

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Saturday, 16<sup>th</sup> March 2013 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover ... (in the Chair)  
Vice-Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
4. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
5. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
6. Dr. Jagwant Singh
7. Professor Keshav Malhotra
8. Professor Naval Kishore
9. Dr. Nandita Singh
10. Principal R.S. Jhanji
11. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
12. Shri Satish Kumar
13. Shri Satya Pal Jain
14. Dr. Tarlok Bandhu
15. Professor A.K. Bhandari ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

Professor Shelley Walia, Dr. Dinesh Talwar, Smt. Gurpreet Kaur Sapra, Director Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh and Shri Tarsem Dhariwal, D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

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

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, “
- “(1) I feel immense pleasure in informing the honourable members of the House that –
- i) The Chancellor of D.A.V. University, Jalandhar, Shri Punam Suri, Fellow, Panjab University, has informed that Professor R.K. Kohli, D.U.I. and Fellow, Panjab University, has been appointed as the Vice-Chancellor of D.A.V. University, Jalandhar.
  - ii) An inaugural event to commemorate the 150<sup>th</sup> Birth Anniversary of Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni, will be hosted on April 5, 2013 between 10.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m. Professor Ashok Sahni, Emeritus Professor and former D.U.I., Panjab University, and an Eminent Scientist Professor Jayant V. Narlikar, will deliver lectures on that day to initiate the year long commemorations. A request has been made to Government of India to release a stamp on Ruchi Ram Sahni in October 2013, to coincide with the Panjab University Foundation Day.
  - iii) Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Minister of Railways, has sanctioned Rs.1 crore to the Panjab University out of his MP Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) for

setting up Chandigarh Regional Innovation and Knowledge Cluster which brings together institutions of higher learning and research in and around tricity Chandigarh on a common platform to facilitate the sharing of facilities and resources by researchers.

- (2) It is proposed that Shri S.L. Verma, Special Officer to Vice-Chancellor be allowed to continue to work as such on the same terms and conditions as already approved by the Syndicate till further orders.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon enquired as to whether Shri S.L. Verma has attained the age of 65 years or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Dr. Dhillon had raised a very pertinent question as there is no provision for continuation of non-teaching employees after the age of 65 years. The Calendar is explicit that the age of retirement of non-teaching employees is 60 years. Hence, there is no special provision to make any appointment of any non-teaching employee beyond the age of 60 years. Since appointments have got made in past in apparent violation of the Calendar, one may argue that there is no restriction beyond 60 years of age. As far as the appointment of Vice-Chancellor is concerned, there is a specific regulation that stipulates appointment of Vice-Chancellor by the Chancellor, without any specific restriction on the age of retirement. But sometimes keeping in view the exigencies of services, Vice-Chancellors have been appointing persons on contract basis for six months or more beyond the age of 60 years. To say that there is no restriction beyond 60 years is totally wrong. As he understood, such an item should have been brought to the Syndicate in the proper form, i.e., for consideration, whereas it has been brought in the form of ratification. Moreover, when Shri S.L. Verma was appointed S.O. for the first time, he was appointed till a particular date 31.03.2013, maybe, keeping in view the date he would attain the age of 65 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had appointed Shri S.L. Verma up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013, i.e., up to the end of financial year. As far as other things were concerned, since the appointment had been made within few hours of his joining as Vice-Chancellor, he had not studied the things with that degree of detail.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that both the appointments, i.e., Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor and S.O. to the Vice-Chancellor, were placed before the Syndicate in the same meeting. One appointment was till further orders and another up to the end of financial year, which might be keeping in view the date of attainment of 65 years of age. He enquired as to when Shri S.L. Verma is going to attain the age of 65 years. He further stated that the tradition and practice in this University had been that the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor had been appointed without any restriction and this discretion was only for one post. It was only for the first time that two such appointments had been made. Since the appointment of S.O. was made up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 and came to the Syndicate for ratification, it was ratified. Now, there is a lot of hue and cry amongst the non-teaching

employees as they think that it amounts to depriving them of one of their cadre posts. Nobody knew that the item would be brought in this form.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri S.L. Verma would reach 65 years of age on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2013. As far as approval of his appointment was concerned, his appointment was ratified up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013. In the light of this, he sought their permission to extend it further.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if Shri S.L. Verma was attaining the age of 65 years on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2013, in view of the sentiments expressed by the members, his appointment should be approved up to 5<sup>th</sup> May 2013 and if they go beyond 65 years, it would create problem for them and they would not be in a position to defend it in any manner. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in one of the meetings of the Syndicate, it was also resolved that all the superannuated persons, including Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor, be relieved with immediate effect because of unrest amongst the non-teaching employees. If his knowledge is right, the post of S.O. was originally occupied by Superintendents/ Personal Assistants, Assistant Registrars and Deputy Registrars. In the light of this, giving extension to Shri S.L. Verma beyond 65 years could not be justified.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that it was his submission to the members that the Vice-Chancellor should be given space to appoint his personal staff. Agreed that Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor should be one of them, but if the workload of the office is more or any other compelling circumstances, the second person should also be allowed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since it had implications on the non-teaching staff, they should not encourage such appointments. Moreover, the University has very good staff and keeping trust, one of the staff members in regular service could be appointed as S.O. to the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that if the rules permit creation of ex-cadre post, the same may be considered so that nobody feels aggrieved.

Dr. Satish Sharma suggested that one should explore the option of ex-cadre position, which does not come in the way of promotion of regular staff.

The Vice-Chancellor made a plea that the appointment of Shri S.L. Verma be ratified up to May 31, 2013, and he would consult the Syndicate members for other options for utilizing his services.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to Professor R.K. Kohli on his appointment as Vice-Chancellor of D.A.V. University, Jalandhar;

- (2) The information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No. (ii) and (iii), be noted and approved;
- (3) Shri S.L. Verma, Special Officer to the Vice-Chancellor be allowed to continue to work as such on the same terms and conditions as already approved by the Syndicate, up to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013, while the Vice-Chancellor explores the other possibilities; and
- (4) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate dated 27.01.2013 as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

After decisions on the statement of the Vice-Chancellor were taken, general discussion started.

- (1) Professor Keshav Malhotra said that instead of appointing the retired non-teaching employees on contract basis, the University should expedite the process of re-employing them as was being demanded by the non-teaching employees.
- (2) Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that a couple of days before a news item appeared in the newspapers about the appointment of Professor Neera Grover, which pained him a lot. There should not be any ifs and buts on the appointments of persons who possessed requisite qualifications and are appointed due to academic exigencies. He further said that the Vice-Chancellor had assured re-advertisement of certain positions, but the same had not been re-advertised so far.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has been learnt that the U.G.C. is in the process of reviewing the directives on the API score. The Minister of Human Resource Development had said that the meeting for the purpose would be held within 2-3 days. Hence, very soon they are expecting a directive from the Centre. If not, he was prepared to give the re-advertisement exactly with the same specifications as already done.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that it had been observed during the last 2-3 meetings of the Syndicate that the non-teaching employees were giving representations and memorandums to the members of the Syndicate. He pleaded that the University authorities should examine their representations/ memorandums according to the rules and regulations of the University and whatever could be accepted, should be accepted. As far as the appointment of Professor Neera Grover was concerned, the matter is sub-judice. As far as API was concerned, a meeting of the U.G.C. Committee was earlier held in January and it appeared in the Press that they would withdraw the API score. Lastly, the meeting of the Committee is presumed to have happened in New Delhi on 11.3.2013 in which the Secretary for Human Resource Development and other concerned persons were present and it

had been decided that keeping in view the standard of Higher Education in the country, the API be retained for screening purposes. For other problems, a 3-member Committee had been constituted which had been asked to suggest changes within three weeks. Keeping in view this and the stoppage of appointments in the University, they had to ponder over as to how under the circumstances the time period for forthcoming advertisement could be shortened.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that as informed by the Vice-Chancellor the new guidelines of the U.G.C. regarding API were expected soon. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to seek information about this from the U.G.C. If the new guidelines are coming within 10-15 days, they should wait for the release of re-advertisement. However, if the revised guidelines are expected to take more time than this, they should re-advertise the posts as per the old criteria and a line should be added that in case the revised guidelines are received from the U.G.C., the University would take decision accordingly.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that only those qualifications should be considered, which are acquired by the candidates up to the last date of submission of applications.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since the new guidelines of the U.G.C. relating to 400 API score had not been adopted by the Punjab Government, these could not be implemented in the affiliated Colleges, including Constituent Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had completely different opinion because the teachers working in the Constituent Colleges are not the employees of Punjab Government; rather they are employees of the Panjab University and whatever rules and regulations are applicable to the teachers of the University Teaching Departments/P.U. Regional Centres/affiliated Colleges, are applicable to the teachers of Constituent Colleges. Otherwise, tomorrow it would not be possible for the University to defend different terms and conditions for some employees and different terms and conditions for other similar employees. As far as other Colleges in Punjab were concerned, they are governed by the service conditions of the Punjab Government, of course, along with the service conditions of the Panjab University.

Professor Naval Kishore said that it was true that persons with 400 API Score were not available for the posts of Principals.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that since the teachers of the Constituent Colleges are the employees of the University, the rules and regulations of the University are applicable on them.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, in fact, for the post of Principal they needed an Administrator and not an Academician. Earlier, a person, who was getting a salary of Rs.25,000/- p.m., was found suitable and appointed Director of one of the Regional Centre of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that providing regular Directors at P.U. Regional Centres, especially at P.U. Regional Centres, Ludhiana and Muktsar, is his foremost priority. If they had experienced faculty members from the Colleges, they would definitely utilize their services.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a 3-4 member Committee of the Syndicate should be appointed to give directive as to how to proceed further in the matter.

**RESOLVED:** That the following Committee be constituted to look into the whole issue and make recommendations:

1. Professor Naval Kishore
2. Professor Nandita Singh
3. Professor Keshav Malhotra
4. Dr. Jagwant Singh.

Shri Satya Pal Jain suggested that the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) should be constituted at the earliest. Secondly, the meeting of the Committee constituted to look into the issue of formulation of policy for regularization of services of persons working on daily wage basis, especially Mali, Beldar, Chowkidars, etc. should be arranged at the earliest.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that a reference had been made to a court case about an appointment, which appeared in the newspapers. He did not know anything about the case as the news which appeared in the city editions, did not appear in the main edition.

