document. Secondly, the expenses incurred for getting the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate are met out of the public exchequer. As such, these DVDs should be given to the public as and when demanded/sought. He felt that it needed to be looked into that it is a public document and should act as a facility to the public to know as to what is happening in the University.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra observed that they could not deny anything to the public under RTI Act as they are not above the law of the land.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that if they say that it could not be made a public document, were they consistent with the norms of the RTI Act because they could not deny any information under RTI on any ground. He added that since it is a legal issue, it should be got examined.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that anybody could seek the DVDs of the recording of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate meetings just by paying a sum of Rs.125/- per DVD. The viewpoints of the Syndicate meetings were that some people are using the DVDs in the Court. Informal discussions were held in the meeting of the Syndicate, wherein the members said that sometimes people say divergent and emotional things, which are misused by the people in the Court by showing the DVDs and they are also tried to affect the decision of the Court in certain manners. Therefore, there was general view in the meeting of the Syndicate that let the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings be videographed just to ensure that the minutes of the meetings are recorded correctly. The members of the Syndicate could get the DVDs, but the others could not. Since it is a decision of the Syndicate, he thought it proper to bring it to the Senate.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that a particular employee had filed 65 RTI cases in a single year. In fact, he was earlier in the University and seen that the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings were marked 'Confidential'. Therefore, the applicant had to specifically ask which information he/she wanted to have. If somebody sought specific information under the RTI Act, the same had to be provided. The proceedings of the Syndicate meetings are being videographed. Could they lay down a condition that the DVDs containing videography of the Syndicate meetings would not be provided even under the RTI Act? In fact, it needed to be legally examined. Secondly, if the DVDs could be supplied to the members of the Syndicate, they could not deny the same to the general public.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that when the Maharashtra University as per its regulations refused to supply a copy of the answerbook under RTI Act, the Supreme Court observed that the RTI Act overruled the regulations of the University. Notwithstanding anything contained in any Act or Regulations or Rules, the RTI Act overruled everything.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that this is the age of transparency and any information which a public body generates should be available to the public. To restrict it, is not acceptable because we are passionate that proceedings in a body are created in an efficient manner and there is nothing to embarrass anybody. Therefore, it is good to supply the DVDs to the public. In law, the important is what is recorded as decision and not what is stated in the meetings. Therefore, the discussion is not of much consequences in law. Therefore, they should ensure that whatever decision is taken/recorded, it is best and the same should be made available to the public. However, it would not be appropriate if the DVDs of the recording are supplied only to the members of the Syndicate and not to the public.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that first of all he would like to inform the House that they were in favour of the videographing of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate. When they had been given a facility by the Constitution, though late, everything could be got through the RTI Act. If there is certain information, which is of national interest that could not be supplied under the RTI Act also, but he felt that what is being done in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate is not the information which could be taken as threat to national security or any sort thereof. The pleas, suggestions, observations made by the members in the meetings would not make any impact on the decisions of the Courts. The ultimate effect would be of the decision, i.e., resolved part and not the discussion which takes place in the House. Secondly, if somebody make a statement in the House, he/she should be responsible for his/her own act, under the principle of self-governance. If a member says something which is not good to the society, it is his/her individual problem and not of the Syndicate or Senate. According to him, the supplying of DVDs of videography of the proceedings of the Syndicate meeting would bring clarity and transparency and people would have more faith in the body and the University as well. He suggested that, if possible, the cost of the DVDs should be reduced to the actual cost of the DVD.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that when they were discussing this issue in the Syndicate, the concern was that on the basis of DVDs of the videography of the meetings, certain things had gone to the Court and somebody has made reference to the recordings of the DVD's. Resultantly, certain embarrassing situations had arisen. Sometimes people also made telephone calls to the members, as to how he/she had made such a statement in the House. If he was not forgotten, how the Vice-Chancellor had made the statement. The comparison was made to the proceedings of the Parliament wherein the proceedings are open to the public and live telecast, but the proceedings of the Cabinet meeting are not telecast. He was of the view that Syndicate is just like a Cabinet and Senate is like Parliament. If videography of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate is to be done, the DVDs had to be supplied to the public under RTI Act and they could not say no. Members do need some forum where they can discuss the things without any fear. If only decisions are recorded and not the whole discussion, i.e.,

statements, pleas, suggestions and observations made by the members in the House, then they would be saving themselves from dragging into courts and facing any embarrassing situation.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know the problem in supplying the DVDs of the videography of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate meetings.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if the videography of the proceedings of the Syndicate is being done just for recording of correct minutes, it should not be provided to anybody.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the RTI Act is the law of the land, they could not deny supplying DVDs of the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings to the public. He would have to seek a legal opinion on the issue.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that he was not present in the meeting of the Syndicate when this issue was discussed. It is a very serious issue. Whatever Dr. Jagwant Singh had said, he agreed with him. Whether it is Panjab University Syndicate or Senate or any other Committee that is not an Institution like the Parliament or Vidhan Sabha? Sometimes such items are placed on which passionate thinking is required and there is difference of opinion or the members did not agree with each other. If recording is done, they could not say that the copy of the recording could not be supplied. He, therefore, suggested that neither the proceedings of the meeting of the Syndicate should be videographed nor of the Senate. He also suggested that recording of the minutes should be done in a precise and concise manner and every word uttered by the members should not be recorded.

Shri S.S. Johl observed that already so much is being recorded in the minutes of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, which is not being done in any of the University. He had seen this in three-four Universities where he was a member of their Senate. He suggested that only the final decisions, i.e., resolved part should be recorded and not the discussion part. According to him, there was no need of writing the names of the members. Agreeing with Shri Satya Pal Jain, he suggested that the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate should not be videographed.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that if they look at the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, they are very bulky, whereas the proceedings of the meetings of Syndicate and Senate of other Universities are of just few pages because they record only the resolved part. But discussions held in the meeting there freely. Now, some of the members had suggested that this practice should be done away with and record only resolved part. He suggested that they should have professional people in the University to record the proceedings. Discussion should be free to which videographing is not an answer. People sought DVDs of the recording under the RTI Act for producing the same in the court. Secondly, for videographing of the proceedings, extra staff is also required. If they see the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate during the tenures of Dr. A.C. Joshi and Dewan Anand Kumar, they would find them to be very small documents.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if that kind of professionalism was available in the University, the demand for videographing of the proceedings of meetings of the Syndicate and Senate would not have arisen.

On a point made by Shri Ashok Goyal that there is no provision for allowing the Director, Public Relations (DPR) to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor said that responsibility for giving a press release of the meeting of the Syndicate would have to be given to someone else.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha observed that in view of the fact that the contradictory reports appeared in the press the very next day after the meeting of the Syndicate, an official version should be given by the University.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that since the Registrar is the Secretary of the Syndicate and Senate, he is supposed to prepare the proceedings of the Syndicate and the Senate, which are to be confirmed by the Vice-Chancellor. As such, it is the job of the Registrar to prepare the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate. However, if the Vice-Chancellor is not convinced with some portion of the proceeding, he could change the same and confirm accordingly. While sitting in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, he (Registrar) should take notes and from those notes, he should make the proceedings. As far as Press Release is concerned, even if the official version is given by the DPR, the members still gave their own version sometimes before the end of the meeting. As told by Shri Rashpal Malhotra, earlier the practice was that very little discussion was recorded and thereafter the decision. But being a democratic institution, many people wanted that their opinion should be recorded, even if, the decision is not according to their opinion. As said by Shri S.S. Johl, the proceedings should be precise and concise and without mentioning the names of the members, for which the Registrar should have confidence to be able to make the proceedings from the notes taken by him. However, they should avoid lengthy discussions including remarks made by the members.

Shri Satya Pal Jain observed that they should not take seriously what appeared in the Press. Now-a-days everything appeared in the press as well as in the televisions as the press has its own network. They could not change it and stop it. He, therefore, suggested that DPR should be allowed to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate to issue the official press release.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that the decision should be left to the Registrar (Secretary of the Syndicate and Senate) to designate an Officer to do the job for him for preparing the minutes of the Syndicate and Senate briefly and without mentioning the names.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that they should continue with the practice of videographing of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate, but prepare the minutes very briefly without mentioning the names, which would protect the members of the Syndicate/Senate. However, if somebody sought the DVDs of the recording, the same should be provided to him/her. He also suggested that even the agenda should be provided to the members in electronic form, which would save a lot of energy and papers as well.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that since they are elected representatives of the people, they had some responsibilities towards their constituencies. He, therefore, said that the existing practice of writing the minutes in the elaborative form (with mention of names of members who made specific points and raised issues) should be continued.

Shri S.S. Johl observed that if the nominated members are secondary members, as implied by Dr. Kuldip Singh, he offered not to attend the meeting of the Senate in future.

Referring to the statement made by Dr. Kuldip Singh, Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that here in the Senate, nobody is representing any political party.

Dr. Yograj Angrish remarked that the nominated members also deserved to be respected as the elected members.

Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop stated that they had already wasted precious time of the Senate on petty issues. The Chancellor nominated the people on the Senate from various walks of life, not just to make the presence of the nominated members felt. So many points have been made by the hon'ble members of the Senate of different version time and again. Members represent different constituencies and make the voters happy by telling them that they had represented their demands effectively and in a

reasonable manner. He endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri S.S. Johl and Shri Rashpal Malhotra that the minutes should be recorded precisely and the practice of mentioning of names should be done away with which would reduce the responsibilities of the elected as well as nominated members.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that he has strong exception to what his colleague had said about the nominated members. In fact, this Senate is an august body and issues needed to be discussed here on the basis of merit. They should not make this Senate a canvassing ground for the election; otherwise, it would be a sad day for the Senate and the University, which is one of the top Universities of the country. If the members of the Senate had their own particular agenda, it should not become a part of the Senate agenda. Since they had some responsibilities on their shoulders, they should discuss the issues on merit.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha questioned the distinction that had been sought to be made between nominated and elected members. Though elected members have certain responsibilities towards their constituencies, he did not know why their names are required to be mentioned to convince their voters, who can, if necessary, be suitably briefed after the meeting. It would be much better not to mention the names, but all points should be summarized.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that the question here is whether videography of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate should be continued or not. Videography is better for good governance. According to her, there are advantages and disadvantages of the videography of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate. They are living in a society where everybody wants to click his/her photo to show someone else. The integrity of the people sitting in this House is more important than anything else. She said that they have to maintain discipline in the House. Here the members are free to speak irrespective of political affiliations or anything else, but for the betterment of the education and the society instead of appeasing someone.

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that, in fact, this item was not on the agenda of the Syndicate; rather this issue was raised during the course of the meeting and a decision was taken. Was it permissible according to the University Calendar? If they wanted to move towards good governance, they have to look into objectively whether the videography of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate is to be continued or not. A lot of discussion took place on the issue whether the DPR should be allowed to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate or not. The media persons are sitting in the Senate Hall today. They all respect the press persons. While the press could sit in the meetings of the Senate why could it not be allowed to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate? As far as he knew, the videography of the Syndicate and Senate meetings was started on the suggestion of few individual members of the Syndicate in the year 2012 who pointed out that the proceedings of the meetings were not prepared properly. He suggested that as per the agenda items, they should accept or reject and if any member wanted to record his/her dissent, he/she is free to do so. If the proceedings are prepared or recorded in this way, a lot of paper is also saved. In this way, things could be improved. Senate is not a political body. Syndicate is a Cabinet and the Senate is the Principal Administrative Governing Council, wherein the members from different walks of life are there. He reminded the members that their primary responsibility should be towards the University and not towards their individual constituencies. If they work in such a way the atmosphere in the meetings could be saved from vitiating.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that he would take up the issue from where Shri V.K. Sibal has left. According to him, whatever decisions are taken or contributions made by the members here, would be looked by all the academic institutions worldwide. The society is looking towards them for guidance and some valuable contributions in the field of higher education as the bodies like Senate comprises best of the minds of the society. Anybody who had made significant contribution has a place in this Senate. Secondly, the Senate is chaired by the Chancellor, which happened to be the Vice-President of India. Whatever proceedings took place in various meetings in the University at different level,

should be properly documented – whether through videography or some other means. He suggested that all the interviews which are conducted in the University should also be videographed. If anybody acted in any objectionable manner, he/she should be responsible to the society. There should be free and friendly discussion on each item on the agenda and, thereafter, only decision taken should be recorded instead of recording names of all the members who participated in the discussion. He added that videography is a good idea, but other point that it should be made available to the public under the RTI Act should be looked into because under RTI Act only decisions mattered and not the whole discussion.

Shri Krishna Goyal stated that the idea of having videography is a good idea. He had serious doubts that under RTI Act only the decisions/ relevant resolved part of the decisions of the Syndicate/Senate should be conveyed through DVDs instead of whole proceedings. He suggested that agenda of the Syndicate/Senate should be sent to the members in the electronic form, which would definitely help in saving a lot of energy and paper and the same would also be environment friendly.

Shri Munish Verma stated that the nominated members of the Senate are the persons who are renowned in their own fields. That was why they were nominated on the Senate of the University by the hon'ble Chancellor. The nominated members would definitely make their presence felt by making huge contributions. Hence, they should respect them.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that since the videography helped in proper recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, it should be continued. Before the starting of videographing of the proceedings of the meetings, the officials of the University used to take notes in notebooks and later prepared the minutes on the basis of those notes. As those shorthand notebooks could not be provided to the public under the RTI Act, it was decided by the Syndicate that the DVDs containing videography of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate should not be made public document and be not provided even under the RTI Act.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be legally examined.

Principal Puneet Bedi stated that since there is a lot of problem in getting the whole discussions recorded, the videography of proceedings of the Syndicate/Senate is required for proper recording of the minutes. She suggested that whenever any person wants information under RTI on a particular item on the agenda, he/she might be provided the edited DVD/DVDs of the resolved part of that particular item instead of providing all the DVDs.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that videography of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate meetings should be continued. If the expenditure incurred on the videography of the proceedings of the meetings is being met from the public exchequer, they are bound to provide the same to the public under RTI. Under the provisions of the Constitution of India, everybody has the right to freedom of speech and express his/her opinion and similarly the persons on the other side had the right to obtain what had been expressed by the members on a particular issue, what is the harm in mentioning the names of the members. He suggested that the recording of the minutes should be continued in the present form and should be made available to the public. Since it helped in keeping the system transparent, there should not be any administrative problem. If the members are right in expressing their views, why should they afraid of the society.

Professor Lalit K. Bansal suggested that the proceedings of the meetings should be precise and concise instead of recording individual statements of the members. The agenda as well as proceedings should be provided to the members in CDs and not in printed form, which would save a lot of energy and papers.

Professor Rupinder Tewari stated that many a times in the meetings, it was said by some members to stop the videography as they are saying something off the record. He suggested that the camera for videographing the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate should remain on till the end of the meeting.

To this, Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that it should only be allowed if the national security is in danger and not if it relates to the personal security of the members.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that videography of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate should be continued. The proceedings in the present form are being prepared very well. Discussions go on in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate and the bulkiness of the agenda is not because of the minutes, it is because of the many annexures in the form of viva and other inspection reports. He was of the view that someone might be bold & outspoken and he/she should not be afraid of what he/she had said in the meetings. Resolutions in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate taken on the basis of the discussions having reasons taken place. He, therefore, suggested that the videographing of the proceeding of the Syndicate and Senate meetings should continue to be recorded as they are absolutely to his satisfaction.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the only thing which was discussed in the Syndicate meeting was that if it is possible to stop supplying DVDs under RTI, then it should be stopped and if legally it is not possible, they should continue to supply the same. But there is no such thing in the Syndicate recommendation that videography should be stopped. The Syndicate only decided to continue with the videography of the meetings of the Syndicate and, that too, for the purpose of correct recording of the proceedings and not for supplying DVDs under RTI Act. In fact, this decision of video recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate was taken by the Syndicate in the morning and the same was conveyed to the Senate, the Senate also agreed to videographing of the proceedings. In case there is difficulty in stopping the supply of DVDs of the video recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate, they should continue with it. He, therefore, suggested that the matter should be legally examined and, thereafter, if it is not possible to stop supplying DVDs under RTI Act to the public, then status quo should be maintained.

The Vice-Chancellor said that status quo should be maintained as far as videography of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate is concerned. However, they would try to make the minutes of the Syndicate and Senate as much as precise and concise as possible. Secondly, the agenda papers for the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, including reports of the Examiners and Viva Voce reports of the Ph.D. students, Inspection Reports in respect of affiliated Colleges, proceedings of the meetings, etc., would be sent to the members in CDs to save the energy and paper. In the long run, the University may explore to make available i-Pads to the members of this House, if suitable financial resource can be found, so that the members would not face any difficulty in surfing through the agenda papers while the meeting is going on.

Shri Dinesh Kumar suggested that the candidates, who apply in the University for various teaching and non-teaching posts, should be asked to apply on-line on the pattern of Delhi University and many other Universities in the country. Till they go in for this step, the people should be asked to submit both the hard copies as well as soft copies of their application forms, testimonials and other documents. It would save the University from a lot of labour.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that whosoever wanted to save the papers, they be provided e-agenda and those who wanted the agenda on papers, they should be provided the same. Let us give them the option.

The Vice-Chancellor said that option would be sought from the members whether they wanted to have e-agenda or hard copies of the agenda as per existing practice.

RESOLVED: That the *status quo* be maintained with regard to videographing the recording of proceedings of Syndicate and Senate. The Registrar, as Secretary of the Syndicate, shall make arrangement for making Syndicate decisions known to the Press, he could seek help of DPR, if so desires.

XVII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-21 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

C-21. That –

- (1)(i) a copy of the complaint received from Ms. Anu Verma, Assistant Professor in English, G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, Distt. Hoshiarpur along with the report of the Enquiry Committee be supplied to Director, Higher Education, Punjab and Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya. The University should also request the Director, Higher Education, Punjab, to supply the original enquiry report, if any, about the incident;
- (ii) the case of sexual harassment of women teachers of Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, be referred to National Commission for Women and/or the Central Bureau of Investigation; and
- (iii) the issue of delay in taking action against the College be enquired into and responsibility for the same be fixed.
- (2) all the affiliated Colleges be directed by the office of Dean, College Development Council, to pay salary to the teachers through account payee cheques.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 Para 30)

Referring to recommendation (ii), Shri S.S. Johl suggested that it should be separated from this item as it did not relate to it.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that when there are allegations against any individual or any institution, these are known to everybody. He was of the view that the person against whom allegations were levelled should be given an opportunity to brief whether he/she has anything to say against those allegations or not and punishment should not be given to him/her until allegations are proved. The punishment to the GTB Khasla College for Women, Dasuya, had already been given by shifting Examination Centre from there. This College is a Girls College, the foundation stone of which was laid by Dr. M.S. Randhawa and the College is doing service to the girls of that very region by providing higher education. The allegations were levelled by teachers of the College against the Centre Superintendent, who was deputed there from the nearby College. Instead of taking action against the concerned person, the students of this College were informed that their Centre of Examination was cancelled and shifted to another College. On this count, the girl students are suffering. He further stated that there were enquiries after enquiries in this matter. They must look into the issue and show-cause notice should be issued to the College and if the College is not at fault, the Examination Centre should be revived there. They should not act like a police person as the affiliated Colleges are the part and parcel of the University system.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that three enquires have already been conducted in the matter in question, one by Director, Higher Education, Punjab; second by a Woman Inspector General, Jalandhar and the third one by the Women Commission. In all the three enquires, the Management and the Principal of the College were exonerated. The fourth enquiry is conducted by the Committee constituted by the University. He was of the view that the Enquiry Officer could not have the authority to punish anyone. He was of the view that Senate members should not have been put on Enquiry Committees because they are the punishing authority. When such types of cases go to the Court, they did not stand anywhere. He pleaded that since the College had already been exonerated by three enquiry Committees, no action should be taken against the College and Centre for M.A. Classes should be created there to avoid harassment to the girl students.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that when this complaint made by five teachers of that College came to the Vice-Chancellor's office, the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee to enquire the matter. She was grateful to the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor for re-posing faith in all of them. The Committee did its job to the best of its ability and in a very transparent manner. The whole country is struggling to put in place some mechanism to counter/handle cases of sexual harassment at workplace; they should also make similar efforts to counter cases of sexual harassment in the University as well as affiliated Colleges. The five teachers who complained in the instant case, only one of them was a regular one and all others were contract teachers. The report was submitted by the Committee on 8th March (International Women Day) personally to the Vice-Chancellor. She is feeling pity in saying that the University had no faith in its own Committee and that was why enquiries were conducted by other agencies. She was pained to see in the minutes of the Syndicate (Action Taken Report), it was mentioned that the G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, sent a note to the Vice-Chancellor's office on 18.4.2013 and a portion of that report appeared in a section of the Press. She showed her strong resentment, the way the agenda papers were framed as reading of (iii) showed as if the Chairperson of the Fact Finding Committee was responsible for delaying action against the College. She would like to ask whether the role of the Committee is appreciated or the Committee members are penalized.

Dr. Mukesh Arora stated that the punishment should be given to the guilty whether it is the College or anyone else and not to the students of this College. As the students had not done any sexual harassment, he pleaded that the Centre of Examination should be created in the College so that the students might not face any difficulty.

Shri Munish Verma endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Mukesh Arora.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that there was a dispute between the teachers of the College and the Centre Superintendent. The Management of this College did not give any support to the teachers. He was of the view that all the record should be checked and seen who is the culprit and the action should be taken accordingly. The girl students of this oldest Girls College of the region should not be harassed by shifting their Examination Centre to another College.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pleaded that as the examinations of 1st and 3rd Semesters of Postgraduate Classes are commencing w.e.f. 9th December, the Examination Centre should be created there for the convenience of girl students.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra drew the attention of the House towards the decision of the Ministry of Women Welfare. As per this decision, any Institution shall appoint a three-member Grievance Committee to look into the cases of Sexual Harassment of Women by including one woman from NGOs. They should advise the College to appoint such a Committee. This Committee shall meet the complainant in camera and the proceedings of this Committee would not be covered under RTI Act. There is an internal Committee to implement the decisions of this Grievance Committee. According to him,

this case was not of such a nature, which could be sent to the National Commission for Women. The University should appoint such a Grievance Committee and this matter should be referred to that Committee.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that he was a member of the Committee constituted under the Chairpersonship of Professor Rajesh Gill. He would not like to give all the details mentioned in the report of about 28-30 pages. If they had gone through the entire report, they would have found that the Committee had done this exercise with extreme earnest and honesty. He briefed the House how they prepared the report by minutely seeing all the aspects of the complaint for which they had to devote 10-15 hours to write and cross-check the documents, which were provided to them. They had not mentioned anything in the report which was not supported by the document. There were number of things which came to them but they simply ignored them. They prepared the report purely on the basis of the enquiry. On the basis of fact finding enquiry, they were very clear that sexual harassment had taken place there. The Centre Superintendent, who was deputed in this College, was from another College. The things were so wrong that these teachers put their job at stake by complaining against the Centre Superintendent that too by exhausting all the channels. They had also examined and sorted out that this complaint is not false. Ultimately, they were fully convinced that the things had happened in a wrong way, and those documents are part of the report as annexures. The past record of the man in question in his previous employment is that he is not respectable to the female gender. During the enquiry, they had found contradiction in the statements of the Chairman and Secretary of the Management of the College. They also contacted the Principal of the College. At the same time, they also met a larger number of staff members of the College, but they in one voice said that they knew nothing in this regard. They were also right because the incident took place in a separate room which was far away from the staff room. During discussion and witness, the accused also admitted that he did not say so. But evidences were clearly there. This all happened there at the Examination Centre and the Centre Superintendent was helping the students in copying at the behest of the College Management. That was why the Committee recommended that they need to shift the Examination Centre of this College to another College. The complaint of the lady teacher was not properly entertained by the College because there was connivance between the Superintendent and the College Management. They decided to dig it out and went to the class to talk to the students. All the girls left except one, who was in the College from +2 stage. From the administrative structure, they came to the conclusion that there was conscious effort on the part of the Management to help certain candidates. As a result, this Superintendent, who did not have good reputation, got appointed as Centre Superintendent in the College. Though the complaint was of serious nature, one after another, five teachers lost their job. The teachers were of the firm view that their dignity is more important than the job. The Syndicate unanimously accepted the report and recommended action accordingly. He would like to inform the House that they (as members of the Committee) were also approached, but they decided to do the job objectively as they wanted to send a clear message. After that, the examination centre of the students was shifted to JCDAV College, Dasuya, which is at a distance of only one kilometer from this College. It was also decided that, in future, the Centre Superintendent in question should not be assigned any job relating to the University examinations. There was a police report which exonerated him (Centre Superintendent). Earlier, the enquiry was being got done from a senior retired Officer of the Punjab Government, but the College Management succeeded in getting him changed. Maybe the Enquiry Report which was submitted by the Director, Higher Education, Punjab, not be the original one? In the end, he pleaded that the Syndicate decision and proposed action should be implemented in letter and spirit without any reservation.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that it is true that G.T.B. Khalsa College was set up by Dr. M.S. Randhawa. It is also true that the examination centre of the College, which was shifted to JCDAV College, Dasuya was just one kilometer away from the College. As such, there should not have been any problem for the College regarding shifting of the Centre. As regards exoneration and so on is concerned, he along with Professor Naval

Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, had met the Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab and he had assured that he would look into the whole issue. However, the Principal Secretary was aware that unacceptable incident had happened in that College and the exoneration given to these people is not justified. He requested Professor Naval Kishore to inform the members if there is any progress in the matter.

Professor Naval Kishore said that a copy of the Enquiry Report with respect to GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya, was handed over to the Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab, who had said he would look into the matter as he was convinced that the Enquiry Report is on the right side and the exoneration is on the other way. He added that the University had sent a reminder to the Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab recently.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the item is wrongly framed as it should have three parts. Nowhere, it had been mentioned that action has been taken against the College and it had also not been mentioned that the Enquiry Report should be accepted. According to him, there is no point in discussing all these issues. He also agreed that this should be dealt in a proper spirit, but the College should not be penalized. The sending of file to the Chairperson of the Committee (Professor Rajesh Gill) to reply a particular query of Principal was absolutely wrong. Whatever letter was received by the office, the same was sent to the Chairperson of the Committee for comments, which needed to be seriously looked into. They should respect the members of the Enquiry Committee, which comprised of Fellows.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that the members had conducted an impartial enquiry after putting themselves at stake/trouble. If the Management found involved in any way in protecting people involved in the sexual harassment, it is not only wrong to hold responsible the person who had committed the offence, but also the Management should be made responsible. Could they pass verdict against the College? They could not allow this kind of incidents to recur as they could not allow reputation of the girls studying/teaching in the College at stake because their reputation is the responsibility of this Senate, it being a supreme body of the University. Therefore, they had to take a decision against the guilty person/s. According to him, the decision of the University to shift the Examination Centre from the GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya to JCDAV College, Dasuya was right.