The Vice-Chancellor responded by sharing that he had learnt that two attempts to admit writ petition on this issue had been refused by the High Court earlier.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, obviously, they were not supposed to speak anything on this, as the matter could be termed as sub-judice. He did not know whether 2-3 facts mentioned in the newspapers are the contents of the writ petition. He added that the Vice-Chancellor was not present in the meeting of the Syndicate, when the item was discussed. Of course, the meeting was chaired by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath. But they did not know whether the University had advertised the post and any application was received by it against the advertisement. According to him, 2-3 points needed to be taken care of: (i) the University had to deal with this case in a manner that it is not a case related to one particular person, but to the institution as its prestige is at stake; (ii) the Syndicate and Senate had taken the decision; and (iii) if the Vice-Chancellor wants, he may share any information with them.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was a matter of concern for all of them that the University Administration, both teaching and non-teaching, are at par, but for one reason or the other the non-teaching employees felt as if they are ignored more often. They had been representing

for quite long time about the re-opening of Pension Scheme for those who could not opt earlier. Though the issue had been discussed a couple of times, nothing had proceeded further. The question was if the regulations did not permit, why the Pension Scheme was reopened once and if it could be reopened once, why it could not be reopened twice, i.e., now and there was no answer to this question. He submitted that by getting help from some Committee, this issue should be clinched. Similarly, in the month of December, the Vice-Chancellor had constituted a Committee regarding empanelment of certain reputed private Hospitals willing to provide treatment at the PGI rates. Such things should be given top priority because people are always in need of medical help. He has been informed that the Committee had visited various hospitals and made certain recommendations, but the same had not been placed before the Syndicate so far. It was nothing else, but just a formal approval of the Syndicate. The University would also save a lot of money and also employees from the harassment. If possible, the item should be placed in this meeting itself.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the non-teaching employees were feeling that they were the most ignored lot. It should be their concerted effort to see that they did not feel ignored. The representations/letters of the non-teaching staff, even if they had approached the court, should be examined and seen whether any settlement out of the court could be made. There was a solution to every problem provided there was a will. But the message was that the University authorities were not concerned about their problems. Unless and until some members of the Syndicate or the Senate took up the issue, things did not improve. As stated by him in the last meeting of the Syndicate, in the morning he got a message that there were some officials who take pride in getting the representations filed/rejected which was very alarming. Since the people felt ignored and isolated, the members of the Syndicate and Senate were hard pressed to express their sentiments. The people at the lowest level felt that they did not get any response for their representations and the situation had gone bad to worse. Even if some decisions were taken by the Syndicate, some of the officials had the guts to question those decisions and got them referred to a Committee. The question was whether the Committee could reject the decisions of the Syndicate? But it had happened and the office had got the guts to say that the Committee had not approved the decisions of the Syndicate. This was the working of the University and it was happening again and again. In this University, anybody could do anything and could escape as no action is taken against anyone, who has willfully disobeyed the decisions of the Syndicate. Sometimes facts were also fabricated by the officials. If something wrong is put up by the lowest ranked employees, it was the duty of the statutory officer to point out the wrong facts and get them corrected, but everybody was in the habit of doing in good faith. Resultantly, the people who had mischievous designs/intensions went scot free and ultimately those, who had done that in good faith, have to give the explanation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would make a serious attempt to correct the things.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in the meantime, the harm done to the Institution as well as the individuals, including the members of the Syndicate and Senate, could not be compensated. One of the facts, which had been mentioned in the record of the University, was completely contrary and he was not ready to believe that the Vice-Chancellor had referred a decision of the Syndicate to the Committee, as no Vice-Chancellor would refer the decision of the Syndicate to a Committee for consideration. Hence, it was wrongly worded, giving an impression as if the Syndicate is a subordinate to the Committee. He, therefore, pleaded that the officials concerned should be taken to task as to why, and under what circumstances, the wrong facts were mentioned in the note. Secondly, it was not at all right to refer the decision to the Syndicate for review. Whereas it was simply taken for approval of the Vice-Chancellor in violation of the decision of the Syndicate. It was only thought at the Registrar level, who suggested to the Vice-Chancellor to refer it to the Syndicate. These were few things amongst many, which needed the attention of the authorities.

**Appointment of Assistant Professors in the Department of Laws**

**2.** Considered minutes dated 13.09.2011 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professors-2 (General-1, SC-1) in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired from where this office note had come that the Hon'ble Court directed the University to go ahead with the appointments at Department of Laws. In fact, it should have been mentioned in the office note that the Syndicate at its meeting dated so and so and Para so and so had deferred the consideration of the recommendations of the Selection Committee. Now, in view of the information shared by the Vice-Chancellor and the fact that they needed faculty in the Department of Laws, the recommendations of the Selection Committee should be approved.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be appointed Assistant Professors (General 1 and SC 1) in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP 6000, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. (Ms.) Rajinder Kaur – General Category
2. Dr. (Ms.) Supinder Kaur – SC Category.

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

**NOTE:** The score chart of all the candidates who appeared in the interview will form a part of the proceedings.



**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the letters of appointment to persons appointed under Item 2 be issued in anticipation of approval of Senate.

**Recommendations of the Leave Cases Committee dated 19.02.2013**

**3.** Considered minutes dated 19.2.2013 (**Appendix-III**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.5.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to how much service one had to put in for becoming eligible for extraordinary leave up to five years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be checked as to how much service is required for taking extraordinary leave up to five years.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee dated 17.01.2013, as per **Appendix-III**, on behalf of the Syndicate after checking as to how much service one has to put in before becoming eligible for extraordinary leave up to five years.

**Status of appointment of Ms. Gaganpreet Walia, Assistant Professor in English (contract basis), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt. Nawanshahr**

**4.** Considered if the status of appointment of Ms. Gaganpreet Walia, Assistant Professor in English (contract basis), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahr, be converted from contract basis (₹30400/- fixed) to purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100 + AGP of ₹6000/- w.e.f the date of declaration of the result of UGC-NET i.e. 12.11.2012.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 4.11.2012 (Para 2) has resolved that the status of appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health, be converted from contract basis (₹30400/- fixed) to purely on temporary basis in the pay scale of ₹15600-39100 +AGP of ₹6000/- + two increments w.e.f. the date of his joining for the session 2012-13 i.e. 09.07.2012.
  2. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that as Ms. Gaganpreet Walia, Assistant Professor in English (contract basis), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahr, had not faced any interview, including walk-in, her case could not be considered for conversion from contract basis to purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.15600/- + AGP of Rs.6000/ w.e.f. the date of declaration of the result of UGC-NET, i.e. 12.11.2012.

Professor Naval Kishore clarified that in the Constituent College at Balachaur, there was no teacher for teaching the subject of English and Physical Education. Since there was dire need of teachers,

the Principal put on the notice board the advertisement for appointment of teachers in the said subjects. Secondly, the advertisement was also put on the University website. Three-four candidates in each subject appeared for the Walk-in-Interview and only the toppers were appointed. It was also a policy decision that if a teacher working on contract basis cleared the UGC-NET, his/her appointment was converted into "purely on temporary basis". He added that the appointment of the candidate who was selected in the subject of Physical Education in the same manner, had already been converted from contract to temporary basis by the office itself. He did not know why this case had been placed before the Syndicate?

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that three teachers of his College cleared the UGC-NET recently and the College had converted their appointments into temporary basis and all financial benefits have been extended to them. According to him, there was no problem in conversion of appointment of Ms. Gaganpreet Walia from contract basis to temporary basis.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that it had been mentioned in the office note (Page 7), "But in case of Ms. Gaganpreet Walia, she did not face the proper Selection Committee and was appointed due to the emergent requirement in the subject of English at Baba Balraj Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahr on contract basis, on a fix salary of Rs.30400, under Regulation 5 at Page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, ...".

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the objection raised by Dr. Jagwant Singh that since Ms. Gaganpreet Walia had not faced the proper Selection Committee, her appointment could not be converted from contract to temporary basis, had already been replied to by Professor Naval Kishore. Moreover, the candidates whose appointments were made under Regulation 5 were not required to face any Selection Committee. But it was astonishing and surprising as to why this isolated case had been brought to the Syndicate, especially when the University had already taken a decision that all the appointments, in which the candidates fulfilled the eligibility conditions, should be converted from contract basis to temporary basis and given financial benefits. In view of that decision, the benefit ought to have been extended to Ms. Gaganpreet Walia automatically. As far as facing of Selection Committee was concerned, the Vice-Chancellor is empowered to appoint any person for a period up to one year, under Regulation 5 at Page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and beyond one year, the Syndicate is empowered. As far as giving financial benefits to Ms. Gaganpreet Walia after qualifying UGC-NET was concerned, the decision should have been taken at the administrative level and the benefit should have been extended from the date, she qualified UGC -NET.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he would be last person to pick any individual case. If as per decision other persons have been given the benefit, the same should be given to Ms. Gaganpreet Walia. He only raised the issue because it had been mentioned in the office note that the candidate had not faced the Selection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the question was why it had been mentioned in the office note when the candidate had actually faced the Selection Committee? In fact, after finding that she was not qualified, the Selection Committee recommended her appointment on contract

basis on a consolidated pay. Now, when she has qualified the UGC-NET and become eligible for the post of Assistant Professor, her appointment should be converted into temporary basis.

**RESOLVED:** That the status of appointment of Ms. Gaganpreet Walia, Assistant Professor in English (contract basis), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahr, be converted from contract basis (₹30400/- fixed) to purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100 + AGP of ₹6000/- w.e.f the date of declaration of the result of UGC-NET i.e. 12.11.2012.

Arising out of the above, Professor Naval Kishore said that the Assistant Professors have been appointed in the Constituent Colleges till the end of the academic session. Meaning thereby, they would be relieved once the session is over. He suggested that since the examinations are going to be started and examination centres would also be set up in the Constituent Colleges, the University would require persons for performing examination duties (Centre Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Invigilators, etc.), their term of appointment should be extended accordingly.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the term of those Assistant Professors, whose term is up to the end of the current academic session (2012-13), be extended by giving them one day's break up to end of the next academic session 2013-14, or till the regular appointments are made for these posts.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 04.2.2013 with regard to check the excessive admission**

**5.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 04.02.2013 (**Appendix-V**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to suggest ways and means/measures to enforce on the Government/Non-Government Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University, Chandigarh the condition to check the excessive admission than the approved intake of students:

1. the Colleges be sternly directed to adhere to the teacher-taught ratio as prescribed in UGC/University Regulation i.e. the Colleges can admit number of students in a Class which is in commensurate to the teaching strength they have.
2. in B.A. I, there exists sharp variation in the option exercised by the students in offering subjects in the given combinations. It is binding on the Colleges to admit only that much number of students in a subject which is strictly as per teacher-taught ratio.
3. the intake approved by the University for each Class must be specified by the Colleges in their prospectus. The Principals of all the Colleges be requested to send Assistant Registrar (R&S), Panjab University a copy of prospectus. The R&S Branch shall ensure that returns of students are received strictly as per intake approved by the University and given in the prospectus.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that the Committee in its third recommendation had recommended that the intake approved by the University for each Class must be specified by the Colleges in their prospectus. The Principals of all the affiliated Colleges be requested to send a copy of the Prospectus to the Assistant

Registrar (R&S). Though a list of Colleges had been put on the University website along with their e-mail numbers, they could not open the website of the affiliated Colleges. He suggested that the approved intake along with break up, i.e., General and Reserved seats, should be displayed on the website by all the affiliated Colleges.

Professor Naval Kishore said that, of course, it was mandatory to specify the number of seats in a Unit as has been done in the case of B.Com. and Science subjects, but as far as Unit strength for B.A. was concerned, the consensus could not be reached, despite considering the issue a number of times.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that factually, there should be 80 students in one Unit. But in Arts, all the students had to take English Compulsory and Punjabi Compulsory, which resulted into increase in the Unit strength. He suggested that in case there were more students in the compulsory subjects, the number of units should be allowed to be increased, but the College had to appoint additional teachers accordingly. However, there should not be more than 80 students in a unit.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that a number of Committees had been formed to consider the issue and after threadbare discussion, none of the Committee could reach at a consensus in respect of unit strength for Arts subjects. He added that sometimes, the number of students who took admissions in a particular College shoot up unexpectedly. Hence, the number of students in a unit for B.A. classes could not be fixed. The only solution to the problem was that the College should appoint the teachers in accordance with the number of units. However, if additional teachers were appointed on regular basis, and in case the students' strength came down next year, the College would not be able to survive.