Shri Munish Verma said that the students should not be punished for the fault committed by others.

Shri Dinesh Kumar, referring to the observations made by certain members, said that it is very painful to note as if the Committee was against the entire College. He clarified that they were not against the College and their primary job was to find out the truth, which all the members did sincerely. As far as punishment is concerned, it is within the power of the Syndicate. The Committee did not recommend punishment. The person, who is accused, is not from the College concerned at all. All the members tried their level best to directly or indirectly tell the Management of the College as to why they were assisting the accused as ultimately it would bring a bad name to the College, which was established by a renowned person, Dr. M.S. Randhawa. Through this particular step, they had tried to ensure to restore the integrity and reputation of the College. Though they did not mention it in their report, mass copying was there at the Examination Centre. He urged the University to take certain concrete steps in this regard.

Dr. Mukesh Arora remarked that majority of the parents wanted to send their daughters to Girls/Women Colleges only.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he was constrained to say that the findings of the Enquiry Committee have to be respected by the authority which had constituted the

Enquiry Committee. However, if they (Syndicate and Senate) wanted to recommend some action against the guilty parties, they have to give reasons.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the report had been accepted by the Syndicate and since the Syndicate wanted to send a signal that this kind of misdemeanour or mistake by a College is to be curbed, recommendation was made that for one year the Examination Centre of this College be shifted to JCDAV College, Dasuya.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that there are a number of legal luminaries in this House. She was sure that they knew the person who had committed the offence and others who protected him in any way are equally liable. Therefore, the question is whether the person, who committed the blunder, should only be punished and not the others. Why others should not be punished? Whether it is a case of copying or complaint of sexual harassment by the teacher, the College Management did not pay any heed. Secondly, she would like to know as to how many of the members had gone through the report and the annexures minutely. They went to the class room and listened to the students and did not rely on the allegations of the complainant. They had asked the students whosoever did not want to put their signatures, could go out and one of them went out. Rest of the students signed the papers which are part of the annexures. They always had huge expectations from the Colleges which take care of the students; however, she was sorry to say that in the instant case, the College had done nothing on the issue. They needed to take an honest decision irrespective of the fact whether it is a case of man or woman.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Punjab Government official/s had admitted that whatever had happened there in the College was unacceptable. Let him confirm from Professor Ronki Ram whether the distance between GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya and JCDAV College, Dasuya is one kilometer or less than two kilometers. Nobody would be shifted to Mukerian as the Examination Centre has to be within a distance of two kilometers. The University would depute some representatives at whatever cost during the entire period of examination to ensure that the students are provided adequate security.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal observed that when they constitute the Committees, they should have faith in them. Earlier, the Syndicate had decided that Examination Centre be not created at Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur, but later on their own members supported the College for creating the centre in that College. If they did not protect the members of the Committees, they would decline to serve on the Committees. In the case under consideration, JCDAV College, Dasuya, where the Examination Centre of GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya, was shifted, is only at 1 kilometer distance.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she would like to appreciate the work done by the members of the Committee. In future, the Enquiry Committee reports relating to sexual harassment of women should be first placed before the Syndicate and then Senate and uniform criteria should be followed in all the cases of sexual harassment.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1)(i) a copy of the complaint received from Ms. Anu Verma, Assistant Professor in English, G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur, along with the report of the Enquiry Committee be supplied to Director, Higher Education, Punjab and Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya. The University should also request the Director, Higher Education, Punjab, to supply the original enquiry report, if any, about the incident; and

- (ii) the issue of delay in taking action against the College be enquired into and responsibility for the same be fixed.
- (2) all the affiliated Colleges be directed by the office of Dean, College Development Council, to pay salary to the teachers through account payee cheques.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the decision of the Syndicate dated 15/25.4.2013 (Para 21) that G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur, be **not** made examination centre for University examinations and a centre for its students be created at J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya, be ratified.

XVIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-22 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C-22. That High Mast Lights/Street Lights, be installed in residential areas of Sectors 14 and 25 of Panjab University Campus and the funds for the same be sanctioned out of the Budget Head “Electricity & Water Fund”.

(Syndicate dated 27.7.2013 & 13.8.2013 Para 14)

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that there is no properly developed site in Panjab University South Campus, Sector 25, for playing of children. She pleaded that a couple of sites should be developed for playing of children in Panjab University South Campus.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-22 on the agenda**, be approved.

XIX. **Item C-23 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

C.23. To elect (by single transferable vote) Five Fellows to Academic Council for the term 1.2.2014 to 31.1.2016 under Regulation 1.1 (I) at Page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007.

NOTE: The following valid nominations duly proposed and seconded, have been received:

1. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
(Emeritus Fellow,
Department of Biochemistry
Panjab University)
House No.206, Sector 40-A,
Chandigarh.
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
H.No. 2342, Astha Apartment
Sector 48, Chandigarh.
3. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
Associate Professor
Department of Punjabi
D.A.V. College, Abohar.
4. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
Associate Professor
Government College for Girls
Sector-42, Chandigarh.

5. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
Associate Professor
Kenway College of Education
Hanumangarh Road
Abohar.

Since only five valid nominations duly proposed and seconded had been received for election of Five Fellows to Academic Council, the following five persons were declared elected to the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2014 to 31.1.2016, under Regulation 1.1 (I) at Page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007:

1. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
(Emeritus Fellow,
Department of Biochemistry
Panjab University)
House No.206, Sector 40-A,
Chandigarh.
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
H.No. 2342, Astha Apartment
Sector 48, Chandigarh.
3. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
Associate Professor
Department of Punjabi
D.A.V. College, Abohar.
4. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
Associate Professor
Government College for Girls
Sector-42, Chandigarh.
5. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
Associate Professor
Kenway College of Education
Hanumangarh Road
Abohar.

XX.

Item C-24 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-24. To elect (by simple majority vote) two Fellows (Non-Syndics) as members of Board of Finance for a term of one year, i.e., from 1.2.2014 to 31.1.2015 under Regulation 1.1 (iv) at Page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. The following valid nominations duly proposed and seconded, have been received:

1. Professor Anil Monga
H.No.E-1/106, Sector 14
Chandigarh-160014.
2. Shri Dinesh Kumar
NTF-13, Sector -14
P.U. Campus
Chandigarh.

2. The candidature of the above persons is provisional subject to their being not elected as members of the Syndicate in the ensuing election on 9.12.2013.

Since only two valid nominations duly proposed and seconded had been received for election of two Fellows (Non-Syndics) as members of Board of Finance, the following two Fellows (Non-Syndics) were declared elected to the Board of Finance for a term of one year, i.e., from 1.2.2014 to 31.1.2015, under Regulation 1.1 (iv) at Page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Professor Anil Monga
H.No.E-1/106, Sector 14
Chandigarh-160014.
2. Shri Dinesh Kumar
NTF-13, Sector -14
P.U. Campus
Chandigarh.

Item C-25 had already been taken up along with Item C-1.

XXI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-26 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-26. That the newly constructed building, Girls Hostel No.9 be named after the name of “Amrita Pritam”, Panjab University Alumnus.

(Syndicate dated 5.12.2013, Para 4)

XXII. The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-11** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

R-1. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved re-employment of Dr. Vijay Rattan, Professor in Public Administration, University School of Open Learning, P.U., on contract basis up to 27.09.2018 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date of his joining as such after one day break as usual, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58)/ 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: (i) Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment.

(ii) The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment under Rule 4.1, at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(ii))

R-2. That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the appointment of following persons as Assistant Professors in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, purely on temporary basis, for the academic session 2013-14 against the vacant post of Associate Professor of the Department 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 other allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Ms. Anjali Jindia D/o Sh. Om Parkash Jindia
2. Ms. Pratibha Bhola D/o Sh. Shakti Kumar.

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor has approved the above appointments as a very special case but it will not be a precedent, in future.

2. The competent authority could assign teaching duties to them in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied departments at a given

point of time, with the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(iii))

- R-3.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Dr. Zarreen Fatima as Assistant Professor on contract basis, in the Department of Urdu w.e.f. the date she starts work, for the academic session 2013-14, against the vacant post of the department or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 on the same terms and conditions according to which she had worked previously during the last session.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(iv))

- R-4.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Professor Shelley Walia, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. Chandigarh on contract basis w.e.f. the date he starts work as re-employed faculty, with one day break as usual, upto 28.7.2016 i.e. the date he attains the age of 65 years, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.6.2008 (Para 58) and 29.2.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to the last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: (i) Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment.

(ii) The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/ she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment under Rule 4.1, at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(v))

- R-5.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the decisions of the Core Committee constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 29.6.2013 (Para 57) regarding grant/non-grant of extension of affiliation to the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University for the session 2013-14.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(viii))

- R-6.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the fee structure of USOL as proposed by the Chairperson, USOL for the session 2013-14.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(ix))

- R-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor, has appointed the following persons as Assistant Professors, against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-2014 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100+AGP of ₹6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Mr. Harvinder Singh Assistant Professor in Economics	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xi))		
2.	Ms. Shafali Assistant Professor in Commerce	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xii))		
3.	Ms. Lipika Gaur Guliani Assistant Professor in Commerce	University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xiii))		
4.	Ms. Abha Sethi Assistant Professor in Commerce	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xiv))		
5.	Ms. Inderjot Kaur Assistant Professor in Law	P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xv))		
6.	Ms. Shweta Assistant Professor in Commerce	P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur (subject to approval of the Punjab Govt./UGC)
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xvi))		
7.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai Assistant Professor in Hindi	P.U. Constituent College, Nihalsinghwala, District Moga
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xvii))		
8.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur Assistant Professor in Physical Education	P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xviii))		
9.	Mr. Karan Gandhi Assistant Professor in Commerce	P.U. Constituent College, Nihalsinghwala, District Moga
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xix))		
10.	Dr. Simranjit Singh Senior Assistant Professor in Oral Pathology	Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xx))		

Sr. No.	Name	Department
11.	Dr. Simarpreet Singh Associate Professor in Public Health Dentistry	Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xxii))		
12.	Dr. (Ms.) Neeraj Sharma Associate Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology	Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.
(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xxii))		

NOTE: The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

R-8. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Mrs. Shruti Sahdev, Medical Officer (Homoeopathic), SSGPURC, Bajwara (Hoshiarpur) for further period of three months w.e.f. 7.9.2013 to 4.12.2013 with one day break on 06.09.2013 or till the post is filled in afresh (on contract), whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xxiii))

R-9. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to admit students for BHMS course to Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh for the session 2013-2014 in the light of the amnesty granted by the Govt. of India up to 30.9.2013 as per rules.

NOTE: Letter F.No. R-13040/10/2011-HD (Tech.) dated 26.8.2013 received from Deputy Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Department of Ayurveda, Yoga and Naturopathy Unani Siddha and Homoeopathy is enclosed.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xxiv))

R-10. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to start the online submission of examination forms for all the PG courses (Semester System) Examinations w.e.f. 26th September 2013.

NOTE: The last date for submission of examination forms (online/by hand for private/re-appear/regular candidates of all Colleges/ Departments/ USOL) has been extended up to 15.10.2013 instead of 1.10.2013 without late fee.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 35(xxvi))

R-11. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the assignment of the following Fellows to the Faculties mentioned against their name:

Professor Navdeep Goyal Dean Student Welfare Department of Physics P.U., Chandigarh	1. Science 2. Law 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Education
Sardar G.S. Ghuman, IAS DPI College, Punjab # 719, Sector 7 Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Science 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce
Justice Sanjay Kishan Kaul Chief Justice Punjab & Haryana High Court Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education
Professor Devinder Singh PUTA President Department of Laws Panjab University, Chandigarh	1. Science 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education
Sardar Kuljit Singh Nagra, MLA 347, Phase 3A, Mohali	1. Arts 2. Science 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Design & Fine Arts
Shri Sandeep Hans, PCS Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh U.T. Secretariat, Sector 9 Chandigarh-160017	1. Science 2. Arts 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Education

(Syndicate dated 5.12.2013, Para 5)

Referring to Sub-Item R-(1), Shri Dinesh Kumar stated that he was unable to understand one very simple question that once they are re-employing someone, it is a new contract because its terms and conditions are totally different from the regular employees, including salary and other things. Why they were putting the item concerned for ratification. As far as his wisdom goes, all the items relating to re-employment should be placed before the Syndicate and the Senate for consideration along with bio-data of the candidate/s concerned. Putting it in the items for ratification meant if somebody challenges only then the bio-data would be provided and, that too, of the concerned candidate only. Because once they put it in the ratification, there would be no annexures and then how the Governing/Superintending Bodies would decide the case/s. He, therefore, pleaded that at least for technical purposes, the re-employment cases of teachers should be placed before the Syndicate and Senate for consideration. He suggested that the University authorities could check from the office since when they are putting re-employment cases before the Syndicate and Senate for ratification. He further suggested that legal opinion should be sought on the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that due to time constraint let the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to approve the re-employment cases, on behalf of the Senate. After taking decision on re-employment cases, he would put all the details before the Syndicate and subsequently before the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are following an age old system. They were fully satisfied with this system and do not want any change in it.

When the name of Professor Shelley Walia was referred to, Shri Dinesh Kumar said that there is no objection to Professor Shelley Walia's re-employment as he wrote article/s in the newspapers every week. He is not challenging his capabilities as a teacher. He is just saying that whosoever applied for re-employment, his/her work should be assessed and the item should be placed before the Syndicate and Senate for consideration. They should also be told since when putting the items relating to re-employment of teachers before the Syndicate and Senate had been shifted from consideration to ratification.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the only change they made in the re-employment of teachers is that they increased the age for re-employment from 63 years to 65 years. They were doing whatever the practice was earlier. But for the sake of Calendar and for the information of the society, they should attach the Curriculum Vitae (CVs) of the teachers who applied for re-employment while putting the item before the Syndicate and Senate. However, there is no need of having the items pertaining to re-employment of teachers exclusively for consideration.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that though, according to him, items pertaining to re-employment of teachers should come for ratification/information, it should be got examined.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they could not put items pertaining to re-employment of teachers before the Senate for information as power to appoint teachers is vested with the Senate.

Professor Karamjeet Singh, respecting the sentiments of Shri Dinesh Kumar, stated that Shri Dinesh Kumar has raised a pertinent question. Let him make it clear that technically there is nothing wrong in placing the items pertaining to re-employment of teachers before the Syndicate and Senate for ratification. In principle, they had decided to give extension to all the teachers. Therefore, it is perfectly right to put such items for ratification. He also agreed with Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath that since these cases are to be approved by the Senate, these are placed before the Senate for ratification and not for information, which is the present practice.

Dr. Devinder Singh said that the items pertaining to re-employment of teachers are put before the Senate for ratification because the policy for giving re-employment to the teachers had already been considered and approved by the Senate. Now, there is no point in placing such items individually before the Senate for consideration. If there is any shift/change in the policy, the same should be brought to the Senate for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that every re-employment case is approved after evaluation. The evaluation has several components, including whether the Department concerned felt that such and such person/s would serve the purpose and, thereafter, the condition of the person concerned being academically active is to be examined. After evaluating all these, the re-employment is granted in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate and the item is sent to the Syndicate for ratification. As some of the members are saying, they should attach adequate documents to the item/s, this practice should be followed. The CV should contain a write up about the person concerned, which should also be put before the Syndicate/Senate as an annexure. To that extent, the views of the member/s are well taken and he would follow it during his tenure.

Shri Dinesh Kumar said that since the re-employment is a new contract under new terms and conditions, despite there being a policy, the item needed to be put before the Syndicate and Senate for consideration. However, whatever the Vice-Chancellor has said about providing details, including CVs having write-up by the persons concerned, he was in agreement with the proposal.

Professor Kehsav Malhotra said that the existing practice, routing the cases of re-employment through the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department concerned, is very good and should continue.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that the existing system is perfectly in order. They were also doing in the same way at their Institute, i.e., at CRRID, where he was Director-General. He reiterated that whatever the Vice-Chancellor has done is absolutely correct as it required to be put before the Senate for ratification as the Vice-Chancellor is not vested with the authority to make re-employments and the said authority had been vested with the Syndicate and the Senate.

Referring to Sub-Item R-3, Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that the appointment of Dr. Zarreen Fatima as Assistant Professor on contract basis, which had been made under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, has been placed before the Senate for ratification, whereas in another similar item (Sub-Item I-5) which has been brought for information, the appointment was not made by the Syndicate.

Referring to Sub-Item R-5, Mrs. Anu Chatrath stated that as per provisions of the Act, this matter has to go to the Government. Moreover, the Core Committee was of a single man of the Syndicate. The Syndicate and Senate are part of the Panjab University Act, 1947, especially after Re-organization Act. After insertion of Sector 72, Panjab University had become an Inter-State Body Corporate. Their Act could only be amended by the Parliament. Earlier, when they all unanimously decided to make amendment in the regulations pertaining to enhancement in the age of superannuation of University teachers as well as of the Vice-Chancellor, the Parliament did not approve it. As per provision of the University Calendar, affiliation is to be granted by the Government on the recommendation of the Senate. As such, the Core Committee could not exercise the power of the Senate. As per provisions of the Act, even the Syndicate is not competent to exercise this power.

Professor Naval Kishore said that there should be no discussion on the issue as the matter is in the Court and sub-judice.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that Professor Naval Kishore has no right to suggest that consideration of this matter should be deferred. In the Court also, Mr. Rajiv Atma Ram, Advocate of the College/s is arguing that the Core Committee members are not competent to decide affiliation as per provisions of the Panjab University Act.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that this University is governed by the Panjab University Act. Sections 27-30 deal with power to grant affiliation to College/s and disaffiliation of College/s. The power started from the Syndicate. The Inspection Committee inspects the College and submit its report, which is placed before the Syndicate for consideration. The recommendations of the Syndicate are placed before the Senate. The Senate considers the recommendations of the Syndicate and sends its recommendations to the Government. After Re-organization Act, 1966, Section 72 had been inserted, under which the Government of India is the competent authority to grant or not to grant affiliation to the Colleges. However, actually the Senate has been exercising the power to grant or not to grant affiliation to the Colleges. What happened in October 2012 meeting of the Syndicate is that an item (Item 40) came to the Syndicate that the criteria for grant of affiliation as provided in the UGC Regulations 2009 be adopted. The Syndicate never considered the question that the power to grant or not to grant affiliation to the Colleges be taken away from the Senate and be given to the Syndicate. Thereafter, item (Item 101) was placed before the Senate and the then Vice-Chancellor gave a clarification that dispute is between the requirement of land, i.e., as per University Calendar, the land requirement is 7.5 acres, but as per new UGC Regulations, the requirement of land is 5 acres. Accordingly, the UGC Regulations 2009 pertaining to land requirement were adopted. In the next meeting of the Senate, when the meeting was going on, a current item was brought stating that the amended criteria

for grant of affiliation should be approved and the same was approved. Had the Senate authority to amend the Act of the Parliament? The power to grant affiliation or not to grant affiliation is with the Senate. Could this power be taken away by the persons elected by them? In one of the cases of Malout College, this University had filed an affidavit in the Court that the power to grant or not to grant affiliation to the Colleges has been taken away from the Senate and the same is now given to the Syndicate. The Dean, College Development Council, had also issued two circulars to the Colleges that the Senate and the Syndicate has taken decision that the power to grant affiliation to the Colleges and disaffiliation of the Colleges has been given to the Syndicate. Thereafter, a petition was filed and the next date of hearing is fixed for 13th December 2013. He challenged that the Syndicate and Senate have never taken such a decision. How and under what circumstances the letters had been issued by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges)? It is a contempt because the University filed wrong affidavit in the Court on the basis of which Malout College's writ petition was dismissed and the same was reopened just to justify it. Now, this ratification had come. He reiterated that even if it is passed, the Senate has no authority to amend the Act. The Senate could only make regulations and the Syndicate rules.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that Shri Rashpal Malhotra has suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred. Let him make few submissions. Though he was not there in the meeting, he could make few things from the agenda. The extension of affiliation is granted to the Colleges for the subjects, which they sought. In the May meeting of the Syndicate, they assigned the task of scrutinizing the reports of the Inspection Committees to a Core Committee. Thereafter, the Core Committee could decide which Colleges are to be given affiliation and which are not. They were trying to overcome the few difficulties. Because in the Senate, the issues pertaining to grant of affiliation were coming after one or two years and it used to grant *post facto* approval. They were trying to correct and overcome those sorts of situations. The Core Committee was to ensure that Colleges have the affiliation from the University for the subjects for which they had actually applied in time. Secondly, they were trying to balance the recommendations of the Inspection Committees with the conditions of the University, U.G.C. and the Punjab Government. The Core Committee had to do this exercise because the University was receiving information that such and such Colleges have not appointed teachers, not giving full salaries to the teachers, etc. etc., which are very serious issues in the process of affiliation, especially relating to Colleges of Education. For this, some tough decision had to be taken. In that process if any College felt aggrieved that due process has not been followed by the University in its case, it had every right to go to the Court. If the entire administrative machinery from the office of the Dean, College Development Council to the Vice-Chancellor had taken some wrong decisions, the Court would take right decision. Since both Mrs. Anu Chatrath and Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath are the Advocates of the College in the Court and are helping the management of the College in the Court against the University, they should not plead the case of the College in the Senate.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the University had filed false affidavit in the Court. Moreover, since as per University Act, the power to grant affiliation or not to grant affiliation is with the Senate, it could not be delegated to anybody else.

Dr. Jagwant Singh clarified that it was not wrong to constitute a Core Committee to scrutinize the recommendations of the Inspection Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the consideration of the matter should be deferred.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that though the Core Committee was constituted to scrutinize the reports of the Inspection Committees, but what actually happened was otherwise. He suggested that the suggestion put forth by Shri Rashpal Malhotra should be accepted and the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that the eligible candidates do not apply in the affiliated Colleges where they are not given salaries as per University/U.G.C. norms. On the other hand, the Colleges plead in the Courts that qualified teachers are not available. They neither allowed disaffiliation of the Colleges which did not follow the regulations/rules/guidelines/ instructions of the University/Punjab Government/U.G.C. nor allowed them to run. Though the admissions are made in the month of July, the members pleaded that action would be taken when the reports of the Inspection Committee would be placed before the Senate. He informed that on the basis of the report of the University, the Minister for Higher Education, Punjab, had placed two teachers under suspension as the University had proofs for its decision and the Government had taken a swift action. The Colleges which did not have even a single teacher could not be granted affiliation/extension of affiliation. Certain Colleges paid salaries to the teachers amounting to Rs.35,000/- per month, but a part of that amount is taken back by the Colleges on the same day. The Court in one of its judgement had said that the College in which the qualified teachers are not available, affiliation/extension of affiliation could not be granted to it and the teachers are to be made available before the start of the academic session. The plea of one of such Colleges had been rejected by the N.C.T.E. twice and even the appeal had also been rejected.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra suggested that they should authorize the Vice-Chancellor to resolve the matter in the interest of the University.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that if the Court had not granted stay in the matter, they had every right to take a decision in the matter. The College had filed a case in the High Court against the University and Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath is representing the College. His personal view is that a member, who is appearing in court against the University, should not participate in the discussion on the said item. Whether a Review or LPA or Writ Petition is moved, but the Court did not grant stay, that meant, they have not been restrained by the Court. Sub-judice did not mean that they could not discuss the matter. If the Court restrained them to do something, they could not do anything; otherwise, they had every right to discuss the matter. Otherwise, certain persons would file a Civil Suit in the Court just three days before the meeting of the Senate and they would be deprived of discussing the matter in the House. In the end, he said that their decisions should be objective to the University interest and should defend the reputation of the University and not the petitioner.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that in the light of the discussions held so far, he would like to suggest, if agreed, without wasting any further time, they should authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take decision in the matter in the interest of the University, so that the position of the University does not get vitiated. He had been associated with large number of Universities/National Institutions and they always respect the Chair. Since the Vice-Chancellor has to run the University smoothly, they have to support him. In the instant case, he would like to request the Vice-Chancellor, through this august House, that he should take up the matter and do something immediately so that the University and other concerned did not suffer.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath drew the attention of the House to Section 72 of the Punjab Re-organization Act, 1966, which reads as under:

- “(1) Save as otherwise expressly provided by the foregoing provision of this Part where any body corporate constituted under a Central Act, State Act or Provincial Act for the existing State of Punjab or any part thereof serves the needs of the successor States or has, by virtue of the provision of Part II, become an Inter-State body corporate, then, the body corporate shall, on and from the appointed day, continue to function and operate in those areas in respect of which it was functioning and operating immediately before that day, subject to such directions as may, from time to

time, be issued by the Central Government, until other provisions is made by law in respect of the said body corporate.

- (2) Any direction issued by the Central Government under Sub-Section (1) in respect of any body corporate may include a direction that any law by which the said body corporate is governed shall, in its application to that body corporate, have effect, subject to such exceptions and modifications as may be specified in the direction.”

The Senate could authorize the Syndicate or the Vice-Chancellor for any matter except for amending the provision of the Act.

Referring to Sub-Item R-6, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that perhaps they were increasing the fees for the courses being offered in University School of Open Learning, which might be due to financial constraints. Every year fees are increased by 10%. They should also see the plight of the children of the poor persons, e.g., Malies, Chowkidars, etc., who cannot afford to pay such hefty fees. By increasing the fees time and again, they are depriving the students belonging to poor families of higher education. If they approved this item pertaining to increase in fees, his dissent should be recorded.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that he agreed with Shri Satya Pal Jain but the University has to address this problem by providing number of scholarships or freeships to the meritorious students, who belong to poor families and could not pay the fees. He remarked that there were so many scholarships in the University for which none of the students come forward. He, therefore, pleaded that they should go ahead with the proposed hike in fee and the students belonging to poor families, who could not afford to pay fees, should be given scholarships or freeships and no fee should be charged from them.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that the differential fee structure should be prepared based on the income of the parents of the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could increase the number of scholarships.