Dr. Satish Sharma stated that a few years ago in most of the affiliated Colleges, especially in District Ludhiana and in its surrounding areas, the number of intake for B.Sc. programme use to be very less. With the result if there were four teachers in the subject of Physics, then there was not enough workload for each of them. Now the situation had been reversed because there was a big response for B.Sc. courses as the craze for joining engineering courses had gone down, which earlier use to be there. Though he was not averse to following the guidelines of the affiliating University, it was creating many difficulties for them. With the revision of pay-scales w.e.f. 1.1.2006, they were facing a lot of problem in paying arrears to the faculty members from 2006-2009 because the Government was giving grant only for the covered posts. At present, the number of uncovered posts had risen to approximately 60% of the existing faculty which was creating a big hardship for them. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to consider all these factors while drafting the final resolution.

Professor Naval Kishore said that earlier, a Committee had met and it was observed that if a Unit contained 80 students and a College is sanctioned 10 units, the number of students in the College would be 800. English and Punjabi being the compulsory subjects, teachers should be appointed as per the actual strength in these subjects. However, no consensus could be arrived at in the meeting of the Committee.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he was a member of the said Committee. There was a problem in the recording of the minutes as well because nobody knew as to how many students were to be admitted in the B.A. Part-I. A teacher was to be there for one unit each. The subject of English and Punjabi or (History & Culture of Punjab) being the compulsory subjects, units could be allowed as per the actual number of students admitted but the College concerned had to appoint teachers as per actual number of units so that the teacher-taught ratio is maintained.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the question was how to fix the number of students, in case, there was no sanctioned strength of students of B.A. Classes. The only thing which needed to be decided by the University was that how many students are to be allowed to be admitted by a College in B.A. Part-I, which at present was not available. According to him, the Inspection Committee could recommend the number of students to be admitted by the College concerned keeping in view the number of teachers available with the College. It was the duty of the University to fix the number of seats of every College for every course including B.A., keeping in view the U.G.C. Regulations.

Continuing, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the strength of units in Arts subjects was 80 students. As far as other subjects/streams were concerned, the strength of unit varies. He, however, opined that if the College had to increase the number of students to be admitted, it must appoint the requisite number of teachers so that the overall GER was also increased at the lower end.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since neither Principals nor the teachers of the affiliated Colleges had been made members of the Committee, the consideration of the item should be deferred. He suggested that the Committee should be expanded by including certain Principals and teachers from the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu reiterated that it would be better if the number of sanctioned seats in each course is mentioned on the website by the College and the same could be accessed by any individual.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the strength of unit for B.A. Classes was 80 students and the unit should be sanctioned as per the strength of actual number of students in compulsory subject, i.e. English, but the College must appoint the teachers according to the number of units.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a directive could be given to the affiliated Colleges to appoint teachers as per number of units sanctioned.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the University was supposed to sanction number of seats/units to each College in each course in advance. It was not that the seats/units would be sanctioned by the University on the basis of number of admissions made by a College. No College could be allowed to have any option to admit students beyond the number of seats sanctioned for which it did not have teacher/s. So much so the number of sanctioned seats had also been fixed for the various courses being offered by the University teaching

departments at the campus. Even they could not admit more students than the sanctioned strength. Earlier, there use to be great rush in Colleges for admission in Arts subjects, e.g. Psychology, Sociology, etc. and the Principals of the Colleges had no option but to deny admission to some of the students. If the Principal decide that since he was getting a lot of students in a particular option, he should be allowed to admit more students for which a teacher would be appointed, probably that could not be allowed. According to him, the whole exercise has to be done in advance before the start of the academic session so that the College should know as to how many students it could admit. The argument that it should be left to the Colleges to admit students, subject to the appointment of teachers accordingly, did not seem proper because the Students' Returns would come to the University in the month of September/October and only then the Dean, College Development Council would ask the Colleges to appoint requisite teachers. When the Colleges would give the advertisement and make appointments? Probably, before the appointments would be actually made, the session would be over.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate they approved the excess admissions of M.R. College, Fazilka, which were made on the request of M.L.A. and other Government functionaries. Moreover, the difficulties of the students should also be kept in view that they could not go to another College, which is about 100 kilometers away.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should devise a way to the problem keeping in view the teacher – taught ratio.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the problem came from the Government Colleges as they did not care for the Syndicate or the Senate. In fact, the number of seats should be fixed on the basis of number of teachers available or on the basis of undertaking given by the College at the time of inspection. Thereafter, if any excess admission is made, the return of students should not be accepted; rather they should take a penal action against the College concerned irrespective of whether it is a Government or private College so that the problem did not recur.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he had spoken time and again that those Colleges, which had not appointed requisite number of teachers, the affiliation of those Colleges for that course should be withdrawn and no new course/s not be given to them.

Professor Naval Kishore said that though it had been decided that the Colleges should give in writing that they would admit the students according to the sanctioned strength, they did not care for it.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that the intake of seats for Science courses could be put on the website. But as far as B.A. was concerned, it could not be as there the intake of seats could not be fixed. How the intake of seats of small Colleges, which are purely Arts Colleges, could be fixed? If for them also, the intake of seats was fixed by the University, it would be nothing but denying the right to education. Keeping in view the practical difficulties being faced by the Colleges, the only solution to the problem was that the College should be asked to appoint teachers in accordance with the number of students admitted and appointment of teachers on regular basis should be insisted in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of the course when the College had

sufficient input about the course. If the College did not appoint the requisite number of teachers, they should take action against it.

Dr. R.P.S. Josh stated that he was sorry to say that neither there was recruitment of teachers in the Government Colleges nor in the private Colleges. On the other hand, they were giving new courses to the Colleges. Resultantly, the courses were being run without teachers. He suggested that they should put pressure on the Government for appointment of teachers in accordance with the number of students admitted. He added that some of the Colleges had made recruitment of teachers, but the University was not giving approval.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that the unit in Arts should consist of 80 students. If a College wanted to admit more than 80 students, one more unit should be allowed, but the College had to appoint one more teacher.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that everything is in-built in the Regulations of the University/U.G.C. As was prevalent in the U.G.C. Regulations, they could not appoint more than 10% staff on *ad hoc*, temporary, contract basis, etc. In the Panjab University itself 20% faculty was on *ad hoc*, temporary, contract basis. The provision of 10% had been made only in those courses where there is uncertainty. But the irony of the situation was that all the affiliated Colleges were running with more than 90% staff on *ad hoc*/temporary/contract basis. The University could not entertain any request for new course/s from such Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the ground reality was that every Institution is running with a large fraction of *ad hoc* teachers. In the background of this, they could not have new course/s. If with the changing scenario, the Colleges are not able to respond to the new course/s, it would be difficult for them to survive and majority of the Institutions would be on the verge of closure.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the argument that: (i) if the Colleges were not allowed to respond to the changed scenario, they would be on the verge of closure; (ii) if the situation demanded they could start new course on experimental basis every now and then; and (iii) the idea of having faculty on contract basis is not bad, but if it is so why the regulatory bodies, e.g., U.G.C./AICTE, are not coming out. He did not differentiate between the University and affiliated Colleges. Rather he would be last person to differentiate between the University, Government, Aided and private affiliated Colleges. Hence, what is applicable to the University should be applicable to all its affiliated Colleges. Let them take a conscious decision in the Syndicate that, as majority of the affiliated Colleges are being run with temporary arrangement, they allow that. Then if they were unable to ensure implementation of regulations for the existing courses, which were being run for the last two decades, they did not have any moral right to ask the Colleges to follow the norms of the University in the new courses. The Colleges would say that this time they should be allowed and next time they would appoint the requisite faculty.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that, at present, the Government Colleges are totally in a mess and they have to address the issue somewhere. If this issue could be properly addressed anywhere, it is only by the Panjab University as they are competent and had the set

up. Since the Government is not addressing the problem, the total education system is in crisis.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the suggestion that if the students' strength is increased, the staff should also be increased accordingly, is not in their hands because the Government has not covered the posts under grant-in-aid scheme. The Colleges had made only stop-gap arrangement.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that all of them, as a part of the regulatory body, felt that it was their responsibility to provide quality education to the younger generations of today and tomorrow. Quality education could only be provided if the University and its affiliated Colleges had requisite faculty and commitment. Hence, he saw a great merit in the opinions expressed by the members. Since they are going to have a special session of the Senate, a resolution should be drafted either by some of the members of the Syndicate or by a Committee and the same along with the discussion, which has taken place here, should be placed before the Senate in its special session so that proper/serious attention could be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this should be the resolution of the Syndicate that the Senate should take a serious note that there was an acute shortage of faculty members in the affiliated Colleges and the Colleges have been facing difficulties in filling up of posts on regular basis in the view of the ban imposed by the Punjab Government. Consequently, the students are suffering. Hence, the Punjab Government be requested to lift the ban imposed on the recruitments of teachers in the interest of education. For this, there is no need of a special session of the Senate. At the most, the resolution could be got drafted with the help of Shri Satya Pal Jain and others and get the same passed by the Senate.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon suggested that the Vice-Chancellor along with the Vice-Chancellors of other two Universities should take up the matter with the Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab, that since the affiliated Colleges are facing difficulties in view of the ban on recruitment of teachers imposed by the Punjab Government, the same should be lifted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was prepared to meet his counter parts in Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, and say that the Syndicate of the Panjab University had given him the directive to meet the Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab, and request him to lift the ban on recruitment of teachers.

Dr. Satish Sharma stated that, recently, the Management Federation of Punjab Colleges met the Chief Minister, Punjab, at his residence. The Chief Minister met them and listened to them patiently and in end he said that except money he was ready to help them in any manner. This was the state of affairs in the Punjab Government. Hence, it would be better if the Vice-Chancellor could take up this issue at the level of Co-ordination Committee of the Vice-Chancellors.

Professor Naval Kishore said that though they had sought income and expenditure statement from several Colleges, only from one College, they have received the income and expenditure statement.



Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that as per Regulations of the University, every affiliated College is supposed to send income and expenditure statement to the University.

**RESOLVED:** That a properly worded resolution would be drafted by a Committee comprising Shri Satya Pal Jain, Principal R.S. Jhanji, Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon, Dr. Jagwant Singh and Dr. I.S. Sandhu. The resolution so prepared would be placed before the Senate with a request to pass it. Secondly, the Vice-Chancellor would raise the issue at the Co-ordination Committee of Vice-Chancellors and request them to accompany him to meet the Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab, wherein they would request him that since the Colleges were facing a lot of difficulties, the ban on recruitment of teachers imposed by the Punjab Government should be got lifted, especially in the background of commemoration of 150<sup>th</sup> Birth Anniversary of Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni and 150 years of Higher Education in Punjab.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a circular be issued by the Dean, College Development Council to all the affiliated Colleges asking them to intimate the proposed intake of seats (course-wise) to the University keeping in view their experience of past two-three years so that on the basis of that they could be asked to appoint teachers before the commencement of the next academic session.

**Fixation of pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences**

6. To consider if the pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor, UIAMS be re-fixed at ₹19060/- in the same grade pay of ₹6000/- on account of revision of pay-scales with her previous employer as per revised L.P.C. submitted by her w.e.f. the date of joining in the Panjab University.

- NOTE:**
1. An office note along with Last Pay Certificate submitted by Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor enclosed (**Appendix-VI**).
  2. The Syndicate dated 31.7.2011 (Para 8) and Senate dated 16.10.2011 (Para XXX) are enclosed (**Appendix-VI**) wherein the pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor, UIAMS has been protected on the basis of record of service book and her past service.