Shri Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that while revising/ preparing the fee structure, they should keep in mind the categories of the students and the areas to which they belong. They should also keep in mind that only reserved category students (SC) could appear in the examination as Private candidates. The students who took admission at University School of Open Learning either could not join regular courses or they could not get admission in the Colleges. He added that the entire area from Ropar to Talwara is low income belt area of Punjab. If the nearest College is situated at a minimum distance of 15 kilometers, the students belonging to poor families would neither be able to go there nor stay there, especially the girl students. He also favoured preparation of differential fee structure on the basis of income of the parents. If they wanted to approve the item, voting should be allowed to be held on the issue.

Professor Lalit K. Bansal stated that during his tenure as Chairman of University School of Open Learning, no increase in fee has been effected. Last year, he had to go to Board of Finance to justify increase in remuneration, which is paid for getting the study material and lessons written. The members of the Board of Finance said that the rates could be approved only if he assured that increase in fee consistent with the increase in rate of remuneration would be proposed and approved. In that context, the increase in fees had been suggested, which is not more than 10% and comparatively lower than being charged by the affiliated Colleges.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the task of procuring income certificates is very difficult. He was of the view that some possible solution should be there for this problem. He added that the students did not raise any objection while paying huge fees in the Convent Schools and Public Schools, but when the same students join the University for

higher studies, they make hue and cry over the fees being charged by the University, which are far far less than the fee charged by the Convent and Public Schools. He pleaded that there should be some criteria/rules for differential fee structure, i.e., high fees for the students who passed their +2 level studies from Convent or Private Schools and less fees for the students who passed their +2 from Government Schools.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would appoint a Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Ronki Ram to consider differential fee structure, which should bring a reasonable proposal keeping in view the interests of the weaker sections of the society, for the affiliated Colleges as well as University School of Open Learning.

Dr. Emanuel Nahar said that, earlier, the students of University School of Open Learning were allowed to deposit their fee in two instalments, but from the last year they have been asked to deposit fee in one instalment, which might be creating a problem for the students. He pleaded that as before the students should be allowed to deposit their fees in two instalments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the students of University School of Open Learning would be allowed to deposit their fees in two instalments, as earlier.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that the affiliated Colleges have been raising the issue of hike in fee structure many a times as they are facing a financial crunch, but nobody is looking into the issue and addressing their problem. Due to the financial crunch faced by them, the Colleges are not able to fill up the vacant posts and the onus is shifted to the Managements of the Colleges. Though they were already at the fag end of the session, there seems to be no solution to the problem. A special meeting of the Senate was also convened, but they were not able to find any concrete solution. Now, they were in a hurry to increase the fees of University School of Open Learning. What about the affiliated Colleges? There are 193 affiliated Colleges, which are contributing a lot of funds to the University, but nobody takes care of their problem. Where would the College go? He urged that the matter should be looked into and the Colleges should be told as to which fee structure would be followed by them, i.e., new fee structure or the old one.

Principal Parveen Chawla stated that she was a member of the Fee Committee, wherein the fee structure for both the affiliated Colleges as well as University was suggested. The fee structure for the University was raised, but the fee structure for B.Com. course was reduced on the plea that the Colleges were getting 95% grant-in-aid. She wanted to tell the House that only few Colleges are covered under 95% grant-in-aid scheme of the Government and majority of the Colleges were self-financing. The self-financing Colleges could not survive with the latest fee structure suggested by the Committee for B. Com. Course. She, therefore, pleaded that there should be two types of fee structure – one for Colleges covered under the 95% grant-in-aid scheme of the Government and another for self-financing Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this difficulty of the Colleges needed to be looked into.

Shri Varinder Singh said that majority of the area falling under the jurisdiction of Panjab University, especially the border area and the area near the border is backward area and the financial health of the people of that area is very poor. Majority of the students from these areas took admission in the University School of Open Learning. He, therefore, pleaded that no financial burden should be put on them.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that since the students had already paid the increased fee, either the excess fee should be refunded to them or the same be adjusted during the next session.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that all the points which the members had made needed to be attended by the Committee proposed to be constituted. They have to keep all these things in mind while increasing the fee for the next session. Secondly, keeping in view the inflation, they must get a direction from the Government. Thirdly, they must also devise some mechanism either of having differential fee structure or some other remedial measure in the form of fee concession, freeships, scholarships, etc. for the students belonging to certain regions, categories and economically weaker sections. Fourthly, if the fee had already been paid by the students, it had to be refunded.

Shri Dinesh Kumar suggested that, if possible, the students of University School of Open Learning should be asked to deposit their fees in 3 instalments. Secondly, some students are facing problem in paying fees, especially in self-financing courses where the fee is much high. He suggested that some provision for scholarship should be made in self-financing courses as well.

Professor L.K. Bansal said that if the students of University School of Open Learning are allowed to deposit their fees in two instalments, the University is not going to lose any money.

Shri Munish Verma said that less fee should be prescribed/charged from the students.

Referring to Sub-Item R-10, Dr. Mukesh Arora stated that it is a very good step. But some people are facing certain problems and the Colleges had also sent e-mails to the Controller of Examinations. He pleaded that the students, whose hard copy of the on-line application was received late in the University, no late fee should be charged from them. Secondly, since it is a newly introduced system, it would take some time for the students to make familiar with it. Even if certain students did not get roll numbers, they should be allowed to appear in the examination at least for first two papers.

Shri Munish Verma said that Punjab Technical University (PTU), Jalandhar, is quite conversant with the on-line system. If need be, help should be sought from PTU.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that since the feedback which they had received so far on the on-line system is very positive, the Vice-Chancellor and the Controller of Examinations, Panjab University deserved congratulations. They need to extend the on-line system to other courses. He would like to tell them that Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar is much ahead of them and they need to catch them as far as on-line system is concerned. Since Panjab University is number one in the country, they have to start thinking for introduction of on-line submission of examination forms for PG as well as Undergraduate courses.

Shri Dinesh Kumar said that they appreciated the Vice-Chancellor and the Controller of Examinations for introducing the on-line system. He suggested that applications for various positions in the University and other purposes should also be sought on-line. Since they had a well-equipped Computer Centre at the Campus, they should introduce a Campus Portal through which the members of the Syndicate and Senate could go through the agenda as well as proceedings of the meetings. It would also save a lot of time, energy and papers as well.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal congratulated the Controller of Examinations for introducing the on-line system.

Professor Anil Monga congratulated the entire team which had contributed for the introduction of the on-line system. He said that similar system should be evolved for payment of fees. If possible, issuance of smart card to the students should be thought of. He also suggested that the timings for depositing fees by the students at the SBI Extension Counter should be increased.

Dr. Kuldip Singh congratulated the Controller of Examinations for introducing the on-line system for submission of examination forms for PG courses (Semester System) w.e.f. September 2013.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Items R-1 to R-4 and R-6 to R-11** on the agenda, be ratified;
- (2) as far as **Sub-Item R-5** is concerned, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Senate; and
- (3) the students of University School of Open Learning be allowed to deposit their fees in two instalments.

Shri Satya Pal Jain, Shri Naresh Gaur, Shri R.P.S. Josh, Shri Munish Verma and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Dr. Mukesh Arora, Shri Varinder Singh and Principal R.S. Jhanji recorded their dissent for approving the Item R-6 pertaining to increase in fee structure of University School of Open Learning.

XXIII. The information contained in **Items I-1 to I-12** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

I-1. That the Syndicate has felicitated S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, on his promotion to the cadre of IAS.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 1)

I-2. That the Syndicate has noted the following information given by the Vice-Chancellor:

- (i) that the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2013-14 powered by Thomson Reuters have ranked Panjab University in the bracket of 226-250 best Universities in the World. These rankings judge Universities world over across all of their core missions – teaching, research, knowledge transfer and international outlook, by employing 13 carefully calibrated performance indicators to provide comprehensive and balanced comparisons.

The 13 performance indicators are grouped into five areas:

- a) **Teaching:** the learning environment (worth 30 per cent of the overall ranking score)
- b) **Research:** volume, income and reputation (worth 30 per cent)
- c) **Citations:** research influence (worth 30 per cent)
- d) **Industry Income:** innovation (worth 2.5 per cent)
- e) **International Outlook:** staff, students and research (worth 7.5 per cent).

Our University has obtained the highest rank among all Indian Universities which participated in the global survey. The Planning Commission and MHRD, Government of India had asked Panjab University to provide data to this survey in May 2013.

The Syndicate acknowledged the performance and achievement of the Panjab University with thumping of desks.

- (ii) that Department of Science and Technology of Government of India has approved a proposal to set up Policy Research Centre at Panjab University Campus, which would focus on promotion of Industries – Academia Research. DST would provide Rs.1 crore in the first year to set up the infrastructure and deploy personnel to serve this Centre. The proposal was presented by Dean (Science), Professor Rupinder Tewari, Fellow, Panjab University, Professor Manmohan Gupta and Professor Gurmail Singh, on behalf of the University. The release of funds in the future would happen after evaluation on year to year basis. Such Centres are being set up under 12th Five Year Plan as a part of Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) policy enunciated by Government of India. The proposals of four Centres have been accepted so far and Panjab University is one of them.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 1 (i &ii))

I-3. That –

- (1) the instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 01.01.2013, be released/paid to the University employees, in anticipation of the announcement of release of the said DA instalment by Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration;
- (2) a copy of the Resolution be sent to all the members of the Board of Finance for their information; and
- (3) for future, an agenda item regarding release/payment of instalment of DA to the University employees as and when it is announced by the Central Government to its employees by delinking the University from the Punjab Government so far as DA is concerned, be placed before the Board of Finance.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para General discussion (1))

I-4. That the payment of leave encashment (Earned Leave) of 180 days to the faculty members, as per the existing provision, be made, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para General discussion (2))

I-5. Sub-Item I-5 was taken up for consideration after considering all information items, but before zero hour discussion.

I-6. The Panjab University has advertised 93 posts of the Assistant Professors in its various teaching departments vide Advertisement No. 7/2013 in accordance with the qualifications approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 20.12.2011 (Para XXXIV) (**Appendix-I**) and template for the selection of Assistant Professor in the Teaching Department of P.U. & other conditions approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 29.9.2013 (Para LIX) (**Appendix-I**). The last date for submission of application forms for these posts is 24.12.2013.

I-7. The following Syndicate item 3(i) & (ii) dated 8.10.2013 was withdrawn (**Appendix-II**):

- (i) The Selection Committee dated 19.12.2012 for appointment of Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ii) The Selection Committee dated 20.12.2012 for appointment of Assistant Professors-2 (General-1 and SC-1) in the Department of Public Administration at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE: Discussion on this item have been recorded in the minutes of the Syndicate meetings held on 27.7.2013/ 13.8.2013, 24.8.2013 and 8.10.2013 are enclosed (**Appendix-II**).

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 3(i) & (ii))

I-8. That the Syndicate decided that the following item 31 dated 8.10.2013 be treated as withdrawn and suitable reply in view of the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.7.2013 (Para 31), be given:

To reconsider the Syndicate decision dated 27.7.2013/ 13.8.2013 (Para 31) with regard to post of Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be offered to Mr. Suresh Thareja, who is on the Waiting List, as Dr. Raj Kumar, the selected candidate, has shown his inability to join the post on expiry of six months period of his extension, in view of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP 18711 of 2013.

NOTE: Discussion on this item have been recorded in the minutes of the Syndicate meetings held on 27.7.2013 (Para 31) & 8.10.2013 (Para 31) are enclosed (**Appendix-III**).

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 31 & Syndicate dated 27.7.2013 (Para 31))

I-9. Withdrawn

- I-10.**
1. The report (**Appendix-IV**) of the Expert Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, as per direction of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, to inspect SGGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur, has been accepted by the Syndicate.
 2. The request of the Principal of S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur for grant of Autonomous Status to the College, has not been acceded to by the Syndicate.
 3. In view of the discussion which took place in the meeting, the Dean, College Development Council, was to examine the whole issue and recommend action against the College under Regulations 11.1 and 14.1 at pages 159 and 160 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 27.7.2013, Para 55)

4. An office note indicating latest update with regard to Mahilpur College is enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

I-11. That the Syndicate has felicitated to the followings:

- (i) Professor A.K. Grover, Vice-Chancellor, on his inclusion in the Administrator's Advisory Council, to advise the Chandigarh Administration on developmental issues and policy matters affecting the Union Territory;
- (ii) Shri Satya Pal Jain, Syndic and Fellow, Panjab University and Professor Manju Jaidika, Department of English and Cultural Studies, on their inclusion in the Administrator's Advisory Council, to advise the Chandigarh Administration on developmental issues and policy matters affecting the Union Territory;
- (iii) Professor J.B. Singh, Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar, Dr. Ashok Kumar and Dr. J.S. Shahi (The High Energy Physics Group) of Department of Physics, on having been awarded the DST Project entitled "R&D Efforts by Universities Group for INO project";
- (iv) Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Chairperson, Department of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies and Fellow, Panjab University, on her having been honoured with 'Bibi Jasmer Kaur Kishanpuri Award';
- (v) Dr. R.P.S. Josh, Postgraduate Government College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh, and Syndic & Fellow, Panjab University, on receiving Shiksha Bhushan Rashtriya Samman 2013;
- (vi) Dr. M.C. Sidhu, Assistant Professor, Department of Botany and Fellow, Panjab University, on his admission as a Fellow of the Indian Botanical Society, India;
- (vii) Dr. Surinder Kumar Deweshwar, Department of Punjabi, Panjab University, on his having been awarded Senior Fellowship 2011-12 by the Government of India, Ministry of Culture, New Delhi; and
- (viii) Dr. S.L. Goel, retired Professor of Public Administration and a former Fellow of Panjab University, on his having been awarded a prestigious award by the Indian Institute of Public Administration by Dr. Hamid Ansari, Vice-President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 5.12.2013, Para 1)

I-12. That the instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 10% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 01.07.2013, be released/paid to the University employees as and when the grant is received, in anticipation of the announcement of release of the said DA

instalment by Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration.

(Syndicate dated 5.12.2013, Para General discussion)

Referring to Sub-Item I-2, the Vice-Chancellor stated that let him tell them what is useful and interesting. Earlier, the Panjab University was ranked between 226 and 250 in the world. In the ranking released by Time Magazine last week, the Panjab University has been 13th amongst the BRICS countries and emerging economies of the world. There are many ways to move forward. The new ranking has given them a clear target as the earlier ranking had not given them as to which is the most effective way and what should be their target. Now, they should look at the strength of the 12 Universities which are ahead of them and maybe the 10 Universities which are behind them. They could see what are the plus points and what are the minus points of those Universities. In this way, now they have a clear target, which can help them to find a course of action to improve.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that he would first of all like to echo the sentiments already expressed both in the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate in the morning. This is a moment of joy for all of them. He congratulated all those who had contributed in getting this rank. He fully endorsed what the Vice-Chancellor had just said to the members that they should not feel satisfied with this ranking and their aim should be much higher. He always felt that probably their aim should be even higher and the Vice-Chancellor had often recalled of the great contributions made by the great alumni of the University in the past, e.g., Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni, Dr. Hargobind Khurana. Dr. Hargobind Khurana got the Nobel Prize when he was not in this University. The question is whether they feel that they are adequately equipped to achieve the target, which the Vice-Chancellor is talking about. They are proud of the ranking achieved by the University at the international level and at the level of emerging economies. Though the Panjab University is getting its due recognition, in recent months there has been very adverse publicity about the way some of their institutions have functioned. Those who are related with the University are asking as to what is wrong with the University. They need to do some introspection. The time has come that they should seriously start thinking of some institutional changes in the University. They have to see whether they could make these institutions more effective and responsive to the requirements. He had no specific suggestions but felt that the time was ripe to start thinking of possible institutional reforms. The constitution we had inherited from the British had remained virtually unchanged for more than a century. The only major change, which was made in the 20th Century under the Re-organization Act, made the University a sort of hybrid with the legal status of a "Body Corporate". A few years ago some thought was given to possible reforms and a detailed plan was drawn up by the then Vice-Chancellor, Professor M.M. Puri but he faced major political hurdles. As a result no changes could be made. The Senate has a responsibility that goes beyond routine matters such as promotions, appointments etc. with which it seemed to be preoccupied. It must devote most of its time to the framing of policy guidelines that go beyond these routine matters with a view to improving academic standards. For this it was important to look to the future and see what institutional changes are needed to ensure that we can meet the requirements of the 21st Century and to achieve our goals to rise even higher in global rankings.

We could constitute a Committee for the purpose comprising academicians, legal luminaries and persons who have experience of working in Universities with higher rankings. The Vice-Chancellor should start applying his mind and come up with concrete proposals.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that one important decision which might take care itself in pulling their University up. Earlier, in a meeting held in this very Hall, they had taken a decision that anybody who wanted to submit his thesis has to publish at least two research papers. But the Syndicate and Senate in their wisdom reduced it to one paper. They in the Committee meeting had observed that two papers are minimum because every thesis has a review chapter and the candidate could come up with one paper from the review chapter. The second paper could be from the results and discussions. He was sorry to say that those Ph.D. Regulations/Rules are still not approved. He, therefore, suggested that they should take this particular decision that the candidate who wishes to submit his/her Ph.D. thesis, has to publish at least two research papers. It would definitely make a huge difference.

Referring to Sub-Item I-7, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky stated that he has a representation regarding appointments to the post of Assistant Professors in the subject of Public Administration. He just wanted to appeal to all the members of the Senate that these candidates are being punished without any fault on their part. In fact, they had been selected by a valid Selection Committee and have been looking for their appointments for the last 10-11 months. He, therefore, pleaded that their appointments to the posts of Assistant Professors in Public Administration should be approved.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that these persons had faced duly constituted Selection Committees having subject experts. The interviews for these positions were fixed before the decision of the Syndicate. The decision of the Syndicate should be made applicable prospectively and not to these appointments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this item was not considered by the Syndicate at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one of the members had just sometime before told that there is no provision for Zero Hour in the Regulations of the University. Now, he would like to tell them that there is no provision for discussion on items for information.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that, in fact, this item was placed before the Syndicate for the first time in its January 2013 meeting. The basic objection was that in the light of the assurance given by the Vice-Chancellor that he would not hold any interview till clarification is received from the U.G.C. Despite this, the interviews were held and recommendations of the Selection Committee were placed before the Syndicate. Everybody gave his/her views in the meeting of the Syndicate. Though consensus was not there, the overwhelming majority was not in favour of approving the recommendations of the Selection Committee. Ultimately, the item was withdrawn. Thereafter, the item was again placed before the Syndicate and unfortunately he was not present in that meeting. The item was also withdrawn from that meeting of the Syndicate. He added that all the four candidates are qualified and eligible for the post of Assistant Professor in Public Administration and neither any irregularity has been committed in their cases nor any relaxation is given to them. The only objection is that the Vice-Chancellor had assured that he would not conduct/hold any interview till the clarification regarding eligibility of Ph.D. done by the candidates under the old Regulations is received from the U.G.C. He requested the Hon'ble members to leave this issue alone and approve the appointments of these four candidates as they are not at fault at all.

When Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that teachers are not being appointed by the affiliated Colleges on similar grounds, the Vice-Chancellor said that there is no comparison between the two items/issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that even if there is no fault of the candidates, let the posts be re-advertised. The Vice-Chancellor had just said that it is a different case. The regulations of the University clearly say that if the Syndicate does not approve any

recommendation of the Selection Committee, the post/s would be re-advertised. In the instant case also, the Syndicate has not approved the recommendations of the Selection Committees. In fact, these recommendations of the Selection Committees were rejected by the Syndicate in its January 2013 meeting. Do they not understand why it is being tagged with other item?

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the matter should be placed before the Syndicate and the new Syndicate (to be elected) would take a call on the issue.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that just few minutes before they were talking about the ranking of the University between 226 to 250 in the world and 13th amongst the BRICS and emerging economies of the countries and giving suggestions to move up. If they wanted to aim and get higher position, they have to think of big and find new ways to look at the things. His personal experience is that in 1947, Dr. D.S. Kothari, Department of Physics, Delhi University, appointed three persons without any advertisement and applications. Dr. Kothari had said only one thing that he has identified these people and he would like to have them. Everybody told him to go ahead. When he (Professor Bambah) joined Panjab University at that time it was a question as to how one thinks. If they wanted to grow, they have to think objectively. He added that most of the times the Vice-Chancellors worked in good faith. Procedure might not be right, but intentions are good. If people are good and have faith, there is generosity. The members should respect the decision of the Vice-Chancellor and, in future, the Vice-Chancellor should also talk to them so that they should have harmony with each other.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 15th December 2012, it was brought to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor that in view of the decision of the Syndicate taken today, he could not go ahead with the interviews, which were scheduled for 19th and during the dinner, the Vice-Chancellor, in the presence of several members, said that he did not care for the Syndicate.

Continuing, Professor R.P. Bambah said that they ought to have mutual understanding and regard for each other and they should go together. Let us give regard to each other and should not say unnecessary things, which hurt each other.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that Professor Arun Kumar Grover is an international scholar and he respected him very much. Dewan Anand Kumar and Dr. Kothari, the former Vice-Chancellors searched for scholars all over the country as there was dearth of scholars at that point of time. Now, since scholars are available here, why should they find scholars elsewhere? He remarked that now numerous applications are received against a single post.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it is wrong to say that the item rejected by the Syndicate could not be placed before the Senate. Earlier, when the recommendation of the Selection Committee regarding appointment of Dr. Parvinder Arora as Reader in UBS was rejected by the Syndicate, the same was placed before the Senate and his appointment was approved.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that according to him the case referred to by Dr. Mukesh Arora was referred back to the Syndicate.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the objection to the appointment of Dr. Parvinder Arora was – did the Selection Committee know that the person concerned was rejected for the post of Lecturer. If a person is rejected for the post of Lecturer/Assistant Professor, how he/she could be appointed as Reader/Associate Professor? At that time, it was decided to refer the case back to the same Selection Committee and the Selection Committee was made aware of this fact.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the issue is highly complicated and difference of opinion is there. The issue before them now is how to resolve it. Everybody is trying to prove that one is right and the other is wrong and kept on indulging acrimoniously aloud.

Let us understand one another. Whenever any decision is taken with good intentions, it is not difficult to arrive at a common platform. They had very good Regulations and Rules for running the Institution. When they did not find a solution within the Regulations and Rules, they should apply their minds as intellectuals to resolve the problem. As said by Professor R.P. Bambah, they should have clear understanding of each other.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that question had been raised whether the Senate could take up an item without its having been approved by the Syndicate. The Regulation at page 28 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 says, no item of business shall be included in the agenda unless it is first considered by the Syndicate. It does not say that the item should have been approved by the Syndicate. This item had been considered by the Syndicate and nothing prevented them from discussing it. He felt that the item should have been put up for consideration and not for information. Secondly, the Senate had power to make appointments and the Syndicate could only make recommendation/s for making appointment, which meant the Syndicate itself could not make appointments. If the Syndicate did not want to approve an appointment, it should recommend to the Senate that this appointment should not be approved, but it (Syndicate) could not reject the appointment on its own as this veto power is not given to the Syndicate. Thirdly, he felt that the Vice-Chancellor is unnecessarily apologetic as there is nothing for him to apologize. In fact, the Vice-Chancellor had given the assurance that he would not convene any further interview, but in the instant case, the interviews were already convened/fixd. At that point of time, the Vice-Chancellor might have forgotten this. As such, there is no breach of confidence of the members of the Syndicate or assurance given to them. The Vice-Chancellor had desired to make improvements and targeted to make Panjab University number one University in the world. How would he be able to do so if he is not allowed to fill up the vacant faculty positions, interviews for which have been conducted and suitable candidates selected? The selected candidates are waiting to be appointed and the members of the Syndicate and Senate are preventing him from making the appointments. The interviews for these posts have been held by legally appointed Selection Committee. He, therefore, suggested that these appointments of Assistant Professors in Public Administration should be approved.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Syndicate had power to make recommendations to the Senate for making appointments. Para 4 of Regulation 6.1 at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 says "The Committee shall interview suitable person and make recommendations which will be placed before the Syndicate. If the Syndicate does not accept the recommendation of the Selection Committee, it may order re-advertisement of the post in case of direct recruitment or re-invitation of application in case of in-service promotion or take such other action as may be considered necessary.....". Therefore, let us not mislead the House by reading selective part of the regulations. It was brought to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor and he was requested not to go ahead with the interviews, but the Vice-Chancellor said that he did not bother about the Syndicate.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that the matter should be referred back to the Syndicate for reconsideration.

Dr. Yog Raj Angrish said that since technicalities are involved, especially about the fact that the item was withdrawn from the Syndicate, the matter should be referred back to the Syndicate for reconsideration.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that since the recommendations of the Selection Committees contained in this item had neither been rejected nor endorsed to the Senate for approval by the Syndicate, these recommendations should be referred back to the

Syndicate for consideration. He, however, felt that the Syndicate was bound to consider the recommendations of the Selection Committees.

Referring to Sub-Item I-8, the Vice-Chancellor stated that there has been some problem because as per regulations/rules of the University, the waiting list remained valid for a period of six months, but in this case the person, who had been appointed and offered appointment, got extension in joining period and refused to join on the last date. In fact, while putting up a note for granting extension in joining period to the appointed person, the office did not make a mention that the waiting list is valid for a period of six months only and as such, the appointed person should be given extension accordingly. If the Senate could make one time exception, i.e., notwithstanding what is there in the regulations/rules, the person on the waiting list should be allowed to be offered the appointment, may be considered. The Vice-Chancellor alluded to the case of Dr. Latika Sharma

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. Latika Sharma was not placed on the waiting list rather she was at number 1 in the list of selected candidates. The problem in her case is that since she joined exactly after a period of six months, whether she would lose her seniority or not. As far as this case is concerned, they told the Vice-Chancellor in the Syndicate also that as per Regulation 15 at page 36 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, "A Selection Committee while recommending a candidate for appointment to a post in the University, may also prepare a waiting list, in order of merit of not more than two persons, so that if the person appointed does not join, the person next on the waiting list may be offered the post. The waiting list, shall, however, be operative for a period of six months from the date of Syndicate meeting in which it is approved". As such, the waiting list could not be made operative even one day after the period of six months.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the only point is that the mistake is on the part of the office and not on the part of the person placed on the waiting list.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Court had asked the University to consider the case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Court had asked the University only to consider the case and pass speaking orders.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that the appointed person had declined the offer on the last date of six months. But since the fault lays with the office, the Senate might consider it accordingly.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Items I-1 to I-4, I-6, I-10 to I-12** on the agenda, be noted.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That **Items I-7 and I-8** on the agenda, be referred back to the Syndicate for consideration/ reconsideration.