**RESOLVED:** That the pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor, UIAMS be re-fixed at ₹19060/- in the same grade pay of ₹6000/- on account of revision of pay-scales with her previous employer as per revised L.P.C. submitted by her w.e.f. the date of joining in the Panjab University.

**Representation dated 2.11.2012 of Dr. Latika Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Education**

7. Considered the representation dated 2.11.2012 (**Appendix-VII**) of Dr. Latika Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Education, Panjab University, regarding correction in seniority.

- NOTE:**
1. The Minutes of the Committee dated 6.12.2012 constituted by the

Vice-Chancellor to examine the representation dated 2.11.2012 of Dr. Latika Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Education is enclosed **(Appendix-VII)**.

2. The recommendation of the Committee approved by the Vice-Chancellor in regard to review the date of confirmation of Dr. Latika Sharma enabling to determine the seniority. As the date of confirmation of Dr. Latika was approved by the Senate vide agenda item 31 dated 30.9.2001, therefore, making any change in the date of confirmation as already decided, requires the approval of the Syndicate/Senate.

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that either he had not been able to understand the case or the item had been wrongly drafted by the office. He did not know on the basis of which facts Dr. Latika Sharma had demanded that her seniority should be changed. In fact, Dr. Latika Sharma was placed at number one on the select list, but she joined later, i.e., after six months. After receiving the appointment letter, she had demanded six months time to join and the University had allowed her. Why she was placed at number three while making confirmation? The appointment letter was issued to her on 20<sup>th</sup> December 1999 and she joined on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2000, i.e., exactly after six months. While confirming, they might have taken the view that she had joined one day after six months period expired. Nowhere, it had been written that she had to join within six months. She had never been advised, even when she asked for extension twice, that if she joined later, her seniority would be ranked lower to those appointed along with her. Moreover, in the letter of appointment, it had been mentioned that "I hope you will be able to accept our offer and will report for duty preferably within 30 days of the receipt of this letter". Meaning thereby, they had to take into consideration the number of days the postal department had taken to deliver the letter. Even if the letter is sent personally to Mumbai by air, it could not be delivered on the same day. For postponement of the confirmation, neither any reason had been in the representation nor is any legal opinion. Hence, nowhere it had been mentioned as to why her seniority had been changed. *Prima facie* she should be placed at number one as she was number one in the merit. Since the confirmation on the basis of which seniority is determined is made by the Senate, the matter should be placed before the Senate for consideration that her seniority be fixed in terms of what was decided by the Selection Committee.

Professor Nandita Singh stated that it has been mentioned at page 30 of the Appendix that "It was pointed out by a member that, as per University rules, where two or more teachers were selected at the same time for appointment, their seniority shall be determined according to the ranking given by the Selection Committee, irrespective of the dates of joining the duties. Provided that the date of joining in case of a teacher who has been ranked higher is not later than six months from the date of issue of appointment letter to him. In the Department of Education, Dr. (Mrs.) Latika Sharma had been issued the appointment letter on 20.12.1999, but she had joined one day after six months, i.e., on 20.06.2000. As such, she should be confirmed on the date next to Dr. (Mrs.) Kirandeep Singh". Probably,

this interpretation was the reason for postponement of her confirmation. Further, she mentioned that the confirmation list which was prepared by the then Vice-Chancellor Professor K.N. Pathak, after seeking legal opinion on the matter, was ignored by the Senate while deciding the seniority. The Committee, chaired by the DUI Professor R.K. Kohli, had noted that Dr. Latika Sharma had joined within time as per the letter received by her.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that though the Syndicate had recommended her confirmation from the due date, the Senate changed the date of her confirmation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in view of the representation of Dr. Latika Sharma, they had no alternative but to refer the case to the Senate because the confirmation had been made by the Senate.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the decision on the representation of Dr. Latika Sharma should be taken at the level of Senate and the other teacher namely Kirandeep should be given an opportunity before making any changes.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the representation dated 2.11.2012 (**Appendix-VII**) of Dr. Latika Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Education, Panjab University, regarding correction in her seniority, be forwarded to the Senate for consideration.

**Recommendation of the  
Faculty of Engineering &  
Technology dated  
24.12.2012**

**8.** Considered the following recommendations of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 24.12.2012 (Para 8) (**Appendix-VIII**) that:

- (i) the request of the Principal Chandigarh College of Engineering & Technology (**Appendix-VIII**) to allow the Institute to follow the policy (JEET) 2013 framed by the Department of Higher Education, MHRD vide letter No. F.No.21-6/2012-TS.I dated 14.8.2012 (**Appendix-VIII**), be acceded to.
- (ii) the same policy (JEET) 2013 be adopted for UIET, UICET & SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur.

**RESOLVED:** That the Notification F.No.21-6/2012-TS.I dated 14<sup>th</sup> August 2012 of the Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India regarding Joint Entrance Examination (JEE) for admission to undergraduate Engineering Programmes in IITs, NITs, and other Centrally Funded Technical Education, etc. be adopted and admissions to various B.E. courses at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Swami Sarvanand Giri Panjab University Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur and Chandigarh College of Engineering & Technology, be made on the basis of JEE.

**Issue regarding grant of Punjab Government pay-scale to Mrs. Neeru Gupta, Accountant, Construction Office**

**9.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 6.11.2012 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of Board of Finance (Item 8) dated 21.2.2012 (**Appendix-IX**) that Mrs. Neeru Gupta, Accountant, Construction Office be allowed the Punjab Government pay-scale of ₹5480-8925 instead of ₹5000-8100 w.e.f. 7.10.1996 notionally.

- NOTE:**
1. The financial benefits, if any, shall be allowed w.e.f. the date of her promotion as Accountant, i.e., 3.4.2008 and not retrospectively.
  2. The Vice-Chancellor has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 6.11.2012 as per authorization given by the Board of Finance dated 21.2.2012.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that, in fact, Mrs. Neeru Gupta was appointed Accountant on temporary basis in the Construction Office in a plan/scheme and that was the reason for giving her the Central pay-scale. He enquired as to when she was shifted to the non-plan side.

It was clarified that she was appointed in the Central pay-scale and after her appointment the Central Government revised its pay-scales w.e.f. 1.1.1996, i.e., with retrospective effect. However, that benefit was not given to her as the University did not adopt the Central Government notification. Otherwise, that benefit would have been given to her from that date. Now, it had been proposed that that benefit should be given to her and her pay be fixed notionally.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that his question that when was she shifted from Plan side to Non-Plan side, was still unanswered. Moreover, three pay-scales had been mentioned at page 61 of the appendix and the pay-scale at C., i.e., Rs.5550-9000 had been confirmed by the Department of Finance, Government of Punjab. Why this pay-scale was not being given to her.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, Mrs. Neeru Gupta had been put to disadvantage as the benefit which was being given to her now, should have been given to her in 2004. She had exercised the option to shift to Punjab Government pay-scale, when it came to her knowledge. He, therefore, suggested that this benefit should be given to her immediately.

**RESOLVED:** That Mrs. Neeru Gupta, Accountant, Construction Office be allowed the Punjab Government pay-scale of ₹5480-8925 instead of ₹5000-8100 w.e.f. 7.10.1996, notionally and the financial benefits, if any, be given w.e.f. the date of her promotion as Accountant, i.e. 3.4.2008 and not retrospectively.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 18.02.2013 of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee**

**10.** Considered minutes dated 18.2.2013 (**Appendix-X**) of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations of the Syndicate regarding applications of the eligible students (students of teaching Department/ Regional Centre and students of University School of Open Learning)

to provide assistance out of Student Aid Fund for the session 2012-2013.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that, in fact, the students who took admissions at University School of Open Learning did not attend classes, whereas the students who studied in various Teaching Departments of the University attended classes and stayed in the University Hostels. Thus, they had to incur a lot of expenses. Further, **a small number of students from low income group are reaching university or are seeking education through USOL. He, therefore, suggested that the small number of students seeking admission should be given the waiver at the entry point and the amount at present being given from Students Aid Fund should be given to those who are doing regular studies at campus.**

Professor Keshav Malhotra endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Jagwant Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the suggestion put forth by Dr. Jagwant Singh would be examined. However, in future, the students of various Teaching Departments of the University be granted more money in comparison to USOL.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee dated 18.2.2013, as per **Appendix-X**, be approved.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 27.11.2012 regarding grant of increments to faculty members on account of acquiring Ph.D.**

**11.** Considered following recommendations of the Committee dated 27.11.2012 (**Appendix-XI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to grant of increments to faculty members on account of acquiring Ph.D.:

1. the Faculty members, who join, P.U. as Assistant Professor after completing the Ph.D. be granted five non-compounded increments, and three non-compounded increments to those Faculty members, who complete their Ph.D. during service.
2. the faculty members, who were already in service and have already been awarded Ph.D. degree by the time of coming into force of these Regulations i.e. between the period from 1.1.2006 to 1.9.2008, shall also be granted 3 non-compounded increments for Ph.D.
3. the matter with regard to grant of Ph.D. increments to those Faculty members, who had completed Ph.D. in accordance with the relevant Rules/Regulations as applicable prior to 1.1.2006 be put up by the office in the subsequent meeting/s.
4. the Regulations with regard to grant of increments for acquiring Ph.D. degree are applicable for Regular teachers only.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there were many cases pending with the University relating to grant of Ph.D. increments to the faculty members from 01.01.2006 onward. The item under consideration did not speak anything about the pending cases. He pleaded that the

office should be directed to put up those cases before the Syndicate for consideration.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that he did not know why this recommendation had come now, especially when under the U.G.C. pay-scales effective from 01.01.1996, those who did Ph.D. prior to 1.1.1996 have already been given two increments w.e.f. 27.7.1998. Referring to recommendation (3), he said that there was no logic for denying the benefit of granting three increments to those who have been awarded Ph.D. degree prior to 1.1.2006.

In one of the meeting, it was raised that a clarification was required for which a special meeting needed to be convened.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that instead of appointing another Committee, such types of cases should be referred to the same Committee.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that segregation needed to be done whether Ph.D. is an essential qualification or an additional qualification.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. the Faculty members, who join, P.U. as Assistant Professor after completing the Ph.D. be granted five non-compounded increments, and three non-compounded increments to those Faculty members, who complete their Ph.D. during service.
2. the faculty members, who were already in service and have already been awarded Ph.D. degree by the time of coming into force of these Regulations i.e. between the period from 1.1.2006 to 1.9.2008, shall also be granted 3 non-compounded increments for Ph.D.
3. the matter with regard to grant of Ph.D. increments to those Faculty members, who had completed Ph.D. in accordance with the relevant Rules/Regulations as applicable prior to 1.1.2006 be put up by the office in the subsequent meeting/s.
4. the Regulations with regard to grant of increments for acquiring Ph.D. degree are applicable for Regular teachers only.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the cases pending in the office for grant of increments on account of acquiring Ph.D. qualification be dealt with soon and placed before the Syndicate.

**Recommendation of the 12. Committee dated 12.12.2012 to review the adjustment of fee in case of shifting NRI category students**

Considered and **RESOLVED:** That the following recommendations of the Committee dated 12.12.2012 (**Appendix-XII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the adjustment of fee in case of shifting NRI category students in the Hand Book of Information & Rules, for Admission 2012 in the light of decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, be approved:

Existing	Amendment
i) If a student shifted from NRI etc. category to General/Reserved category, his/her Registration fee and development fund of foreign/ PIO/NRI category shall be adjusted in the later /same Department/Institute /Centre of the Panjab University but shall not be refunded under any circumstances.	If a student is shifted from NRI/PIO/Foreign to General/ Reserved category then the Registration Fee & Development Fund already charged from such students shall be refunded fully in case the seat vacated by such NRI/PIO/Foreign student is filled by the another same category.
ii) In case a student shifted from General/Reserved Category to Foreign/PIO/NRI category tuition fee, Registration fee & Development Fund. Other charges deposited by him/her shall be adjusted in the same session only. His/her General/Reserved category tuition fee and balance (if any) be refunded after deduction of Rs.500/- as administrative charges.	In case the seat vacated by NRI/PIO/Foreign student in consequence of his/her shifting to General/Reserved Category is not filled by any other candidate of same category then the Registration Fee & Development Fund already charged form such student shall be adjusted in the same Department/Institute/ Centre only to the extent of the Registration Fee & Development Fund as applicable to the General/Reserved student in the same session only the balance of Registration Fee & Development Fund shall neither be adjusted/ carried forward nor be refunded any circumstances.

Arising out of the above, Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that though there were 15 seats for NRI candidates in the B.D.S. course at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, only 5-6 seats were filled in every year and the rest of the seats remained vacant. In fact, the major reason for this was requirement/condition of SAT. But since sufficient number of SAT qualified NRI candidates were not available, almost 60% of the seats remained vacant, which resulted in a huge loss to the University exchequer. Moreover, the condition of SAT was required only if the number of applicants were more than the number of seats and if the number of applicants were less than the number of seats, the condition of SAT was not required. He pleaded that if the condition of SAT was removed, all the seats would be filled up, which would generate an income to the tune of Rs.3 crore more to the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the other Institutions in the country were making admissions of NRI candidates to B.D.S. courses without SAT and were earning a lot of income. Of course, they were making admissions on the basis of merit. They had 15 seats for NRI's at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital and a large number of them remained vacant due to the condition of SAT imposed by the University. He did not know why this condition had been imposed here when it was not existing in other Dental

Institutions all over India. Many NRI candidates who came to India and wanted to get B.D.S. degrees were compelled by them to study in the private Institutions by paying a hefty fees and get sub-standard degrees due to this SAT condition. He suggested that it should be got examined whether the condition of qualifying SAT was of the DCI or had been imposed by them at their own. If it had been imposed by the University itself, it should be removed to facilitate the NRIs to get admission to B.D.S. course at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital. In this way, all the seats meant for NRIs would be filled up because Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital was better than many other Dental Institutions and it would generate more income to the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that they should also popularize their courses so that more and more NRIs could take admissions in various courses being offered at the Campus. Similarly, they should also think as to how they could increase their income. Earlier, University Institute of Engineering & Technology was generating a lot of income for the University, but for the last couple of years its income had come down drastically.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, they had to adopt a uniform policy because the other private institutions were offering different courses, but here in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, they had to act as per the DCI norms. He further stated that, in fact, Institutions like UIAMS, University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, were established for running Self-Financing courses. These were established for those who could afford to pay more. He learnt that a proposal was coming to equate the MBA degree of P.U. Regional Centre with the MBA degree of UBS. If they could start MBA (General) course by charging fee of more than Rs.2 lac per year, per student, why could they not increase the number of MBA seats at the University Business School keeping in view the interest of the weaker sections of the society. Or they would have to revise the fee structure of the UBS keeping in view the quality of people, who shift from P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, UIAMS, etc., to UBS. It would also raise the standard of the UBS. In fact, when the MBA at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, was started, the identity of University Business School was kept separate. But after a couple of years, a proposal came that the MBA section at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, should be named as UBS, Ludhiana. Though it was discussed that it would create confusion amongst the people, the proposal was accepted. Resultantly, people started writing UBS, instead of UBS, Ludhiana. Secondly, admissions to MBA at the UBS, Chandigarh, were made through CAT, whereas the admission to MBA at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, were made on the basis of merit of qualifying examination. The people from all over India had already started thinking that there is only one UBS at Chandigarh. Hence, they were already suffering as far as the brand name is concerned. In the end, he said that though they should encourage the new courses/institutions, but not at the cost of the existing ones.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the NRIs belonged to different nations and they came through SAT, which is a uniform filter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there has to be some mechanism to make admission of competent students. But the basic purpose of



reservation of seats for NRIs is to earn money and also to impart education to NRIs and PIOs. If the seats reserved for NRIs are to be kept vacant, then what is the idea of creating them? SAT is required if the number of applicants were more than the number of seats; otherwise not.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue regarding keeping of SAT condition for admission to NRIs would be placed before the concerned Faculties.**

**Recommendation of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 24.12.2012 regarding assigning of separate grade**

**13.** Considered and

**RESOLVED:** That the following recommendation of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 24.12.2012 (Para 10) (**Appendix-XII**) for assigning separate grade in case of poor class/lab attendance (<75%) be approved and implemented w.e.f. 2012-2013:

Existing (as per new guidelines effective from 2010-2011)	Proposed (to be implemented w.e.f. 2012-2013)
<p><b>F Grade:</b> The F Grade denote very poor performance. F grade is also awarded in case of poor class/lab attendance (&lt;75%)</p> <p>If a candidate gets F Grade he/she will have to reappear in subsequent University examination as well as Internal Assessment examination for that subject.</p>	<p><b>F Grade:</b> The F Grade denote very poor performance i.e. failing the course.</p> <p>If a candidate gets F Grade he/she will have to re-appear in subsequent University examination as well as Internal Assessment examination for that subject.</p> <p><b>R-Grade:</b> R grade will be awarded in case of poor class/lab attendance (&lt;75%).</p> <p>A candidate who does not fulfil the attendance (&lt;75%) in any subject he will get R Grade and he/she will have to repeat the course of instruction in that subject.</p>

**Starting of M.Phil. Sanskrit at VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur**

**14.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 14.2.2013 (**Appendix-XIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor as per decision of the Syndicate meeting (Para 29) dated 15.12.2012 that V.V.B.I.S & I.S., Hoshiarpur, be allowed to start M.Phil. Sanskrit Course w.e.f. the session 2013-14:

1. that V.V.B.I.S. & I.S. Hoshiarpur, be allowed to start M.Phil Sanskrit Course w.e.f. the session 2013-14 in view of the fact that they have adequate space, adequate Faculty and no additional funds are required from the University.
2. that there will be Common Entrance Test and Common Syllabus & Rules for admissions/ examinations for M.Phil. Sanskrit at V.V.B.I.S. & I.S. Hoshiarpur and Department of Sanskrit, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**NOTE:** Professor Pankaj Mala Sharma suggested that the services of Emeritus Professors like Professor Aruna Goel, Fellow, Professor Ved Parkash Upadhaya and other retired Professors from the Institute of V.V.B.I.S. & I.S. Hoshiarpur, may be utilized in the field of Research Work etc.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu enquired whether M.Phil. in Sanskrit course was being offered at the Panjab University Campus? Further, what would be the intake of seats for the course?

**RESOLVED:** That V.V.B.I.S & I.S., Hoshiarpur, be allowed to start M.Phil. Sanskrit Course with an intake of 20 seats (as are in the case of Department of Sanskrit, P.U., Chandigarh) w.e.f. the session 2013-14 and the admissions to the course be through the Common Entrance Test (both for Department of Sanskrit & V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur).

**Decision with regard to video recording of proceedings of meetings of Syndicate and Senate**

**15.** Considered if the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.12.2011 (Para 2) (**Appendix-XV**) with regard to recording of proceedings of the Syndicate/Senate meeting be amended from experimental basis to permanent basis as the objection are being raised by the Audit.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate meeting dated 20.12.2011 (Para 2) has resolved that the recording of proceedings of the Syndicate/Senate meetings be videographed on experimental basis..

Professor Nandita Singh enquired about the outcome of decision at Sr. No.(iii) of the Syndicate that a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the pros and cons for videographing of the recording of proceedings of interviews for selections made in the University and the affiliated Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the decision of the Syndicate at Sr. No.(iii) should have not been reproduced in the agenda.

**RESOLVED:** That the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.12.2011 (Para 2) (**Appendix-XV**) with regard to recording of proceedings of the Syndicate/Senate meeting be amended from experimental basis to permanent basis.

**Duration of 5-Year Integrated Degree of B.E. (Chemical) with MBA changed from 5 to 5½ years**

**16.** Considered the recommendation of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 24.12.2012 (item 12) (**Appendix-XVI**) that the duration of 5 year Integrated Degree of B.E. (Chemical) with MBA be changed to 5 ½ years for the admission 2013-14.

**RESOLVED:** That the duration of 5-Year Integrated Degree of B.E. (Chemical) with MBA be changed from 5 years to 5½ years with effect from the admissions of 2013.

**Qualifications for the post of Principal Scientific Officer-I at University Science Instrumentation Centre**

**17.** Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.1.2013 (**Appendix-XVII**) regarding amendment in qualifications for the post of Principal Scientific Officer-1 (pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.7600/- (Central Replacement Scale)) in the University Science Instrumentation Centre (C.I.L.).

**RESOLVED:** That the qualifications for the post of Principal Scientific Officer-1 (pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.7600/- (Central Replacement Scale)) in the University Science Instrumentation Centre (C.I.L.), be amended as under:

<b>Existing qualifications approved by the Syndicate (Para 32 dated 29.10.2006)</b>	<b>Proposed qualification/experience, as recommended by the Committee dated 25.1.2013</b>
<p><b>Qualifications</b></p> <p>“M.Sc.(Physics/Chemistry/ Instrumentation) or M.Tech. (Instrumentation/Electronics); with at least 55% marks and Ph.D. Degree in any specified subject as above.</p> <p><b>Experience</b></p> <p>5 years experience in handling and operation of sophisticated Analytical instruments* in a University, National Laboratory or R &amp; D Institute/ Organization.</p> <p>NOTE:*Sophisticated and analytical instruments include NMR, TEM, SEM, XRD, LCMS.”</p>	<p><b>Qualifications</b></p> <p>M.Sc. 1<sup>st</sup> Class with 10 years’ experience* OR Ph.D. with 5 years’ experience* in the field of Instrumentation/ Electronics/ Physics specialization in Instrumentation or electronics</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>OR</b></p> <p>M.Tech. 1<sup>st</sup> Class with 8 years’ experience* in the field of Instrumentation/ Electronics/Micro Electronics/Mechatronics.</p> <p><b>*Experience</b></p> <p>Research and development activity in the field of Sophisticated Analytical Instruments** in reputed Scientific Laboratory, Research Institute or University or Industrial R &amp; D with suitable evidence.</p> <p>NOTE:       **Sophisticated analytical instruments viz. NMR, SEM, TEM, XRD, XRF, LMC/MS, GCMS/MS, CHMSO or similar equipments etc.</p> <p><b>Job Profile</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of staff to handle Sophisticated Analytical Instruments</li> <li>• Handling and maintenance of Sophisticated Analytical equipments.</li> <li>• Analysis and Interpretation of data of Sophisticated Analytical Instruments.</li> <li>• Other Administrative jobs as assigned by the Director.</li> <li>• Liasion with funding agencies.</li> <li>• Any other administrative work assigned by the Director .</li> </ul>

**Deferred Item**

**18.** Considered request dated 3.12.2012 received from Officiating Principal Rayat College of Law, Railmajra, District Nawanshahr with regard to allow the admission of Ms. Vandana, student of B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester of 5 Year course, as per the decision taken by the Board of Control of ULS dated 27.11.12). in similar case of Tejinder Singh (C.W.P. No. 23307 of 2011). Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

Professor Nandita Singh said that they did not know from where the case had come as the copy of the court case had not been attached.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they did not know the status of the case. Neither CWP No.23307 of 2011 nor minutes of the Board of Control had been attached. Interestingly, the Officiating Principal, Rayat College of Law, Railmajra, had given the reference of Board of Control of University Institute of Legal Studies, which had recommended that Ms. Manpreet Kaur be admitted in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester and accordingly be allowed to appear in semester examination commencing from November 2012. However, the members noted that the candidate is required to attend 75% lectures to be eligible for appearing in the examination. Although she is being permitted to appear in 3<sup>rd</sup> semester examination as a special case, she will have to submit an undertaking to the effect that she would satisfy the statutory requirement of attendance of 75% lectures later on. The University instead of placing the case before the Syndicate had referred it to the Law Officer of the University. Even till now, they did not know the status of this student.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that it had been mentioned in the communication of the Officiating Principal that Ms. Vandana D/o Shri Braham Dass has taken admission in B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) 5-Year, 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester on 30.11.2012 according to the decision of Board of Control of University Institute of Legal Studies. The issue now was that whether they had to conduct her examination after imparting instructions? In case the candidate had already appeared in the examination, whether her result had been declared or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the result of the candidate should not be declared, even if, she had appeared in the examination.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the item be deferred.

Arising out of the above, Professor Naval Kishore stated that it needed to be decided once for all whether a candidate, who had not attended even a single lecture, was to be allowed admission and appear in the examination. He added that one of the students cleared his/her re-appear by availing golden chance granted by the University. He applied for admission to B.P.Ed. 4<sup>th</sup> Semester on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2013. Last year also, certain students were allowed admission on the basis of direction of the Court. While granting special chance/golden chance, they needed to take into consideration their implications.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they had to take serious note of the way the University is being defended in the Court. As far as golden chance was concerned, it did not entitle one for admission in

the higher class. Golden chance is given to clear a particular examination. Hence, golden chance could not be considered for admission to next class in the same year. However, as discussed in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, one of the College at Ludhiana admitted the students to B.C.A. 3<sup>rd</sup> year just on the basis of golden chance given by the University to clear the compartment of B.C.A. 1<sup>st</sup> year. Even if they had cleared their compartment, they were not eligible for admission unless and until they were otherwise eligible as per University rules. If the people were approaching the Courts and the Courts are giving them relief that meant the University was not being properly represented in the Courts.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he think they discussed that in all such cases where stay has been granted by the Court, University should move applications for vacation of stay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that while giving special/golden chance it should be clearly spelt out that clearance of reappear/compartment on the basis of this chance would not entitle the student concerned to take admission in the next higher class in the same session/year. Everything should be made clear to the candidates and there is no harm if it is given in the Press. **The Vice-Chancellor asked the Controller of Examinations to make the things crystal clear and give a Press Release accordingly.**

## **Affiliation Withdrawn**

**19.** Considered affiliation earlier granted to Tagore College of Education, Fatehgarh-Korotana, Jalandhar Road, District Moga (Punjab) for the B.Ed. course (100 seats), be withdrawn, in view of letter No. F.NRC/NCTE/ PB-259/207<sup>rd</sup> meeting/2012/37286 dated 28.1.2013 (**Appendix-XVIII**) received from the Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, National Council for Teacher Education, Jaipur (Rajasthan). Information contained in the office note (Appendix-) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** Tagore College of Education, Fathehgarh-Korotana, Jalandhar Road, District Moga (Punjab) is affiliated with the Panjab University, Chandigarh and running B.Ed. course (100 seats) from the session 2006-2007.

Professor Naval Kishore enquired could they disaffiliate Tagore College of Education on the basis of withdrawal of recognition by the National Council of Teacher Education? Secondly, the College had sought panel for appointment of teachers. Earlier, the NCTE had withdrawn recognition on the basis of shortage of teachers. If now a panel was given by the University, the College would appoint the teachers and could claim in the Court that though they had the requisite number of teachers, the NCTE had withdrawn the recognition wrongly. He urged that he should be given clear-cut direction in this regard.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that even if a panel is given by the University and the College appointed the requisite number of teachers, how would it meet the other conditions, e.g., building plan, affidavit, land documents, etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the University is supposed to deal with the College keeping in view its status as on today and as on today the College had been de-recognized by the NCTE and the University has no business to deal with it. The objections which had been raised by the NCTE were not for the session 2013-14, but for the session 2012-13. The complete order of the NCTE dated 28<sup>th</sup> January 2013 had been appended with the item. As far as apprehension expressed by Professor Naval Kishore was concerned that if the panel is given by the University, the College would claim in the Court that they are still affiliated with the University, it be observed that the NCTE had not restrained the University from taking such an action. But the University had been trapped by many Colleges many times. Therefore, it should be decided, in principle, once the apex body de-recognizes any affiliated College, the University should not deal with it under any circumstances.

Professor Naval Kishore said that, earlier, in a similar case one of the Colleges of Malout, which was de-recognized by the NCTE, the University had to accept the returns of the students as the Court had stayed the matter. He pleaded that the said stay order should be got vacated by the University; otherwise, examination centre for the coming examination would have to be set up there.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, as far as the stay granted by the Court was concerned, the stay had been granted with the direction to the University and the NCTE that both would send Inspection Committees to the College and the report be submitted in the Court. Both the University and the NCTE had sent Inspection Teams and had inspected the College and submitted their reports in the Court. After fulfillment of the direction of the Court, the NCTE had again de-recognized the College. But he did not know whether the University also has to again disaffiliate the College or not. However, the College claims that in view of the stay granted by the Court, neither the University nor the NCTE could move in the direction of de-recognition. In fact, the University was not properly represented in the Courts and the Colleges and other parties have taken advantage of this loophole. In the case referred to by Professor Naval Kishore, the University should immediately file an application in the Court for vacation of stay with the plea that the University had already complied with the direction of the Court.

Professor Naval Kishore said that as per direction of the Court, the Inspection Committee of the University had already inspected the College and submitted its report in the Court. A copy of the report had also been sent to the College concerned. But their legal system was such that the person who is representing the University is saying that the University has not issued the show cause notice to the College, whereas the University had visited the College and submitted its report. However, they had not received any response from the College. At that point of time, the NCTE Committee had not visited the College. Hence, they had to complete the process.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had to complete the process and pass final orders.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that they might say that they had conducted the inspection of the College and came to the conclusion that a

prayer should be made to the Court for vacation of the stay. Secondly, it should be examined whether the court had raised its objection or they had issued the show cause notice, or they had initiated *suo motu* action against the Colleges.

Dr. Satish Sharma suggested that they should proceed in the matter in accordance with the provisions of the Calendar.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that since the session 2012-13 was coming to an end, there was no question of compliance at this stage. Hence, they should go by the decision of the NCTE.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that he had brought some wrong doings of one of the Colleges (Lala Jagat Narayan College) to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor to which the Vice-Chancellor had told him that a Committee comprising him (Shri Dua) would be sent to the College. Though the letter was issued to the other members of the Committee, he was not issued the letter. Fortunately, he was not questioned as to how he was inspecting the College. If someone had questioned, what would have been his position? In fact, he reached the College in advance, but could not go inside as he had no communication regarding his appointment. He even could not make phone to the University as the University did not mention the telephone numbers of its officers on the letters. Ultimately, he went inside the College when other members arrived. The Committee prepared and submitted the report without his signatures. If he was not to be appointed a member of the Committee, why he was asked to visit the College?

Professor Naval Kishore ensured that telephone numbers of the concerned Officers would be mentioned in the letters to be sent to the members, in future.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu stated that when the Inspection Committee went to the Colleges, they were not supplied the report/s of the previous Inspection Committees. Similarly, even if the College did not comply with the conditions imposed by the earlier Inspection Committee, another Inspection Committee is sent by the University. Further, Inspection Committees for grant of affiliation for the year 2011-12 are still being sent to the Colleges. Even if they did not recommend affiliation, what would happen because the admissions had been made and the students had appeared in the examinations? The recommendations of a Committee dated 06.02.2013 had not been placed before the Syndicate in its meetings 24.2.2013, 5.03.2013 and 16.03.2013. Resultantly, there was a confusion whether minimum six regular teachers were required as per old guidelines/norms or four regular teachers as claimed by the Colleges. Though the recommendations of other Committees, meetings of which were held much later had been placed before the Syndicate, not of the Committee dated 6.02.2013.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that a sensitive issue had been raised by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua. Probably, everybody was concerned about the difficulties being explained by the members of the Syndicate and Senate at the hands of the officers/officials of the University. It was a matter to be decided once for all as to how members of the Inspection Committees are to be treated by the University and its affiliated College. The way they were being treated presently that probably is the biggest insult to the members of the Senate and the

Inspection Committees. Shri Dua had visited the College on the direction of the Vice-Chancellor where very serious illegalities were committed. In fact, it warranted immediate stern action on the part of the University to a matter which was brought to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor by a member of the Syndicate and Senate. The Vice-Chancellor had assured him that a Committee would be constituted to inspect the College. Surprisingly, a Special Inspection Committee was appointed where his (Mr.H.S. Dua's) name was not mentioned, which was a serious matter and needed to be enquired into as to why his name was ignored. If intention was not to send him, why a message was conveyed to him that he would be sent? Secondly, the situation in Punjab was not as simple as they considered. In fact, there the people go to the extent of personal enmity harming the members of the Senate, Inspection Committees, Centre Superintendents, members of Flying Squads. There they are even assaulted physically as well. It is imperative on the part of the University to see that the security and safety of the members of the Senate is kept intact. Whether it was true that the members of the Inspection Committee (two Professors – one serving and one re-employed) had gone to inspect the College without a member of the Senate to see whether the allegations against the College was true or false. The other members of the Committee had submitted their report without Mr. Dua's signatures. That meant, the people were least concerned with the members of the Syndicate and Senate. Were they so powerful that they had the guts to ignore the members of the Syndicate and Senate? Their report should not be accepted in the present form. In fact, the other members of the Committee should not have submitted the report unless and until he (Shri Dua) is party to the same. If tomorrow the report is contrary to the facts which had been observed by them along with him, who would be accountable and responsible. According to him, the report could be 100% contrary to the facts. Whenever anybody applied for a new College, the Registrar is supposed to accompany the Survey Committee to see whether the College could be opened or not. In spite of this, the former Registrar was sent in the Committee. He did not know as to what was the mechanism for selecting such people. The Vice-Chancellor could verify the claims made by the member of the Senate. Such a College had misled the Committee to such an extent that no repair could be done. The person who had observed the deficiencies should have been the part of the Committee. An excuse could be made that it was a lapse on the part of the office. It was extreme carelessness that the other two members of the Committee had already submitted their report without his (Shri Dua's) signatures, which should not be accepted under any circumstances. As told by Shri Jain in the morning that Inspection Committees are by and large approached by the influential people of the concerned areas. In fact, taking action immediately was the need of the hour to avoid such kinds of pulls and pressures. Under the circumstances, which Shri Dua had explained, is it not a serious matter to be deliberated by the Syndicate? Unless and until they do their own introspection as to where and why they had gone wrong, they do not have any right to raise finger on others. He pleaded that an enquiry should be immediately ordered as to how the other members of the earlier Inspection Committee visited the College when Shri Dua had requested them to postpone the visit. Was the visit fixed with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor? If this kind of manipulation is allowed to be done, there was no idea of discussing anything. Even Shri Dua was threatened by the same management. He had the moral right and was duty bound to point out as member of the Senate that the sanctity of the Syndicate should be maintained under all



circumstances. Nobody should be sent to the Colleges for inspection alone; rather 3-4 persons should be sent together. He pleaded that this case should be taken seriously as they are going to face such situation in other cases. The NCTE had also taken into consideration the Khasra Number, but here the people say to the Inspection Committees that to verify land and buildings was none of their business. In the end, he suggested that if any report is submitted by the other members of the Committee, the same should be returned to them with the direction that the report should be got signed from Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and thereafter submitted to the University.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, in fact, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua was the chairman of the first Committee. Two members of the Committee reached the College for inspection, but Shri Dua could not reach the College. He learnt later that Shri Dua went to the College the next day. Shri Dua rang him up saying that there were serious irregularities, which needed to be explored. He did not tell him that the other two members had visited the College separately. When other members were contacted later, they did not convey the same seriousness/ irregularity, which Shri Dua had explained.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was for the first time that a Committee had visited a College on two different days.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that Shri Harpreet Singh Dua had brought to their notice a very serious matter. He suggested that a Surprise Committee should be sent to the College to verify the things.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that there were also problems in Sadbhavna College of Education. The same should also be got verified.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had openly stated in the meeting of the Senate that some of the people had access to the documents in the Colleges Branch to which even Fellows did not have. Some of the documents, which were not available in the official file/s, were attached with the representation as annexures. The documents were related to two different Colleges. The Inspection reports of the Colleges were not being referred to as annexures. In fact, serious allegations were levelled in the representation against the integrity of the members of the Inspection Committee/s, including the nominee of the Vice-Chancellor. The issue was discussed in the Senate for more than two hours and a decision was taken to send a Special Committee to see what was there. The Special Committee visited the College and gave it a clean chit by saying everything was right there. It had brought a bad name to all of them notwithstanding that the newspapers were carrying news every now and then that the owner of the College is a very good professional doctor and is in the habit of going behind the bars and coming out. His licence for medical practice had also been withdrawn. Whether they were dealing with such Colleges knowing fully well?

**RESOLVED:** That the affiliation earlier granted to Tagore College of Education, Fatehgarh-Korotana, Jalandhar Road, District Moga (Punjab) for the B.Ed. course (100 seats), be withdrawn, in view of letter No. F.NRC/NCTE/PB-259/207<sup>rd</sup> meeting/2012/37286 dated 28.1.2013 (**Appendix-XVIII**) received from the Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, National Council for Teacher Education, Jaipur (Rajasthan).

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Surprise Committee comprising Shri Harpreet Singh Dua as one of the members with escort and camera be sent to inspect Lala Jagat Narayan College of Education, Jalalabad.

**Provisional Extension of Affiliation to Dashmesh College of Girls, Badal for Add-On Course**

**20.** Reconsidered if provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Dashmesh College of Girls, Badal (Shri Muktsar Sahib) for Diploma Add-on-course as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Financing course in Communicative English, for the session 2012-2013.

**NOTE:** Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).

**RESOLVED:** That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Dashmesh College of Girls, Badal (Shri Muktsar Sahib) for Diploma Add-on-course as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Financing course in Communicative English, for the session 2012-2013.

**Deferred Item**

**21.** Considered request dated 21.01.2013 received from Officiating Principal Rayat College of Law, Railmajra to allow the late admission to Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh student of B.A. LL.B. 5 year (Hons.) course 1<sup>st</sup> Semester, seat allotted in 4<sup>th</sup> Counseling at Rayat College of Law, Railmajra.

**NOTE:** 1. In this regard, Legal opinion of Sandeep Chopra, Law Officer, was taken, which reads as under:

“The admission in the affiliated Colleges situated in Punjab are governed by the admission schedule and the instructions of the Punjab Government. Joint admission in the Five-Year LLB/BA.LLB (Hons.) for the session 2012-2013 was conducted by the Punjabi University, Patiala for the Law Colleges situated in the Punjab. Admissions in the Rayat College of Law, Railmajra (an affiliated College of the Panjab University) were made as per the admission schedule approved by the Vice-Chancellor of the Panjab University. However, even after the third counseling, some seats were left vacant. On this account, the Special Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Punjab directed the Dean, Academic Affairs, Punjabi University, Patiala (who conducted the joint admissions for the session 2012-2013) to conduct the fourth counseling for filling the vacant seats. Consequently, the fourth counseling was held and Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh was admitted by the Rayat College of Law. The Rayat

College of Law vide letter dated 17.11.2012 requested for approving the admission of Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh (as per the Punjab Government Notification dated 20.9.2012 and the forth cancelling of Punjabi University, Patiala) and Mr. Tejasvi Rana (as per the Syndicate proceeding of the Panjab University dated 4.11.2012). The University approved only the admission of Mr. Tejasvi Rana. Now, again vide letter dated 21.1.2013, the Rayat College of Law has requested for approving the admission of Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh.”

2. Memo No. 13/10/10-6C1/3149 dated 20.9.2012 of Special Secretary, Higher Education, Department Government of Punjab, regarding conduct of 4<sup>th</sup> Counselling during 2012-13 was enclosed.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the Department of Higher Education, Punjab Government, had ignored the schedule of Panjab University by allowing the 4<sup>th</sup> Counselling. This was something, which could not be accepted.

Professor Naval Kishore informed that the Punjab Government assigned the responsibility of conducting the counselling for the three Universities of the State on rotation basis and, last year, the responsibility to conduct the counselling for admission to LL.B. course was entrusted to Punjabi University, Patiala.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the request had been made by the College for approving the late admission of Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh student of B.A. LL.B. 5 year (Hons.) course 1<sup>st</sup> Semester, citing the admission approved by the University in the past. Earlier, in one of the cases, the admission of one candidate namely Mr. Tejasvi Rana was approved by the Syndicate and the name of this candidate did not figure in the list. He did not know why the case of this candidate, Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh, was not put up before the Syndicate along with Mr. Tejasvi Rana. Now, the College vide its letter dated 21.01.2013 had requested for approval of admission of Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh. The College had also written that “we have admitted Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh beyond the schedule approved by the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University because their admissions were governed by the Punjab Government and the Punjab Government issued notification to the Punjabi University, Patiala, with a direction to conduct 4<sup>th</sup> counselling for B.A.LL.B. course and according to the directions of the Punjab Government the Punjabi University conducted 4<sup>th</sup> Counselling and allotted Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh to our College, therefore, we were bound to admit the students”. It had also been written that the student had appeared in the November/December 2012 examinations under the Panjab University Roll Number 10208. Under the circumstances, the Syndicate took the decision on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2012 for not approving the admission of this candidate. What changes had taken place in the intervening period on the basis of which they would take a decision contrary to November 2012? His pertinent question was – whether the case of Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh was placed before

the Syndicate or not, if it was put up, on what grounds it had negated. If it was not put at all, then they had to find out the reasons and fix the accountability/responsibility as to why the case was not put up before the Syndicate? The first letter of the College contained two names. Why the University did not approve this case alone. If the University did not find any merit in the contention of the College that on account of Punjab Government notification they did not approve the admission, how it could be approved now? Why the office was so casual in putting up the note? Referring to legal opinion, he enquired as to what were the criteria for obtaining legal opinion from different legal persons. Sometimes, they took legal opinion from the University Legal Retainer and sometimes from the outside Lawyers and sometimes from Law Officer of the University. As he understood from the practice, whenever something is to be gone beyond the regulations, the legal opinion is taken from the Law Officer and something is not to be done, they took legal opinion from outside Lawyers. Hence, they seek a desired legal opinion from different Lawyers. He further said that why the issue had been kept pending for 3-4 months, especially when the College had written that he had already appeared in the University examination. Why they were fooling them? Were they left with any other alternative? Now, the student might be preparing for his 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester examination. He sought guidance from the chair as to what could they do in the absence of any background.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon read out the following extract from the letter of the College dated 21.01.2013:

“It is pertinent to mention here that we have admitted above mentioned student beyond the schedule approved by the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University because our admissions are governed by the Punjab Government and the Punjab Government issued notification to the Punjabi University, Patiala with a direction to conduct 4<sup>th</sup> counselling for the above mentioned course and according to the directions of the Punjab Government the Punjabi University conducted 4<sup>th</sup> counselling and allotted Mr. Sukhmanjot Singh our College, therefore, we were bound to admit that student.....”.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the item be deferred.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that following Item 22 on the agenda be treated as withdrawn:**

**Withdrawn Item**                      22. Considered request received from Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Assistant Professor, G.G.N. Khalsa College, Civil Lines, Ludhiana to allow him for Ph.D. registration till May, 2013 as he has joined the course work in the evening, Department of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies Panjab University, Chandigarh .

**NOTE:** An office note is enclosed.

**Recommendation of the College Development Council meeting dated 09.01.2013**

**23.** Considered minutes dated 9.1.2013 (**Appendix-XX**) of the College Development Council.

Professor Nandita Singh, referring to Sr.No.4 at page 114 of the appendix, suggested that, in fact, the category should be Means-cum-merit instead of 'Only Single Girl Child'.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the College Development Council dated 9.01.2013, as per **Appendix-XX**, be approved.

**Issue of allowing students of Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana to appear in the third year exams of BCA, BBA, B.Com. and B.A.**

**24.** Considered if the students of Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana be allowed to appear in the third year exams. of BCA, BBA, B.Com. and B.A. and/or action to be taken against the College for making wrong admissions. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XXI**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** All these students have submitted their examination forms through their Principal in the month of December 2012. Now the students are pleading that they may kindly be allowed to take their third year exams and be issued Roll Numbers and necessary instructions to appear in the University Exams to be held in April 2013.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that something different from the facts discussed in the previous meeting had emerged i.e. students were admitted after an undertaking, it meant that they are not innocent in the situation.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that even if the students would have cleared their compartment of 1<sup>st</sup> year in September/October after availing normal chances, they were not eligible for admissions to 3<sup>rd</sup> year. Hence, what was the idea of making admissions, when the students were not eligible for admissions even after clearing their compartments. According to him, it was a ploy for making admissions, sending students' returns and thereafter, examination forms to the University. The managements were in the habit of making such types of admissions. If the students were not aware of it, the fee charged by the College should be got transferred to the University and the College should be heavily penalized for committing such a blunder. As told the Principal had stated that it was a mistake, let the Syndicate take a decision. He also had got so many pulls and pressures, but at the same time they had to be careful as to what type of signal they had to send. Not that whatever one might do, he/she could escape with it. Hence, the Syndicate should take an appropriate decision.

Dr. Satish Sharma stated that, in addition to what Shri Ashok Goyal had stated, whether the transfer of fee of the students to the University, could be considered for any kind of relief to the College. According to him, the College had committed the mistake for the second time. Secondly, the College had not recommended the requests of the students for any kind of relief by the University.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the College had made the admissions of the students on their own risk and responsibility.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated sometimes they admit those students, who were placed under compartment in their 10+2 examination, because admissions were always provisional. That was why, sometimes the students' returns were submitted in the University after September/ October because they knew that the documents were still awaited. Admissions were always provisional until they were confirmed/approved by the University and up to then they could be rejected at any time. In the end, he suggested that the College should be given a stern warning so that it should not repeat such mistake in future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in view of the fact that even if the students had cleared their compartment by availing the golden chance in September/October, they were not eligible for admission to higher course, it was nothing else but that the College had cheated the students and had also tried to involve the University in it. Unless and until one possessed the minimum qualification, he/she could not be admitted even provisionally. The College had swindled the students and they were saying that the College should be given just a warning.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that majority of the Colleges did not know that even if the students cleared their compartments in September/October, they would not be eligible for admission to 3<sup>rd</sup> year in the same year. He was not saying that the College had not committed the mistake as everyone is supposed to know the rules/regulations. But a reasonable fine should be imposed on the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though some of his friends had tried to defend the action of the College to which he had strong objection because the College could not be defended under any circumstances. In fact, the College had made the mistake knowingly. One of the members said that the College had not recommended the requests of the students, he said that sending students' returns and examination forms was nothing but recommendation of the Principal/College. Examination forms could only be recommended to the University if the students concerned are eligible for appearing in the examination. It was the grievance of the students which had come to the notice of the University and the University had looked into it as to how the mistake had been committed. It was for the Syndicate to decide as to what kind of penalty is to be imposed, probably not to defend the action of the College.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that everybody had the right to express his own opinion. His only submission was that if there were any other similar cases pending with the Controller of Examinations, the same should also be considered sympathetically.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that a nominal fine should be imposed on the College.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested a figure of Rs.1 lac as fine, to which some members responded by stating that the College had collected fee to the tune of Rs.3 lacs to Rs.4 lacs from the students and the quantum of fine ought to take such a fact into account. There

was a consensus that the College must reimburse the fee charged from the ineligible students.

Professor Nadita Singh stated that since these are provisional admissions and even if the students have appeared in the University examinations, there is nothing wrong. If the students are not allowed to sit in the examination by the University, their fee should be refunded. Since they knew that the College is at fault, some fine should also be imposed on the College and the fine should be either equivalent to the amount they have collected from the students as fee or its double.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the students of Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana, who were ineligible for admission to BCA, BBA, B.Com. and B.A. Part III, be **not** allowed to appear in the examinations;
- (2) the fees charged by Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana, from the students, who were ineligible for admission to BCA, BBA, B.Com. and B.A. Part III, be refunded to the concerned students and intimation in this regard along with proof be given to the University; and
- (3) a fine equivalent to the fees charged for the academic session 2012-13 by the College from the students, who were ineligible for admission to BCA, BBA, B.Com. and B.A. Part III, be imposed on Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana, for admitting ineligible students.

**Agenda Items 25 and 26 being Ratification and Information Items, these be read under Items 28 and 29.**

**Recommendations of Committee dated 7.01.2013 regarding empanelment of reputed private Hospitals**

**27.** Considered the following recommendations of the Empanelment Committee dated 7.1.2013 (**Appendix-XXII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the empanelment of following reputed private Hospitals willing to provide treatment at the rates already approved by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 17.5.2012 (**Appendix-XXII**) for a period of one year initially and to be revised after one year, be approved:

1. Max Healthcare, Phase-VI, Mohali
2. Ace (formerly Prime) Heart & Vascular Institute, Sector-69, Mohali
3. Alchemist Hospital, Sector-21, Panchkula (for Cardiac Procedures only)
4. J.P. Hospital, Ambala Raod, Zirakpur
5. Grewal Eye Institute, Sector 9-C, Chandigarh
6. Grover Eye Laser Hospital, Sector 35-A, Chandigarh
7. J.P. Eye Hospital, Phase-VII, Mohali
8. Dhristi Eye Hospital, Sector-11, Panchkula
9. Surya Kidney Care, Sector-69, Mohali
10. Dharam Hospital, Sector 15-C, Chandigarh
11. Fortis Hospital, Mohali (For Cardiac Procedures only)
12. Laser Eye Hospital, SCF 9, Phase-IX, Mohali.

- NOTE:**
1. The minutes dated 8.10.2012 (**Appendix-XXII**) enclosed.
  2. Draft *pro forma* of MoU enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).
  3. Additional procedure proposed for approval (**Appendix-XXII**) for inclusion to the already approved list.
  4. Minutes dated 30.11.2012 of the Hospital Empanelment Committee enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

Initiating discussion, Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the recommendations of the Committee regarding empanelment of certain reputed private Hospital, which were willing to provide treatment at the rates already approved by the Syndicate, should be approved on experimental basis for one year. In the meantime, it would be seen whether the University employees get any benefit from this and quality services are provided by these Hospitals. Secondly, the rates should be revised by the University from time to time as revised by the Central Government.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the rates for different kinds of treatment should be revised from time to time as revised by the Central Government. Secondly, the whole system be reviewed after a period of one year. He also appreciated the office for locating the file, preparing the item and placing the same before the Syndicate at such a shortest notice.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the empanelment of following reputed private Hospitals willing to provide treatment at the rates already approved by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 17.5.2012 (**Appendix-XXII**), be approved, initially for a period of one year and after a period of one year the whole system be reviewed as observed by the members:

1. Max Healthcare, Phase-VI, Mohali.
2. Ace (formerly Prime) Heart & Vascular Institute, Sector-69, Mohali.
3. Alchemist Hospital, Sector-21, Panchkula (for Cardiac Procedures only).
4. J.P. Hospital, Ambala Raod, Zirakpur.
5. Grewal Eye Institute, Sector 9-C, Chandigarh
6. Grover Eye Laser Hospital, Sector 35-A, Chandigarh.
7. J.P. Eye Hospital, Phase-VII, Mohali.
8. Dhristi Eye Hospital, Sector-11, Panchkula.
9. Surya Kidney Care, Sector-69, Mohali.
10. Dharam Hospital, Sector 15-C, Chandigarh.
11. Fortis Hospital, Mohali (For Cardiac Procedures only).



12. Laser Eye Hospital, SCF 9, Phase-IX, Mohali.

(2) the additional procedure for inclusion in the already approved list, be approved; and

(3) the *pro forma* of the MoU, as per **Appendix-XXII**, be approved.

**Routine and formal matters**

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

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Sanjay Kumar, Assistant Professor in History (Temp.) at Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahr, w.e.f. 09.01.2013, under Rule 16.2 page 83 P.U. Calendar, Vol. III 2009.

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 16.2 page 83 P.U. Cal. Vol. III 2009 reads as under:

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

2. Sanjay Kumar has deposited ₹40355/- through Demand Draft No. 200634 dated 9.1.2013 which was deposited in the account of the University vide P.U. receipt No.52951 dated 30.1.2013.

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

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has granted extension in Extraordinary Leave (without pay) for one year more w.e.f. 28.1.2013 to 27.1.2014 to Shri Ajay Kumar Arora, Assistant Librarian, UIAMS, P.U., and allowed him to retain his lien on his substantive post of Assistant Librarian.

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor has also ordered that no substitute will be provided to the Institute against the leave vacancy of Sh. Ajay Kumar Arora reason being that the posts of Deputy Librarian (8) & Assistant Librarian (26) have already been advertised vide Advt. No.1/2013 for which the last date of receipt of

applications has been fixed for 20.2.2013 & the panel of Library Assistants (on contract) has already been exhausted.

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Shri Tarlochan Singh, Tutor-Cum-Curator (Punjabi), designated as Teacher, USOL (whose term of re-employment for the third year expired on 11.9.2012) afresh w.e.f. the date of his joining for one year (for the fourth year) on the terms and conditions as approved by the Syndicate dated 29.6.2010 (Para 78(XVIII)).

**NOTE:** The Syndicate meeting dated 29.6.2010 (Para 78(XVIII)) has approved that the re-employments are with the condition that they will take classes regularly in other related departments also on need basis. The re-employment on contract basis would be on fixed emoluments 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 Allowances. Payment on this account will be made against the posts of Tutor-Cum-Curator in the University School of Open Learning vacated by them on their retirements.

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of Er. V.K. Bhardwaj, Technical Advisor, Construction Office, P.U. for another one year w.e.f. 22.2.2013 to 21.2.2014, on the previous terms & conditions.

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of contractual appointment of Shri Madan Mohan Kapoor (Supdt. Retd.) for another 6 months on contractual basis in the UIAMS w.e.f. 2.1.2013 after giving him one day break on 1.1.2013, as OSD in the UIAMS, as per norms of the previous appointment i.e. @ half of the salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowance) rounded off to nearest lower 100, out of the Budget Head "General Administration-Sub Head-Hiring services/ Outsourcing Contractual/Casual or Seasonal Worker".

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of contractual appointment of Shri S.N. Sharma, (Supdt. Retd.), in the Publication Bureau up to 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2013, w.e.f. 22.2.2013 after giving him one day break on 21.2.2013 @ half of the salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowance) rounded off to nearest

lower 100, out of the Budget Head “General Administration – Sub Head-Hiring Services/Outsourcing Contractual/Casual or Seasonal Worker”

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor has further ordered that no further extension will be provided.

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to re-appropriate a sum of ₹15.00 Crore as loan from Plan funds in anticipation of receipt of grant from Centre/Punjab Government.

**NOTE:** 1. A sum of ₹2.74 Crore is available as Bank balance in the Panjab University Current Account No. 10444978333 as on 28.1.2013 and a sum of ₹5.00 Crore is available in the shape of STDR. A sum of ₹15 Crore is more required to make the payment of salary for the month of January 2013 paid in February 2013.

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

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the Entrance Test (O-CET) for vacant seats for external candidates seeking admission to M.Sc. 1<sup>st</sup> year (Hons. School) course in Geology for inclusion in the Handbook of Information 2013-2014.

**NOTE:** Approval of Board of Control in circulation enclosed **(Appendix-XXV)**.

## **Routine and formal matters**

**29.** The following information contained in Items **I-(i)** & **I-(ii)** on the agenda was read out and noted, i.e. –

**(i)** The Vice-Chancellor as appointed/substituted the members of the already constituted House Allotment Committees I and II (for the term 01.4.2012 to 31.3.2014 **(Appendix-XXVI)**), under Rule I at page 52 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 for the remaining term 01.02.2013 to 31.03.2014.

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 1 at page 52 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009. Reads as under:

“The Syndicate may appoint two House Allotment Committees, i.e. one for houses up to ‘D’ type categories and the other for houses above ‘D’ type categories i.e. ‘E’ and above categories. The term of the Committee shall

be for 2 years, beginning from April 1”

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

Sr. No.	Name of the Employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits Sanctioned
1.	Dr. Priya Darshan Chaudhry Deputy Librarian U.I.P.S	05.06.1978	31.03.2013	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough
2.	Mr. Kahan Singh Sr. Assistant, R&S (Store) Branch	21.11.1972	31.03.2013	
3.	Shri Ranu Ram Senior Technician Grade-III U.I.E.T.	22.01.1985	31.03.2013	
4	Mr. Ram Khelawan Security Guard, U.I.C.E.T.	06.06.1973	28.02.2013	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations
5.	Mr. Jaswant Singh Security Guard Security Staff	23.03.1985	28.02.2013	

**(ii)**

The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

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

In the Zero hour:

Dr. Jagwant Singh raised the issue regarding the case of re-evaluation of a student of M.A. Defence Studies and the events preceding the same.

Mr. Ashok Goyal suggested that a committee should be formed to redress the grievance of the student.

**This was agreed to.**

A.K. Bhandari  
Registrar

Confirmed

**Arun Kumar Grover**  
**VICE-CHANCELLOR**