When Sub-Item I-5 came up for consideration, Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor, excused himself and Professor R.P. Bambah was requested to chair the meeting in his absence.

XXIV.

The information contained in Sub-Item I-5 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

I-5. The Syndicate has resolved not to accord approval to the recommendation of the D.U.I. conveying the recommendation of the Academic & Administrative Committee of Department of Music dated 19.7.2013 with regard to extension in term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover against vacant post of Professor, purely on temporary basis as per Panjab University rules. No reasons have been recorded by the Syndicate for their non-acceptance of the recommendation of the D.U.I.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, Para 33)

NOTE: The D.U.I. had forwarded the request of some of the faculty members of the Department of Music that Professor Neera Grover, who had been appointed as Professor, be allowed to continue as such till the post of K.L. Sehgal Professor in Music is filled in on regular basis. An office note on this issue was also put up to follow up.

(Appendix-V)

Early in the discussion the Chairman (Professor R.P. Bambah) remarked that he was quite convinced that, while closing the meeting of the Syndicate in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor, the Syndicate and its Chairman (Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon) had no intention to show disrespect to the Vice-Chancellor. He suggested that the relevant portion containing comments on item 33 of the Syndicate may be taken off the record. After some other suggestions from the House, it was agreed that all comments/observations made on item-33 of the Syndicate Proceedings by the Vice-Chancellor, Secretary of the Syndicate and Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon be taken off the record and should not be made part of the proceedings.

There was a general feeling in the House that Professor Neera Grover should be given extension/re-appointment in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

During the discussion, the following three proposals were made:

1. That she may be given extension by the Senate;
2. That the matter be referred back to the existing Syndicate for reconsideration within a short time; and
3. The matter be referred back to the Syndicate for consideration in a regular meeting.

It was observed that her leave from her parent department expires on 16th of December 2013, and she could not continue without getting further leave from her parent institution.

It was unanimously agreed to accept proposal number 3, i.e., it was –

RESOLVED: That the issue pertaining to the extension in term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be referred back to the Syndicate for reconsideration.

A.K. Bhandari
Registrar

Confirmed

R.P. BAMBAH
CHAIRMAN

XXV.**ZERO HOUR**

- (1) Mrs. Anu Chatrath stated that UNESCO Centre(Chair) has been established in the University after a lot of efforts. They should be thankful to Shri Munish Verma for taking keen interest in the establishment of this Chair. It would definitely raise the level of the University and one day it would be at the top.

- (2) Professor Ronki Ram stated that as pointed out by Shri Rashpal Malhotra, the matter relating to parity of Technical Staff with the Ministerial Staff as far as pay-scales are concerned, should be placed before the Board of Finance in its next meeting. He urged that, if possible, all the benefits available to the Ministerial Staff should be extended to the Technical Staff.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath pointed out that in the previous meeting of the Senate, it was decided that the matter would be placed before the Board of Finance. Why it has not been placed before the Board?

Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu said that this issue had come up in the last 2-3 meetings of the Senate. The same should be resolved at the earliest.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that he seconded the proposal of Professor Ronki Ram.

- (3) Professor Ronki Ram stated that couple of employees, who had been placed under suspension, are getting 75% of the salary, enjoying other facilities, including accommodation at the campus, medical reimbursement, etc. without doing any work of the University. He pleaded that instead of paying huge amount of money without any work, they should be put on duty pending the outcome of the enquiries.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Ronki Ram, Shri Deepak Kaushik said that one of the suspended employees is a Driver. His services should also be utilized as there is a shortage of Drivers in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into the issue.

- (4) Mrs. Anu Chatrath stated that when they were coming to attend the meeting of the Senate in the morning, the students of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh, were sitting on Dharna. They were raising slogans against the University for withholding their results.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that there are certain problems of the students of Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College, including declaration of their results. Since the students had already been enrolled with the College, their results should be declared. As far as affiliation is concerned, the same should be continued.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University had sought legal opinion on the issue.

- (5) Dr. Emanuel Nahar urged the Vice-Chancellor to look into whether proper reservation had been given to the candidates belonging to the reserved categories in the 93 posts of Assistant Professors recently advertised by the University. Though there is a provision for reservation of

2.5% to the Socially Backwards, it had never been given to the deserving candidates so far. He further said that since the University had adopted the UGC Guidelines 2010 in toto, they should constitute the Selection Committee by giving proper representation to the minority communities.

Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu said that though the University had advertised 93 posts of Assistant Professors, it had not made any effort to fill up the vacant posts of Associate Professors and Professors for the last so many years. He pleaded that the members of the Academic and Administrative Committees should be asked to expedite the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the posts of Associate Professors and Professors are of senior level positions, they are facing a lot of difficulties, especially in regard to making the benefit of pension available to them. In fact, they are unable to attract good people because they are unable to resolve the issue of pension. He expected the Pension Committee to come up with some progressive decision.

(6) Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that, in the previous meeting of the Senate, he had pointed out that certain Colleges of Education have applied for starting M.A. (Education) course. The Colleges had also paid the requisite fee for the same. He was sorry to say that despite his raising the issue a couple of times, nothing has been done by the University so far. He added that the point raised by Principal S.S. Sangha regarding 2/3rd staff in the Colleges of Education should be taken care of.

(7) Professor Anil Monga stated that the University had adopted UGC guidelines for recruitment in toto. As per UGC guidelines, in the subjects in which the UGC did not conduct NET, the candidates from the allied subjects are eligible for the post of Assistant Professor. He urged that this should be mentioned in the advertisement that in the subjects in which UGC did not conduct NET, the candidates from the allied subjects are eligible for the post of Assistant Professor and there is no need to qualify UGC NET in that subject. Citing an example, he said that in the subjects of Fashion Technology, Computer Science, Police Administration, the condition of UGC NET is not applicable. The same should be clearly mentioned in the advertisement. The candidates were told at the last moment, sometimes at the time of interview, that they were not eligible for the post which resulted into harassment of the candidates. Therefore, it should be made the responsibility of the University in the case of posts in the University and College management concerned in the case of post/s in the affiliated Colleges. Only eligible candidates should be called for the interview.

Dr. Jagwant Singh informed that the decision that the candidates from the allied subjects are eligible for the post of Assistant Professor, had already been taken in one of the Syndicate meetings.

(8) Dr. Devinder Singh stated that they had exempted all the Ph.D. holders irrespective of whether the Ph.D. degree has been obtained under new UGC Regulations 2009 or old Regulations of the University. He pleaded that this decision should be implemented in letter and spirit.

Professor Anil Monga said that the University could make all those Ph.D. degree holders eligible who have done Ph.D. under the old regulations. Therefore, they should go ahead with this.

- (9) Dr. Devinder Singh said that though they had seniority list of the teachers in the University, but the inter-Department seniority list of teachers had not been prepared. They are facing a problem on this front. Since the record is available with the Establishment Branch, the University should prepare seniority list of the teachers inter-department-wise and the same should be put in the public domain.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Devinder Singh should take up this matter with the Dean of University Instruction separately.

- (10) Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal had sanctioned a sum of Rs.20 lac from his MPLAD Fund for development of parks in Panjab University South Campus, Sector 25. He suggested that the Senate should thank him for this kind gesture and a letter of thanks should be written and sent to Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal by the University.

- (11) Principal Gurdip Sharma said that, last year, the result of BCA Part-I was very poor and the students were assured that the fee paid by them for re-evaluation would be refunded to them. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to ensure that the fee is refunded to the students concerned.

- (12) Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it has been learnt that the audit had raised a technical objection on the fixation of pay of Shri Sunil Khosla, Principal of one of the Constituent Colleges of the University. In fact, the word written is 'protected', whereas it should have been 'may be fixed'. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to see that the pay of Shri Khosla is fixed at the minimum of the pay-scale as decided by the Syndicate and Senate.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the pay of the Principal has to be fixed at the minimum of the pay-scale, i.e., at Rs.43000/- plus AGP of Rs.10,000/-.

The Vice-Chancellor assured that he would get the same done.

- (13) Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there is confusion amongst the Colleges whether the API Score is to be implemented in the case of appointment of Principals or not.

It was clarified that the Punjab Government had adopted the relevant document of the UGC on 30th July 2013. Now, the same would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. Once it is adopted by the University, clear-cut instructions would be issued to the concerned quarters, including the Vice-Chancellor's nominee/s.

- (14) Shri Varinder Singh stated that the BDS student, Ms. Aunkurita Tripathi, at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, who had committed suicide, had secured 94% marks in her +2 examination and her All India Rank was 146. According to the information gathered by him from the students, the teacher, Dr. Savita Prashar, was not behaving properly with the students. The student concerned cleared all the four papers in her first attempt except Bio-Chemistry, which was taught by Dr. Savita Prashar. He pleaded that none should protect Dr. Savita Prashar rather action should be taken against her. Though the teachers are harassing the students, the University had not taken action against anyone of them, including Professor Rakesh Datta, Department of Defence & National Security Studies.

Dr. Devinder Singh intervened to say that all (teachers, students and their parents) are shocked by this incident. Though he did not talk to the teacher concerned, he had met the parents of the student, who had told him that they had full faith in the University system.

Continuing, Shri Varinder Singh stated that the students are deliberately failed due to departmental politics. In fact, there is politics in each and every teaching department of the University. He suggested that there should be a Grievance Committee and the names of its members along with their addresses and phone numbers should be put on the Notice Boards of all the departments as also on the website of the University. He further suggested that to motivate the students, seminars or conferences should be arranged.

Principal S.S. Sangha, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Varinder Singh, stated that there is serious issue pertaining to harassment of students while pursuing Ph.D. Recently, the Punjab Government had appointed 53 Deputy Superintendents of Police and the Chairperson of one of the Department had written to the Government that the candidature of one of the candidate selected by them is not good. He pleaded that an enquiry should be conducted to know the truth.

- (15) Shri Varinder Singh said that the post of the Director Sports is lying vacant for the last few years and no effort has been made by the University authorities to fill up the same.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the post of Director Sports is lying vacant for the last two years. He pleaded that scrutiny of the applications should be got done before 22nd January 2014.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had to re-advertise the post of Director Sports due to some technical points raised by someone. Secondly, the Dean of Student Welfare is looking into the whole issue.

- (16) Shri Munish Verma said that Dr. Neelam Paul, Department of Music, P.U. had deliberately failed 11 students of an affiliated College. He pleaded that strict action should be taken against her.

Dr. Devinder Singh said that the matter pertaining to the students of Music Department of Panjab University had already been solved.

Dr. Kuldip Singh suggested that they should appoint a Counsellor to counsel the students, so that they did not take extreme steps.

On a point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that he had demanded many a times in the meeting of the Senate that a representative of the students, especially from the P.U. Students Council, should be made a member of the Senate as has been done in the case of PUTA and PUSA. He urged that Dean of Student Welfare should be asked to write to University authorities that a representative of the students is appointed on the Senate whenever it is constituted next time.

The Vice-Chancellor informed that the Maharashtra University Act allowed two members of the Students' Council on the Senate.

- (17) Principal S.S. Sangha pleaded that as the University is conducting the inspections of the affiliated Colleges, the inspection of all the teaching departments of the University should also be got on the same pattern, which would help in removing the shortcomings of the departments.

- (18) Dr. Tarlok Bandhu stated that, in September 2013 meeting of the Syndicate, he had raised the issue of declaring by the Academic & Administrative Committees of Department of Punjabi that the research work of Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal for guiding Ph.D. student/s is not adequate. He got a copy of the proceedings of the said meeting of the Administrative and Academic Committee of the Department of Punjabi from the General Branch. In the proceedings, it has only been mentioned that “after thorough discussion, it was decided not to grant approval to Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal as Ph.D. Guide”. Though it has been mentioned that his research work is not up to the mark, the research work of Principal Gosal has not been attached and only titles of the books and headings of publications have been mentioned. He wanted to know, as there were clear-cut guidelines of the UGC on the issue adopted by the University in July 2009 and the circular has also been issued by the University, why the Vice-Chancellor had constituted a Committee for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the students’ issues raised by Shri Varinder Singh and Shri Munish Verma needed to be taken seriously. As far as appointment of Supervisors is concerned, there is no uniformity in different teaching departments of the University and the teachers & Principals of the affiliated Colleges are suffering due to this negative attitude of the Teaching Departments of the University. He suggested that the Dean Research should be asked to coordinate in such issues and resolve the matter at his own level.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that the Syndicate and Senate had decided that, if desirous, the teachers of the Colleges be allowed to be registered for Ph.D. But such teachers would have to compete amongst themselves and not amongst the other general candidates, i.e., JRFs and the candidates who had qualified the University Entrance Test for Ph.D. Though this decision had been taken quite some time back, how many of the College teachers have been registered for Ph.D. Recently, a letter from the Dean, Faculty of Business Management & Commerce had been received in the General Branch seeking clarification whether some specific seat(s) is/are to be earmarked for permanent teachers of Colleges affiliated to Panjab University/teaching departments of the University or they will compete with others in the already notified seats. What is the specific purpose of holding mandatory interview for Ph.D. programme? Can the selection or rejection of a candidate be made on the basis of the said interview? If yes, the detailed criteria thereof may please be supplied. To this, the General Branch had given the reply as under:

Query-1: There is no seat earmarked for permanent teachers. Thus, they are to compete with others in the already notified seats.

Query-2: The purpose of interview is to meet the UGC requirements as well as to have interaction with the candidates. Selection or rejection cannot be done on the basis of interview.

He stated that the Syndicate had already decided the criteria for admission of candidates to the Ph.D. and according to that criteria the College teachers were not supposed to compete with other candidates. Rather one

seat, over and above the prescribed limit of 8 (eight) Ph.D. students has been reserved for the College teachers.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that the Syndicate dated 15.12.2012 (Para 5) and Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para LII) had *inter alia* approved that: (i) the approved permanent (regular for Government Colleges) teachers of the Panjab University and Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University with two years' experience be exempted from Entrance Test/s for admission to enrolment for Ph.D.; and (ii) one seat, over and above the prescribed limit of 8 (eight) Ph.D. students to be supervised by a faculty member, be reserved in each University Teaching Department/approved Research Centres for regular teachers of Colleges affiliated to Panjab University/UGC Rajiv Gandhi National Fellow for pursuing Ph.D. degree. Accordingly, a circular was also issued by the University on 28.02.2013. But when the Dean, Faculty of Business Management & Commerce sought clarification from the General Branch, the General Branch sought further clarification from Dean Research, despite their mentioning the above-said decisions of the Syndicate and Senate, the Dean Research wrote with his hand that there is no seat earmarked for permanent teachers. Thus, they are to compete with others in the already notified seats. The Dean Research had no authority to defy the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate. Several such cases are pending in the University. Since a seat has been reserved in each Department of the University for the College teachers, they are not supposed to compete with other candidates, who sought enrolment/ registration to Ph.D. on the basis of Entrance Test or other basis. He urged that this issue should be taken up seriously.

Some papers related to the issue were handed over to the Vice-Chancellor on the floor of the House and **the Vice-Chancellor said that since the issue is very serious, the matter would be looked into.**

- (19) Dr. Kuldip Singh said that he went to a College as nominee of the Vice-Chancellor for the purpose of appointment. Later on, he was issued a show-cause notice by a Superintendent, Colleges Branch. Is he competent to seek explanation from the Fellow/s?

Mrs. Anu Chatrath remarked the Superintendent had such a confidence to issue show cause notice to the Fellow. She pleaded the Registrar must take action against the Superintendent concerned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

- (20) Shri Deepak Kaushik stated that earlier the Pay-Scale of the Assistant Registrar in the University was equivalent to the Under Secretary in the Punjab Civil Secretariat. But at present, the Assistant Registrars in the Panjab University were drawing less Grade Pay and Special Pay in comparison to the Under Secretaries. One of the Assistant Registrar from Punjabi University, Patiala went to the Court and the Court had made their parity with Under Secretary of Punjab Civil Secretariat as far as Special Pay and Grade Pay is concerned. Though they had provided a copy of that decision of the Court to the University authorities about six months ago, but no action has been taken by the University so far. He pleaded that keeping in view the above decision of the Court, the Grade Pay and Special Pay equivalent to Under Secretary of the Civil Secretariat should be given to the Assistant Registrars. During the function organized by the Non-teaching Employees Federation for retired employees, one of the retired employees told that earlier the pay-scales/salary of the University employees used to be more than the employees of the Punjab Civil Secretariat. When one of the Fellows asked as to how they could give

more salary to the University employees, the then Vice-Chancellor told it is the University and not an ordinary office. But today the University employees are getting less salary than the Civil Secretariat employees.

- (21) Shri Deepak Kaushik said that about a year ago, a Committee was constituted by the University to frame a policy for regularization of services of Daily-Wage employees. Legal opinion has been sought on the recommendations of the Committee. Earlier, the regularization was done on the basis of 3650 days, i.e., @ 365 days per year, which was wrong because nobody could attend the office for 365 days in a year. Even according to the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Uma Devi, there is no requirement of 3650 days service. He pleaded that the Daily-Wage employees who have been working in the University for the last about 10 years or more should be regularized and the decision in this respect should be taken at the earliest.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Deepak Kaushik, said that the service of all those, who had completed 10 years service, should be regularized if they are qualified. The Punjab and Haryana Governments had regularized the services of all those daily-wage employees, who had completed 10 years or more service, as one time exception.

- (22) Shri Dinesh Kumar said that till now only Professors are allowed to conduct viva-voce of the Ph.D. candidates. He pleaded that the Associate Professors should also be allowed to conduct viva-voce of the Ph.D. candidates. When Professor Shelley Walia had earlier raised the issue for providing seed money to the newly appointed faculty members, the Vice-Chancellor had said that the matter would be looked into.

- (23) Shri Dinesh Kumar said that, earlier, the item regarding grant of advance increments was deferred. The same should be placed before the Syndicate/Senate again.

- (24) Shri Dinesh Kumar stated that, as said by Professor Anil Monga, there are certain inter-disciplinary courses, e.g., B.A.LL.B. course at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur. He suggested that a Committee should be appointed to examine whether the candidates, who had done M.A. (History) and LL.M., could be declared eligible for the post of Assistant Professor for teaching LL.B. course, so that if there is no sufficient teaching workload, they could be assigned the workload of the other subjects.

- (25) Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that, earlier, the pay of some of the teachers was fixed/protected on the basis of their previous pay/service, but the RAO had raised certain objection. Recently, the Syndicate also considered the issue and decided that the pay of the persons, who are coming from any Government Institute, Aided Institute, etc., be protected. But since the University is protecting the pay of everybody, including those who are coming from private institutes/ colleges, the RAO had raised objection. He pleaded that the pay of all the persons irrespective of the fact whether he/she is coming from Government Institute or Aided Institute or non-aided Institute should be protected, provided they applied through proper channel and the same should be done with retrospective effect.

- (26) Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Shri Naresh Gaur, their own Fellow, had persuaded the State Bank of Patiala, to donate a sum of Rs.2 lac for the functions arranged for commemoration of 150th year of Higher Education

in Punjab in the name of Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni. The Senate should thank him as well as the State Bank of Patiala for this kind gesture.

- (27) Shri Naresh Gaur said that as said by Mrs. Anu Chatrath the issue for which the students of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital had been sitting on dharna should be resolved at the earliest. Secondly, as said by Professor Ronki Ram and certain other members, they are paying 75% of the salaries to the employees who had been placed under suspension. He suggested that either their cases should be settled at the earliest or they should be allowed to join duties pending outcome of the enquiries.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

- (28) Shri Lilu Ram stated that the Pre-Ph.D. course work proposed to be started for the College teachers during vacations should be expedited. He further said that the applications received by the University for the purpose of recognition of research centres should be processed without any further delay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had already provided an alternative for arranging of pre-Ph.D. course work by the recognized Research Centres jointly, but he had not received any proposal from their side so far.

- (29) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that the University had changed the nomenclature of one of the Constituent College, i.e., from Saheed Udham Singh Govt. College at Guru Har Sahai to P.U. Constituent College at Guru Har Sahai, which had caused a lot of resentment amongst the people of that region.

- (30) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that it would be better if along with the profile of the teachers, their research areas, publications and national/international conferences attended by them, are put on the website of the University.

Shri Dinesh Kumar endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa.

The Vice-Chancellor said that an item pertaining to this would be placed in the meeting of the Chairpersons of the University Teaching Departments.

- (31) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the benefit being given to single girl child should also be extended to one of the girls if they are twin sisters.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Resolution on this issue should be moved by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa for consideration by the Syndicate and Senate.

- (32) Shri Munish Verma said that as per decision of the Syndicate of 1996 (Para 5), the blind students are given full fee concession. Keeping in view this decision of the Syndicate, Mr. Bilu Paswan should be exempted from Hostel fee and mess charges. He added that the father of Mr. Bilu Paswan has been hospitalized and his mother is not alive. He, therefore, reiterated that his all fees, including hostel and mess charges should be waived off.

Dr. Emanuel Nahar said that Mr. Bilu Paswan had been exempted from payment of hostel fee as per University/UGC Regulations. As far as exemption from mess charges is concerned, he would take up the issue with the Dean of Student Welfare for making available some funds under weaker sections of the society, so that maximum financial help could be given to Mr. Bilu Paswan.

- (33) Shri Munish Verma said that the sanction letter for establishment of UNESCO Centre(Chair) has been received by the University about six months ago, but nothing has been done by the University in this regard so far.
- (34) Shri Munish Verma stated that one of the students, who had done M.Phil. in Police Administration, was being ignored for appointment as Assistant Professor in Police Administration on temporary/ *ad hoc*/guest faculty basis both in the University as well as in the affiliated Colleges. He pleaded that such persons should be made eligible for appointment as Assistant Professors in the subjects of Police Administration as well as Public Administration.
- (35) Shri Munish Verma suggested that if duff & dumb candidates fulfilled minimum eligibility conditions, they should be given preference both in admissions and in service.
- (36) Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that they appreciate the Dean, Faculty of Science, for making sincere efforts for getting the inspections of certain Colleges done pertaining to recognition of Research Centres in various Science subjects. But last time he got an answer from the Registrar that the cases regarding recognition of Research Centres in the subjects of Arts and Commerce are pending in the office as per orders of the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Dean, Faculty of Business Management & Commerce because they are waiting for approval of revised *pro forma* for recognition of Research Centres. Earlier, it had been decided that till the revised *pro forma* and other guidelines are approved by the competent authority, the cases received by the office should be processed as per old *pro forma* and guidelines. He stated that one College applied along with requisite fee to the University for recognition of Research Centre in April 2013 and another in August 2013. The case of College which applied in August 2013 had been processed and inspection got done on 4th December 2013, whereas in the cases of College/s, which applied in April 2013, neither any action had been taken by the University office so far nor any information given, which is a serious matter. Why the issue of recognition of Research Centres is hanging fire, especially when the Syndicate and Senate had already permitted establishment of Research Promotion Cell. In this way, they are depriving the affiliated Colleges from research. Almost one year has been wasted as there is no activity for the promotion of research for College teachers. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter as to why the requests of certain Colleges for recognition of Research Centres had not been accepted by the Deans, Faculty of Arts and Business Management & Commerce and ensure that these requests are processed without wastage of any more time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue raised by Dr. Dalip Kumar is well-taken and the matter would be looked into.

- (37) Dr. Mukesh Arora said that a panel of six examiners for evaluation of Ph.D. thesis of a candidate is sought and only two out of them are appointed for the purpose. He suggested that the four examiners, who are not appointed, should not be debarred for a period of one year. He also

suggested that the Associate Professors should also be allowed to be appointed for evaluation of Ph.D. thesis.

- (38) Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that his basic objection is that it is for the first time that the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate were not recorded and, if recorded, were not implemented and some orders were passed on the basis of decisions of the Syndicate and Senate which are not in existence and this issue has been raised in one of the item earlier. He was shocked that one of the persons had courage to write a letter to the affiliated Colleges. He pleaded that an enquiry should be conducted to unearth the truth. No Officer had the power not to implement the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate. Referring to the issue raised by Dr. Dalip Kumar regarding keeping pending the cases of recognition of Research Centres by the office, he said that it is very unfortunate. Several years back, he was the Chairman of one of the Committees and in the meeting of the Committee, it was observed that certain Departments did not want to allow research in the affiliated Colleges. Certain Departments had even written that if the teachers from the affiliated Colleges were allowed to do research, the standard of research would go down. However, the Committee observed that the standard of research would not be affected if permission to do research is granted to the College teachers. At that time, they decided to allow the teachers of the Panjab University Regional/Rural Centres and affiliated Colleges to guide Ph.D. students. But despite this decision, certain Departments of the University are not allowing the teachers of the Regional/Rural Centres and the affiliated Colleges to guide Ph.D. students, which is a serious matter. He would like to ask the office through the Vice-Chancellor to process and put the pending cases to the Registrar/Vice-Chancellor. Secondly, it should also be ensured that such things did not recur in future. As they could not make regulations and implement regulations without the approval of the Government of India, they also could not amend the Act without the approval of Parliament. As such, letters/circulars are being issued wrongly. As said by Dr. Ajay Ranga, the pay of the persons coming from other institutions should be fixed by giving the benefit of previous service. They had done this in certain cases even in today's meeting. One of the persons is very much right because the College/Institution in which he was serving when he came back, he has not been given the increment/s, whereas certain persons, who joined the University after serving in that very College/Institution, had been given the benefit. He further stated that a Professor appointed by way of direct method is given a minimum of Rs.43,000/- plus Grade Pay and somebody is given increment/s in spite of protecting his/her salary. If salary of somebody is not protected they say that they would give him/her 1/2/3 increments. There are specific instances wherein the people had got less than the minimum. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter.

A.K. Bhandari
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR