

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 21<sup>st</sup> December 2014 at 11.30 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. Balbir Chand Josan
4. Professor B.S. Bhoop
5. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
6. Dr. Dalip Kumar
7. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
8. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
9. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
10. Dr. Jagpal Singh
11. Dr. Karamjeet Singh
12. Dr. Preeti Mahajan
13. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
14. Shri Sandeep Kumar
15. Dr. S.K. Sharma
16. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

Principal Puneet Bedi, S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, and Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, could not attend the meeting.

**Vice-Chancellor's  
Statement**

**1.** The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the honourable members of the Syndicate that –

- (1) The University Grants Commission vide its letter of 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2014, has approved the up-gradation of the Department of Biophysics from Departmental Research Support-II (DRS-II) to Department of Special Assistance-I (DSA-I) programme for a period of 5 years from 1.4.2015 to 31.3.2020. Rupees 127.50 lacs + salary of one Project Fellow shall be made available to this Department.
- (2) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been selected for the prestigious 'Professor M.R. Balichwal Pharma Oration Award' by Institute of Chemical Technology (ICT), Mumbai, for his unparalleled contribution to pharmaceutical education, research and profession, especially in the domain of developing novel and nanostructured drug delivery systems using Quality by Design (QbD) and Advanced Pharmacokinetic modeling.
- (3) The University has received a donation of rupees eleven lac from Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge as a contribution with respect to 'Panjab University's Registrar's accommodation/furnishings'.

- (4) The University is going to receive two AC Buses through MPLAD Funds provided to PU to promote Chandigarh Region Innovation and Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) on the recommendation of Hon'ble Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Fellow, Panjab University. The services of these buses shall commence on the auspicious occasion of 'Lohri' festival in January 2015."

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the University should thank Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal for giving funds to the University so liberally out of the MPLAD Fund.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has come across some statements appeared in the newspapers, which probably had not been placed before the Syndicate, that the UGC had not agreed to give Rs.30 crore demanded by the University in its revised budget estimates for the current financial year. The U.G.C. has agreed to pay only Rs.176 crore against the revised demand of Rs.206 crore. In case the additional money of Rs.30 crore is not given, the University would face hardship during the current financial year especially because the University is continuously filling up all the vacant positions.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they were hopeful to get the needs of University fulfilled. He added that he was continuously in touch with the concerned authorities. A meeting that was to be convened between the University, UGC and MHRD officials, which has however not got convened till date. Until and unless, the meeting is held, the figure of Rs.30 crore would remain a 'default deficit figure'. The UGC/MHRD are of the view that they can give only 8% enhancement every year in the non-plan budget, whereas the University is spending much more on salary component due to the increase of DA, annual increments, etc. which are to the tune of 18% or more. The authorities in Delhi are also fully aware that the increase of the University would be over and above. The Punjab Government had already put a limit on their grant. The budget exercise of Central Government is in the transitory stage. He was hopeful that in the month of January/February 2015, a meeting would get convened in Delhi and MHRD/UGC would release some money to the University, which would ease the financial position of the University to some extent.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that on the one hand the University is facing a financial crunch and on the other hand, they are continuously filling up all the vacant positions. In such a situation, the financial position of the University would become from bad to worse.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a directive from the U.G.C. to fill up all the vacant positions and we have also to maintain the standing and competitiveness of the University. As such, they have no alternative, except to fill up the vacant positions. To get more funds, they have to project their case as a National University.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that instead of additional demand of Rs.30 crore, they should project that their requirement is much more than the given figure, as P.U. would have to pay substantially to the newly appointed faculty members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they were following the University case very vigorously.

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to the statement of the Vice-Chancellor that they were hopeful to get more finances from the Central Government. He suggested that instead of hoping, the University should prepare an alternative plan (Plan 'B') to meet the contingency. He expressed his concern on conflicting directions of U.G.C. on filling up of vacancies and restrictions on expenditure. He said that he had also apprised the members in the meeting of the Senate that there is no such directive from the U.G.C. to fill up all the vacant positions. They only wanted that instead of filling up the posts on contract, *ad hoc* and temporary basis, etc., they should appoint need-based faculty on regular basis, as the contract/*ad hoc*/temporary faculty did not shoulder any responsibility after the completion of the session. He expressed his doubts on source of funding to meet the salary requirements of the sanctioned budgetary posts. He was of the view that if they filled up all the vacant sanctioned budgetary posts, then even the receipt of Rs.130 crore more would not be sufficient, what to talk of Rs.30 crore deficit this year. If they devise their programmes on the basis of hopes, it would put the University in an embarrassing situation, similar to what the University faced about two-decades ago when the University was not in a position to pay even the salaries to the staff. He was of the view that until & unless they receive requisite grants from the U.G.C., the exercise of filling up of all the vacant positions should be put to a halt. Since the U.G.C. had to deal with other Universities in the country, he had apprehensions that UGC would give any differential preference to Panjab University. He wished to caution the University, well in advance as the letter of the U.G.C. had not been placed before the Syndicate and Senate till date. If the said letter is placed before the Syndicate and Senate, they could advise the University as to how to reduce the expenditure and enhance the revenue. Secondly, the posts should be filled up on regular basis only after assessing the workload.

**Referring to Sr. No.3** of the Vice-Chancellor's Statement, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was for the first time in the history of the University that someone had donated money for a particular work, i.e., for furnishing of accommodation allotted to the Registrar of the University. He was of the view that if they started receiving donations in this way, the University would become a Dharamshala and nothing more than that. There are so many renowned Scientists in the University who could arrange money for their own individual houses and personal facilities. It would have been welcomed if Dr. Judge had donated a sum of Rs.11 lacs for the smooth functioning of Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, which is in a

snoozing state. If he donates more money for that Institute, the University could think over for reducing the fees of the students. When anybody donates money to the University, he/she should not dictate to the University to where the money should be spent. According to him, it is a slap on the face of the Syndicate and it ought not be appreciated. Moreover, the offer of Dr. H.S. Judge had already appeared in the media. In his view, it is below the dignity of the Syndicate to accept this donation for this particular purpose. He suggested that they should return this money to the donor with thanks.

**Referring to Sr. No.4** of the Vice-Chancellor's Statement, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that as far as his knowledge goes, this money from MPLAD had been donated to the University two years ago for purchase of two buses and there has been delay in execution of purchase. He wished to know the utilization of this money for the period of delay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would give them a status report on MPLAD Fund.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they should not accept donation of Rs.11 lacs for furnishing of Registrar's House; otherwise, tomorrow it would be taken as a precedent and other faculty members would also start getting money from industries for renovation/furnishings of their houses as well.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that he was not in agreement with the views expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal on this issue. He was of the view that if any person was donating money for a particular purpose, they should accept it. According to him, it is for good purpose and it should be accepted and spent for the purpose the donor had given.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the Committee was constituted by the Syndicate to take stock of all these things. When the matter was placed before the Syndicate last time, only objection was regarding furnishing of the House and the money was approved for the renovation of the House. If somebody donated money for the renovation of the University property and the Committee recommended that they should accept it, there is nothing wrong in it. Moreover, if some money remained after the renovation, the same could be spent for renovation of other houses.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath. The meeting of the Committee was convened and when he reached the venue of meeting at the given time, he was told that the meeting has been postponed as the Advisor and Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor (ASVC) was not available. He was informed that the next meeting of the Committee had been scheduled for 8<sup>th</sup> December 2014 and he had told them then and there that he was not available on 8<sup>th</sup> December. The Dean of University

Instruction, who was a member of the Committee, told that he would also not be available on 8<sup>th</sup> December.

He was surprised to know that though the Syndicate constituted the Committee comprising five members, the Committee went ahead with the meeting in spite of non-availability of two members. Not only the meeting of the Committee was held, but it also decided to accept the donation as told by Shri Chatrath. The terms of reference of the Committee was something else and the Committee had recommended something else. Moreover, the proposal had not been placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that though the D.U.I. was present there, he refused to attend the meeting. He further said that he did not think that they needed a sanction of the House. If somebody offers to donate money to the University, the same should be accepted and the same should be placed before the House just for information.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that 2-3 years ago, the Oswal Company asked the University that they wanted to construct the Gate of the University by putting the name of Sri Aurobindo on the Gate. At that time, the University had not allowed them to do so. He was of the view that if they wanted to take the donation, it should not be for a particular purpose. They should take it in the Development Fund of the University and spend it anywhere.

Professor S.K. Sharma endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at present this matter is just for information and not for consideration. The University had received the donation and he had forwarded the same to the F.D.O.'s Office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University should not accept any donation without approval of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal should not disguise the things in this way. This issue and the issue raised by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal cannot be correlated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if this donation is accepted in the present form, his dissent be recorded.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, on his selection for the prestigious 'Professor M.R. Balichwal Pharma Oration Award' by Institute of Chemical Technology (ICT), Mumbai.

- (2) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Serial Nos. (1), (3) and (4) be noted and approved;
- (3) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 26.10.2014, as per **(Appendix-I)**, be noted.

**Appointment of Assistant Professors in History at Department of History**

**2.(i)** Considered minutes dated 26.11.2014/ 27.11.2014 **(Appendix-II)** of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professors in History-3 (General-1, SC-1, PH for Blind Disability of Low Vision-1) at Department of History, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. the following persons be appointed Assistant Professors of History at History Department, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University:
  - (i) Shri Ashish Kumar (SC) against SC Category
  - (ii) Dr. Priyatosh Sharma against General 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.

2. since only one candidate, Mr. Anoop appeared in the interview under PH for Blind Disability and Low Vision category, and he was also not up to the mark to get appointed as Assistant Professor; secondly, he has no previous experience to teach at College/University level either and his performance was also very poor, the post be re-advertised.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the following persons, in order of merit, be placed on the Waiting List:

1. Shri Rajesh Chander against SC Category
2. Dr. Jasbir Singh\* against General Category

\*The subject Experts and the Chancellor's nominee were very impressed with Dr. Jasbir Singh's scholarship in his chosen area and desired that in order to encourage him to grow professionally and contributes in a research environment comprising among peers, efforts should be made to get him moved from Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, to Department of History, P.U. Campus, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, will form a part of the proceedings.
  2. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates enclosed. It is certified that the selected candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

**Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, at Department of Political Science**

**2.(ii)** Considered minutes dated 28.11.2014 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Pampa Mukherjee be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **27.03.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 + 67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the CAS, at Department of Political Science**

**2.(iii)** Considered minutes dated 28.11.2014 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Navjot be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) at Department of Political Science, Panjab University, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **29.07.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000 + AGP Rs.9000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the

incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, at Department of Psychology**

**2.(iv)** Considered minutes dated 28.11.2014 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Psychology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Harpreet Kanwal Chhabra be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Psychology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.01.2009**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000 + AGP Rs.10000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, at School of Communication Studies**

**2.(v)** Considered minutes dated 28.11.2014 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), School of Communication Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Archana R. Singh be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), School of Communication Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **12.01.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000+AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Appointment of Assistant Professors in Information Technology at UIET**

**2.(vi)** Considered minutes dated 08.12.2014/09.12.2014 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professors in Information Technology-3 (General-2, SC-1) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be appointed Assistant Professors in Information Technology at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of



Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University:

1. } Ms. Neelam Goel
2. } against General
3. } Ms. Yogita Category
3. Ms. Nidhi (SC) against 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.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the following persons, in order of merit, be placed on the Waiting List:

1. Ms Ravreet Kaur against General Category
2. Ms. Preeti Aggarwal against General Category
3. Mr. Sukhvir Singh (SC) against SC Category

**NOTE:** 1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, will form a part of the proceedings.

2. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates enclosed. It is certified that the selected candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

**Promotion as Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under CAS, at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur**

**2.(vii)** Considered minutes dated 09.12.2014 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted as Assistant Professors (CSE) (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professors (CSE) (**Stage-2**), at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. the dates mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the University; the post would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them.

1. Mr. Naveen Dogra 08.07.2013
2. Ms. Prabha Sharma 08.07.2013.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion as Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under CAS, at U.I.E.T., P.U. Chandigarh**

**2.(viii)** Considered minutes dated 09.12.2014 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Mr. Akashdeep be promoted from Assistant Professor (CSE) (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (CSE) (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **21.08.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Appointment of Assistant Professors in Electrical & Electronics Engineering at UIET, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2.(ix)** Considered minutes dated 18.12.2014/ 19.12.2014 (**Appendix-X**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professors in Electrical & Electronics Engineering-3 (General) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be appointed Assistant Professors in Electrical & Electronics Engineering at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Vivek Pahwa
2. Ms. Aditi Gupta
3. Ms. Sabhyata Uppal Soni.

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.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the following persons, in order of merit, be placed on the Waiting List:

1. Mr. Navdeep Singh
2. Mr. Amit Kumar Pandey
3. Mr. Sunny Vig.

**NOTE:** 1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, will form a part of the proceedings.

2. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates enclosed. It is certified that the selected candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the letters of appointment/promotion to the persons appointed/promoted under Item 2(i) to 2(ix), be issued in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal said that as brought out earlier, the Screening Committee's job was to shortlist candidates on basis of some criteria. The practice in vogue is that no person other than the shortlisted candidates is called for interview. However, in one case, on basis of a representation made by the individual, she was called for interview, thereby depriving the opportunity to other 20 prospective candidates. He felt that this was discriminatory.

The Vice-Chancellor, clarified in one such case, where the candidate had been working with the University for many years and by virtue of being on teaching faculty, she would have possessed the relevant qualification and she had by oversight not attached the B.Tech. qualification with the application form, thus fell below the required API Score. The score if added then she would have been above the threshold and qualify for the interview. Hence, the Vice-Chancellor had exercised his discretion as he was aware that individual by virtue of being a teaching faculty member possessed the relevant degree qualifications.

Shri Ashok Goyal said this was discussed earlier too, at the time of Registrar's appointment when other Army Officers/candidates were also allowed to appear who had not attached their certificates along with the application form. He felt that the Screening Committee must follow as per the provisions in the Advertisement. Alternatively, the advertisements must be modified accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that though he had not applied for the post of Professor in this University, he was appointed as Professor in this University. The University had asked him to submit his CV when the interview date was fixed. He had submitted his CV to the Chairperson of the Department and he had to bring NOC from his organization where he was serving at that time. He had served as Professor for three years at P.U. and during this period the Vice-Chancellor of the JNU had invited him at Delhi when they were inducting faculty members. He had not formally applied there either. The Vice-Chancellor of JNU had sought his CV on the date of the interview. He went and appeared in the interview. As there was no other candidate, he was selected as Professor at JNU, Delhi. Such

had been his experience of inducting faculty members in the two Universities of India.

Shri Ashok Goyal reiterated that if the person had applied, but not shortlisted for interview by the Screening Committee and even then he/she had been called for interview, then it was not appropriate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Shri Goyal is well taken. This was not a common practice, but such type of situation gets created sometimes by the internal candidates.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that they should take note of what Shri Ashok Goyal remarked. The law is that if somebody wanted to make mention of his/her qualifications, that could be done only up to the last date of the submission of the applications as per the advertisement. If somebody failed to attach any certificate with his/her application, the same could be shown at the time of interview.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the candidate/s could show his/her certificate/s at the time of interview, if he/she failed to append the same, but the qualifications must be mentioned in the applications before the expiry of the last date.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed that in future cases these aspects will be taken care of while giving advertisement and during screening process to ensure that there is no apparent disparity and equal opportunity is given to all.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 26.11.2014 regarding API scores awarded to the candidates for the post of Assistant Professors in the Department of Sociology and in Physics/Applied Physics at U.I.E.T.**

**3.** Considered the minutes dated 26.11.2014 (**Appendix-XI**) of the committee of the Syndics constituted by the Syndicate, in its meeting held on 26.10.2014 (Para 2 (i) & (xv) to examine the API scores awarded to the candidates pertaining to appointment of Assistant Professors in the Department of Sociology and in Physics/Applied Physics at University Institute of Engineering & Technology advertised vide Advt. No.7/2013.

**NOTE:** An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that at the time of examining the application forms of candidates recommended by the Selection Committee for appointment as Assistant Professors in Physics/Applied Physics at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, said that the marks awarded to these candidates for peer review international publication seems to be incorrect. In his opinion he further said that it has been alleged that the Ph.D. thesis of one of the selected candidates has been published in the form of a book which is neither a text book nor a reference book.

On the decision of the Committee at Sr. No.2 at page 6 of the Appendix, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that as per

the advertisement, it has been mentioned that marks would be given only for the publications in the National and International Journals. So, in case of the book of the waitlisted candidate in Sociology, Mrs. Jasleen Kewlani, the publisher is national, hence, she is entitled for minimum of 2.5 marks. In his opinion, there was no local publication. He pleaded that this should be got reviewed from appropriate expert committee whether it was national or international publication. It should also be got reviewed from the subject expert. He was surprised that the candidate has been given only 15 marks for her Ph.D. thesis. One mark should have been given for the distinction, i.e., Gold Medalist which probably escaped from the vision of the Chairman of the Selection Committee. He had been given to understand that one of the candidates had challenged the recommendations of the Selection Committee in the Punjab & Haryana High Court and a notice had also been issued to the Panjab University and the orders passed in that notice that the appointments, if any would be subject to the outcome of the decision of the Court. However, the Syndicate is still considering the matter despite a notice of motion had been issued, which technically was not in order.

About the validity of the publications twice, Professor B.S. Bhoop stated that the candidates should not be given benefit of Ph.D. thesis as well as the publications depicted out of it and published in the national and international journals.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, on numerous occasions since 2012 when he had taken over as the Vice-Chancellor of this University, the benefit of the Lambert Publications was being given to the candidates uniformly to all in the direct recruitment of Faculty as well as promotions under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS). Thesis *per se* is a document of an individual. The University had been providing marks of Lambert Publications for the promotions under CAS uniformly without any question. He had to go by the judgements of the Screening Committees and the Dean of University Instruction is the Chairman of the Screening Committee, who normalized all these things. The Vice-Chancellor further stated that he was not able to stop the credit for Lambert Publications, as it is not possible at this stage to differentiate between work published in Lambert Publications and other conference proceedings and all the e-journals having ISSN number, etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that they themselves given the credit for the same publishers in Panjab University for the last so many years. He had brought this thing to the knowledge of the D.R. (Establishment) as well as other members of the Committee at the time of the meeting of the Committee, however, no heed was paid for the same. If the University had been following this practice for the last so many years, then the same should be applied to Sociology candidate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as far as appointments in Sociology are concerned, there is an ambiguity in the award of Gold Medal to the candidate that whether it is for Part-II or Part-I and II put together. He had asked the Controller of Examinations to verify about her Gold Medal from the concerned University.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that Gold Medal is always awarded on the basis of particular Degree and not in Part-I or Part-II.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Screening Committee was chaired by the Dean of University Instruction, who is an experienced person of the University and had also served as C.O.E, Registrar and Dean, College Development Council, who normalizes all the things on behalf of the University and if marks were not awarded for the Gold Medal to the concerned candidate, he could not do anything at that stage. He had informed the candidate during the interview that one mark for Gold Medal could not be given to her as she had not submitted the certificate. He could not do more than that. So far as the marks of publications are concerned, if a candidate claims the benefit of publications twice/thrice, it amounts to self-plagiarism.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that even he had personally scanned/looked at each and every Application Form of the candidate/s and if any discrepancy was found in allotment of marks, he informed the concerned candidate/s then and there, in some cases candidates were contacted telephonically to solicit appropriate proof. He further said that he had constituted a Committee of the Syndics. He had given a clarification in the case of Physics where simple issue was of a thesis v/s book. The burden of doing all these things was on the Syndics Committee. Now, he had placed the same thing which the Committee of Syndics resolved.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that large number of Companies had been floated in the market, which are asking money for publishing the Research Papers in their journals. This had become a big racket. He suggested that in order to ensure the induction of faculty with clear credentials, a Committee should be constituted immediately which would recommend that what type of publications, the University would accept, while recruiting teachers in the University so that this type of nexus could be curbed effectively in this University.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they have to go by what had been happening at the national level and they could not take any decision in isolation. Panjab University being an iconic University could suggest/initiate steps in this direction, but could not do anything unilaterally. There suggestions are ratified in Delhi. Last year when the Secretary, Higher Education, Government of India visited the Panjab University and asked to prepare the module for API scoring so that the government may introduce it in the academic induction system nationally. The University needs

inputs in this regard from the academic leadership of the University comprising of newly elected Deans, Chairpersons, Board of Studies of various subjects and other academic people and they should come forward in this direction so that the mess of mushrooming of the shoddy publications could be curbed. He would take up the matter with the Chairperson of the U.G.C. so that some reforms or moves could be taken to curb the mushrooming of shoddy publications. He further said that for the posts, which had already been advertised, the prevalent norms for API scores would have to be followed and for future, they would act as per the new directions.

Professor Karamjeet said that there is a provision in the U.G.C. Guidelines that each Department/Faculty could decide on list of journals to be accepted, etc. in respect of API scores.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that instead of violating the Regulations/Rules of the U.G.C. and other Governing Bodies, they should put up their case to the U.G.C. that it is not practically possible to follow particular rules and avoid giving justifications after violations. The present scenario is that in the name of the autonomy, the Panjab University did not follow the instructions in toto due to that the Panjab University as well as Government of Punjab is facing problems. We should convey to the UGC that there were some loopholes in the practicability of the regulations which need to be plugged and in the meantime, we should inform them that we were taking interim decision.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the marks awarded by the experts could not be challenged. What had been happening was that the members of the Screening/Selection Committee do it because sometimes their own students had been appearing in the interview/s. He suggested that to avoid such type of difficulties later on, the candidates who appeared in the interview should be shown the API Score and asked him/her to put his/her signatures on it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would put this practice, in near future.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that marks should be put on the website to avoid such things, as many Central Universities are following this practice.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as a part of e-governance after the screening of the applications, the output could be sent on the e-mail to the concerned candidates and they could be given one week's time to check and if there is any discrepancy, he/she could point it out. This practice could only be possible for future.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that the marks given to the candidates only on the credentials of the Conference. According to him, it needed to be checked thoroughly.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That after examining the recommendations of the Committee of Syndics dated 26.11.2014 (**Appendix-XI**), constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 26.10.2014 (Para 2 (i) & (xv)) to examine the API scores awarded to the candidates pertaining to appointment of Assistant Professors in the Department of Sociology and in Physics/Applied Physics at University Institute of Engineering & Technology advertised vide Advt. No.7/2013, approved that the following persons be appointed Assistant Professors in Physics/Applied Physics at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Suresh Kumar  
against S.C. Category
2. Dr. Sunil Bansal  
against General 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.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the following persons, in order of merit, be placed on the Waiting List:

1. Dr. Ashok Kumar (SC) against SC Category
2. Dr. Navneet Kumar against General Category

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, will form a part of the proceedings.
  2. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates enclosed. It is certified that the selected candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That, in the light of the discussion took place in the meeting, the appointments of Assistant Professors of Sociology in the Department of Sociology, be re-examined by the Committee.

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



**Confirmation of certain Assistant Professors**

4. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the following Assistant Professors, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member & Departments	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
1.	Ms. Richa Sharma University School of Open Learning	22.01.1983	26.04.2013	26.04.2014
2.	Dr. Anju Goyal Department of Statistics	02.09.1983	21.03.2013	21.03.2014

**NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 28.09.2014 (Para XIX) while considering the confirmation of the certain Faculty members has noted that the probation period of Ms. Richa Sharma of one year be also computed after excluding the period of maternity leave which she has actually availed w.e.f. 25.11.13 to 23.05.14 i.e. during probation period. Thus, her confirmation from the due date i.e. 26.04.2014 will be got finalized later on.

Ms. Richa Sharma, Assistant Professor, USOL, has joined the duty on 23.05.2014 (A.N.) after availing the maternity leave w.e.f. 25.11.2013 to 23.05.2014.

2. The Senate meeting dated 28.09.2014 (Para XIX) has noted that the probation period of Dr. Anju Goyal be computed after excluding the period of maternity leave which she has been availing w.e.f. 03.02.14 to 01.08.14 i.e. during probation period. Thus, her confirmation from the due date i.e. 21.03.2014 will be got finalized later on, after she joins back.

Ms. Anju Goyal has joined the duty on 04.08.2014 after availing the maternity leave w.e.f. 03.02.2014 to 01.08.2014 (02.08.2014 & 03.08.2014 being Saturday and Sunday).

3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

**RESOLVED:** That the following Assistant Professors, be confirmed, in their posts, w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member & Departments	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of Confirmation
1.	Ms. Richa Sharma University School of Open Learning	22.01.1983	26.04.2013	26.04.2014
2.	Dr. Anju Goyal	02.09.1983	21.03.2013	21.03.2014

	Department of Statistics			
--	-----------------------------	--	--	--

**Issue regarding 5.** Considered the pre-ponement of the dates of promotion of the following Assistant Professors Stage-1 to Assistant Professors Stage-2 as mentioned against each:

**Pre-ponement of the dates of promotion of certain Assistant Professors from Stage-1 to Stage-2**

Sr. No.	Name of the teacher	Department/ Institute	Date of promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage- 2
1.	Dr. Yogesh Kumar Rawal	Zoology	<b>05.08.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 18.3.2011 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 17.03.2011, vide office order No. Estt./11/9092-9121 dated 2.9.2011
2.	Dr. (Mrs.) Amarjit Kaur	Chemistry	<b>03.11.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 25.9.2010 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 24.09.2010, vide office order No. Estt./11/4126-4183/Estt. I dated 9.6.2011
3.	Dr. (Mrs.) Sonal Singhal	Chemistry	<b>08.11.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 25.9.2010 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 24.09.2010, vide office order No. Estt./11/4126-4183/Estt. I dated 9.6.2011
4.	Dr. (Mrs.) Neetu Goyal nee Gupta	Chemistry	<b>23.12.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 25.9.2010 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 24.09.2010, vide office order No. Estt./11/4126-4183/Estt. I dated 9.6.2011
5.	Dr. Manish Sharma	Gandhian and Peace Studies	<b>03.11.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 26.12.2009 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 25.12.2009, vide office order No. Estt./11/4126-4183/Estt. I dated 9.6.2011

**NOTE:** 1. The recommendation of the Syndicate dated 27.1.2013 (Para 3) regarding adoption of letter No.1-2/2009 (EC/PS) Pt. VIII dated 7.12.2012 received from Under Secretary, UGC with regard to extension in date for participation in Orientation/Refresher course up to 31.12.2013 in respect of eligible Teachers/ Assistant

Registrar/Assistant Director of Physical Education / College Director of Physical Education for placement under Career Advancement Scheme were approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 24.3.2013 (Para V). However, the Audit has raised objection that:

“The decision of the Senate dated 24.3.2013 is merely the adoption of UGC letter dated 7.12.2012 and does not authorize the Vice-Chancellor to prepone the date of promotion for which the competent authority is Senate. It is a general rule that an authority who had approved the date of promotion then any amendment requires the approval of same authority.”

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

**RESOLVED:** That the pre-ponement of the dates of promotion of the Assistant Professors Stage-1 to Assistant Professors Stage-2 as mentioned against each, be approved as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the teacher	Department/ Institute	Date of promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage- 2
1.	Dr. Yogesh Kumar Rawal	Zoology	<b>05.08.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 18.3.2011 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 17.03.2011, vide office order No. Estt./11/9092-9121 dated 2.9.2011
2.	Dr. (Mrs.) Amarjit Kaur	Chemistry	<b>03.11.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 25.9.2010 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 24.09.2010, vide office order No. Estt./11/4126-4183/Estt. I dated 9.6.2011
3.	Dr. (Mrs.) Sonal Singhal	Chemistry	<b>08.11.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 25.9.2010 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 24.09.2010, vide office order No. Estt./11/4126-4183/Estt. I dated 9.6.2011

4.	Dr. (Mrs.) Neetu Goyal nee Gupta	Chemistry	<b>23.12.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 25.9.2010 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 24.09.2010, vide office order No. Estt./11/4126-4183/Estt. I dated 9.6.2011
5.	Dr. Manish Sharma	Gandhian and Peace Studies	<b>03.11.2009</b> instead of date of promotion already given w.e.f. 26.12.2009 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course on 25.12.2009, vide office order No. Estt./11/4126-4183/Estt. I dated 9.6.2011

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 10.09.2014 regarding cases of non-compounded Ph.D. increments**

**6.** Considered minutes dated 10.09.2014 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the audit observation/objections regarding cases of non-compounded Ph.D. increments to the faculty members (already granted in terms of Senate decision dated 29.09.2013 (Para XVII)).

Initiating discussion, Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that 1.09.2008 is a crucial date. There are teachers who had done Ph.D. without course work and also the teachers who had done Ph.D. with course work. He pointed out that the benefit of five non-compounding advance increments to teachers who were appointed with Ph.D. degree shall be admissible only in those cases where the Ph.D. was completed on or after 01.01.2006 (notionally) and the financial benefit of additional increment shall be given only w.e.f. 01.09.2008, which is technically not correct. All the Universities extended this benefit to its teachers w.e.f. 1.09.2008. He suggested that those teachers who had joined the University service prior to 01.09.2008 and had Ph.D., they should be given 3-5 non-compounding advance increments. According to him, they could not fix the date of extending this benefit prior to 01.09.2008.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, it meant, they wanted that the teachers who had Ph.D. and joined the University service from 1.1.2006 to 31.08.2008 should be given 2-4 non-compounding advance increments and the teachers who joined University service after 31.08.2008 should be given 3-5 non-compounding advance increments. It would also be technically right.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if someone had joined the University service on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2008 and the person who joined the University service on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2008 would get more emoluments than his/her senior, which is not justified.

It was clarified that if these increments w.e.f. 01.09.2008 were granted, the senior teachers would be on the lower side and in this way there would be a lot of applications for pay anomalies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this benefit from 01.01.2006 would be sacrosanct.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the Syndicate and Senate of the University are not above the rules/regulations of the Government of India. He was of the view that the teachers who had Ph.D. and joined the University service prior to 01.09.2008 should be given 3-5 advance compounded increments.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it meant five increments to those teachers who had done Ph.D. through Entrance Test and after doing proper course work and the teachers who had done Ph.D. without attending the course work they are entitled for 2-4 advance compounded increments. The University at one point of time decided that the teachers who had done Ph.D. with course work or without course work would be treated at par. In this way, they had themselves diluted the guidelines.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had ample opportunity and they would have to decide in this matter at the earliest so that it could be implemented before 01.01.2016.

Referring to page 31, 9.4 (ii) of the Appendix, it was clarified that there are already transitory provisions and quoted as under:-

“However, teachers in service who have already been awarded Ph.D. by the time of coming into force of these Regulations or having been enrolled for Ph.D. have already undergone course-work as well as evaluation, if any, and only notification in regard to the award of Ph.D. is awaited, shall also be entitled to the award of 3 non-compounded increments even if the University awarding such Ph.D. has not yet been notified by the UGC as having complied with the process prescribed by the Commission.”

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they should do in accordance with the rules.

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

**This was agreed to.**

## **Deferred Item**

**7.** The following item on the agenda was read out, viz.-

To fix the dates for the meetings of the Faculties to be held in March 2015 for the purpose of election of various Boards of Studies (i.e. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Boards of Studies) for the term 1.4.2015 to 31.3.2017, as provided under Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:-

“The election of teachers from the affiliated Colleges of Under-graduate and Post-graduate Boards of Studies by the Faculties concerned shall be held by March 31 every alternate year by Single Transferable Vote System.

The Syndicate shall fix a date or dates on which meetings of the various Faculties shall be held for the purpose of electing Board of Studies.

xxx            xxx            xxx”.

2. An office note along with a copy of the schedule approved last time for the term i.e. 01.04.2013 to 31.03.2015 is enclosed .

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that he and Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal had submitted a Resolution in the month of May 2014 regarding election of Board of Studies in respect of those subjects which are being taught in more than three affiliated Colleges instead of nominated Board of Studies. On this Resolution, a Committee had been constituted under the Chairmanship of Principal B.C. Josan which gave its recommendations in the month of September 2014. He pointed out that more than four months had already elapsed and they did not know the fate of the recommendations of that Committee as the same had not been placed before the Syndicate till date. He pleaded that it should be traced as to where the recommendations of the Committee were lying in the University as it is very important issue. He pleaded that the consideration of the item be deferred and the same be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate along with the minutes of the Committee constituted to consider the Resolution proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal regarding constitution of Board of Studies in respect of the subjects being taught in more than three affiliated Colleges of the University.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of **Item C-7** on the agenda, be deferred.

**Appointment of Revising and Committee Regulations**

The following item on the agenda was read out, viz. –

To appoint the following Committees for the period noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
1.	Revising Committee	Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32, P.U. Calendar, Volume- II, 2007	Calendar year 2015, i.e., 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015
2.	Regulations Committee	Regulation 23.1 at page 33, P.U. Calendar, Volume- I, 2007	Calendar year 2015, i.e., 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015

**NOTE:** 1. Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 for composition of Revising Committee along with present membership of the Committees w.e.f. 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014 is enclosed **(Appendix-XV)**.

2. Regulations 23.1 for composition of Regulation Committee along with present membership of the Committees w.e.f. 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014 is enclosed **(Appendix-XV)**.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**Deferred Item**

**9.** Considered if, the existing provision for admission under Riot Victim category, at page 207, 2(vii) in the Handbook of Information-2014, be amended as below and be incorporated in the Handbook of Information- 2015 and other prospectuses i.e. U.B.S., UIAMS, PURC Ludhiana and CET etc.

Existing Provision	Proposed Provision
“2% for Sons/ Daughters/ Husband/Wife/Brothers/Sisters of persons killed/incapacitated in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh. A Certificate from the District Magistrate to this effect must be submitted by the Candidate. Migrant Card alone is not enough”	“2% for Sons/ Daughters/ Husband/Wife/Brothers/Sisters of persons killed/incapacitated <b>(including disability caused due to financial/capital/asset loss forced displacement)</b> in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/ incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh. A Certificate <b>along with Migrant Card</b> from the District Magistrate to this effect must be submitted by the Candidate.”

**NOTE:** The proposal of the Dean University Instruction along with legal opinion of

Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Legal Retainer, Panjab University enclosed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the names of Regional Centres, Hoshiarpur and Muktsar were missing from the Item. He suggested that these should also be included.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the definition of incapacitated needs to be clarified to validate benefit under this category to be given to the candidates during admissions. He was of the view that under the garb of this category undue benefit may be taken by the undeserved persons. He pleaded that they should not go beyond the Punjab/Central Government so far as the definition/meaning of incapacitated is concerned. He said that in Government of India there are two things, i.e., Migrant and other is incapacitated.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they should prepare the wording of this item in accordance with the wording of the benefit to be given to the wards of the Freedom Fighters.

The Vice-Chancellor said the purpose of this item was to include the people who were migrated because their businesses were burnt, however, they might not have been physically incapacitated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should take decision in tune with the policies prevalent in Government of India/Punjab. In this way, the terrorist and riot affected people would also be eligible for this benefit and it would become endless.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of **Item C-9**, on the agenda, be deferred.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 3.11.2014 regarding introduction of the subject "Domestic Violence against Women and Children" as Compulsory Paper**

**10.** Considered the recommendation dated 03.11.2014 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the subject "Domestic Violence against Women and Children", be introduced as a separate Compulsory qualifying paper having maximum 50 marks (one semester) at undergraduate level.

- NOTE:**
1. At present, there is one compulsory qualifying paper namely Environment and Road Safety Education carrying 70 Marks (Env. 50 and Road Safety 20 marks).
  2. Earlier too, the said issue was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 12.07.2014 (Para 22), but the consideration of the item was deferred.



Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that in July 2014 this item was there to include "Road Safety and Environment" and at that time it was deferred. Now, the proposal is to introduce separate compulsory qualifying paper having maximum 50 marks (one semester) at undergraduate level. He was of the view that it should be introduced as an elective subject on the pattern of Police Administration, Public Administration, Human Rights, etc. in the affiliated Colleges at undergraduate level. If they wanted to add "Domestic Violence against Women and Children" in the already running subject of 'Road Safety and Environment', the main theme of the Environment would be diluted. As per the latest guidelines of the UGC as per their October 2014 Module, the UGC had directed that the earlier Module should not be disturbed at any cost.

Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh suggested that there should be division of marks, i.e., 35+15+50 (Environment, Road Safety and Violence Against Women and Children) and in this way, they would do without making any change in the existing syllabus and the directions of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court would also be meted out.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that last year on the direction of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, they had included "Road Safety" in the syllabus of Environment Education. But now, they are going to introduce one compulsory subject "Domestic Violence against Women and Children" on the direction of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. He was of the view that there are already two compulsory papers, i.e., English and Punjabi or History and Culture of Punjab. If they introduce one more compulsory subject of "Domestic Violence against Women and Children", they would burden the students. According to him, there should be only one paper of 50 marks by including syllabus from all the three components, i.e. Environment, Road Safety and Violence against Women and Children at undergraduate level by dividing it in Part - A and Part-B.

Shri Jagpal Singh suggested that the proportional marks of this proposed paper should be 40+20+40 (Environment, Road Safety, Domestic Violence against Women and Children).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is no direction from the Court. The Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court had never expressed that "Domestic Violence against Women and Children" should also be taught as separate subject. Keeping in view their proposal, 91 questions which the University had set to give the basic idea that what is the domestic violence against women and children and what are the remedies. According to him, 91 questions are enough for giving the basic idea to the students. He was of the view that this is a qualifying paper and there should not be any separate compulsory paper. Earlier, this qualifying paper is of 70 marks. The marks of this qualifying paper could be enhanced to 100 and name of this paper could be

“Environment, Road Safety and Domestic Violence against Women and Children.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Karamjeet Singh, Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there should not be any separate paper, but some portion from Domestic Violence against Women and Children could also be included in it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the problem is that how to distribute the marks.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could decide it by forming a Committee.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there should be one compulsory qualifying paper and the nomenclature of the paper should be such that all the three aspects are inserted into it.

Referring to the latest judgements of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court of India are expanding Article 21 of the Constitution of India and bringing all the things, such as Road Safety, Pollution, Pure Water, Violence against Women and Children, etc. to its ambit and this process would continue with the advancement of time. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that there should be one paper of Legal Studies covering all the above aspects. If they wanted to do so, a Committee comprising Principals of affiliated Colleges, Law Experts, etc. could be constituted. He could also assist in this matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should collect information in this regard from other neighbouring Universities and they should not do anything in haste at the moment.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee and the recommendation/s of the Committee be placed before the Syndicate in one of its meetings.

**Permission to Ms. Ritu Bala, a Ph.D. candidate to submit Synopsis beyond three years**

**11.** Considered if, Ms. Ritu Bala, a Ph.D. candidate (enrolled on 14.11.2011), in the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce, be granted permission for submission of Synopsis beyond three years, as she could not submit the synopsis due to family problems.

**NOTE:** The application dated 19.11.2014 of Ms. Ritu Bala along with office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).

**RESOLVED:** Ms. Ritu Bala, a Ph.D. candidate, be granted permission for submission of Synopsis beyond three years, (enrolled on 14.11.2011), in the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce.

**Permission to Ms. Preeti Gupta, a Ph.D. candidate to submit Synopsis beyond 2½ years**

**12.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor, that Ms. Preeti Gupta, a Ph.D. candidate (enrolled on 21.09.2011) in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, UIET, be granted, further extension of six months i.e. up to 18.09.2014 beyond 2½ years for submission of her Ph.D. synopsis, as a special case.

- NOTE:**
1. Ms. Preeti Gupta, vide her application (**Appendix-XVII**) has requested for grant of permission to submit her Ph.D. synopsis as she could not submit the same within a period of two years due to unavoidable circumstances.
  2. Earlier too, she was granted extension of six months i.e. up to 19.03.2014 beyond the prescribed period of 2 years by the Vice-Chancellor.
  3. Para 13 of the new UGC guidelines, 2009, is reproduced below:

“In case a candidate fails to submit synopsis to the Chairperson of the Department within a period of two years, his/her registration shall stand as automatically cancelled. No separate intimation will be sent to the candidate.”

**RESOLVED:** That Ms. Preeti Gupta, a Ph.D. candidate (enrolled on 21.09.2011) be granted, further extension of six months, i.e., up to 18.09.2014 beyond 2½ years for submission of her Ph.D. synopsis, as a special case, in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, University Institute of Engineering & Technology.

**Recommendations dated 22.10.2014 of Board of Studies in Medicines regarding Regulations/Rules for Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing**

**13.** Considered the recommendations dated 22.10.2014 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of Board of Studies in Medicines (Item 1), that the Regulations/Rules for Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing (DPN) under Centre of Excellence, (duly approved by the Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences), as per authorization given by the Faculty of Medical Sciences in its meeting dated 23.3.2014 (**Appendix-XVIII**), effective from the session 2014-15, be approved. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

**RESOLVED:** That the Regulations/Rules for Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing (DPN) under Centre of Excellence, (duly approved by the Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences), as

per authorization given by the Faculty of Medical Sciences in its meeting dated 23.3.2014 (**Appendix-XVIII**), effective from the session 2014-15, be approved.

### **Amendment in Regulations**

**14.** Considered the recommendations dated 29.10.2014 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to reconsider the recommendation of the Administrative Committee dated 27.09.2013 (**Appendix-XIX**), that the following Regulation 10.2 of Chapter III "General Regulations for Examinations" be amended as proposed and given effect from the session 2014-15:

<b>Existing Regulation</b>	<b>Proposed Regulation as recommended by the Committee dated 29.10.2014</b>
<p><b>10.1.</b> Unless otherwise provided, a person who has already passed an examination of this or any other University shall not be permitted to reappear in that examination or a corresponding examination.</p> <p><b>*10.2.</b> A candidate is allowed to appear in two examinations simultaneously, i.e. one for improvement and one regular full-time course, in addition to a Certificate/ Diploma /Advanced Diploma Course <b>offered in the evening session</b>, being pursued by him/her as a regular student/private candidate of the University Teaching Department / Department of Correspondence studies/Affiliated Colleges of the University/in private capacity, as the case may be. Appearance at the improvement examination will be allowed only after completion of the entire course as per the existing regulations/rules.</p>	<p><b>No Change</b></p> <p><b>10.2</b> (i) A candidate is allowed to appear in two examinations simultaneously, i.e. one for improvement and one regular full-time course, in addition to a Certificate/ Diploma /Advanced Diploma <b>Post Graduate Diploma Course offered in the evening session or through USOL</b>, being pursued by him/her as a regular student/private candidate of the University Teaching Department / Department/University School of Open Learning/Affiliated Colleges of the University/in private capacity, as the case may be. Appearance at the improvement examination will be allowed only after completion of the entire course as per the existing regulations/rules.</p> <p>(ii) the wording, "offered in the Evening Session" in the Existing Regulation be allowed to be restored.</p>

**NOTE:** \*The above said Existing Regulation 10.2 of Chapter III "General Regulations for Examinations" has been sent to Govt. of India and yet to be printed at page 18 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007.

**Referring to Regulation 10.2 (i),** Professor Karamjeet Singh pleaded that the students should be allowed to appear for improvement of examination/ performance in between the completion of the course/degree instead of after completion of the entire course as per the existing regulations/rules. He was of the view that it should be re-looked.

Professor S.K. Sharma was also not agreed with the viewpoint put forth by Professor Karamjeet Singh.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that it could not be done at this stage. If he wanted any change in this regard, he could propose a Resolution.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the following Regulation 10.2 of Chapter III “General Regulations for Examinations” be amended as proposed and given effect from the session 2014-15:

<b>Existing Regulation</b>	<b>Proposed Regulation as recommended by the Committee dated 29.10.2014</b>
<p><b>10.1.</b> Unless otherwise provided, a person who has already passed an examination of this or any other University shall not be permitted to reappear in that examination or a corresponding examination.</p> <p><b>*10.2.</b> A candidate is allowed to appear in two examinations simultaneously, i.e. one for improvement and one regular full-time course, in addition to a Certificate/ Diploma /Advanced Diploma Course <b>offered in the evening session</b>, being pursued by him/her as a regular student/private candidate of the University Teaching Department / Department of Correspondence studies/Affiliated Colleges of the University/in private capacity, as the case may be. Appearance at the improvement examination will be allowed only after completion of the entire course as per the existing regulations/rules.</p>	<p><b>No Change</b></p> <p><b>10.2 (i)</b> A candidate is allowed to appear in two examinations simultaneously, i.e. one for improvement and one regular full-time course, in addition to a Certificate/ Diploma /Advanced Diploma <b>Post Graduate Diploma Course offered in the evening session or through USOL</b>, being pursued by him/her as a regular student/private candidate of the University Teaching Department / Department/University School of Open Learning/Affiliated Colleges of the University/in private capacity, as the case may be. Appearance at the improvement examination will be allowed only after completion of the entire course as per the existing regulations/rules.</p> <p>(ii) the wording, “offered in the Evening Session” in the Existing Regulation be allowed to be</p>

**Recommendations dated 25.11.2014 of the Committee regarding fee/fund structure for the Session 2015-16**

restored.

**15.** Considered the following recommendations dated 25.11.2014 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the fee/fund structure for the session 2015-16 of the University Teaching Departments, Regional Centres, be finalized:-

1. Fee hike of 5% may be approved subject to a minimum increase of Rs.500/- and maximum of Rs.1500/- for all courses of the University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres.
2. The sub head of fee structure may be merged except those for which separate accounts are maintained.
3. Wi-Fi charges of Rs.30/- p.m. may be charged from the University Students, wherever the Wi-Fi facility is made available. This amount shall be used for maintenance and up-gradation of Wi-Fi, intranet and such infrastructure.
4. The fee/fund structure as approved by the competent authority be incorporated in the Hand Book of Information Rules for Admission for the session 2015-2016 onwards.

**NOTE:** The Senate at its meeting dated 22.03.2014/ 25.05.2014 (Para XLVI) has resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to appoint a Standing Committee for revision of fee structure for the University as well as affiliated Colleges. The Standing Committee should make its recommendations well in advance so that the same could be placed before the Senate in its last meeting of the year.

Initiating discussion, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that proposed fee hike of 5% should be approved subject to a maximum increase of Rs.1000/- instead of Rs.1500/-.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that at page 102 of the Appendix, it was mentioned that "All the members were of the view that there should be 5% fee hike with the maximum limit at Rs.1500/- for all courses including self-financing course for the next academic session, i.e., 2015-16." He suggested in the Item at Page 100, Sr. No.1, it should be mentioned for all courses of the University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres, including the Self-financing Courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the University was trying to highlight in the media that the extra funds which

would be collected with the proposed fee hike of 5%, would be incurred on providing better facilities to the students. For example, they would charge the enhanced fee from 100 students and benefit of scholarship/s and free-ship would be offered to some students out of them. He was of the view that they were trying to befool the students. Instead of saying that the money generated from the fee hike would be spent for the welfare of the students, they should take a conscious decision that they would have to enhance the fee every year to cope up with the inflation as well as other allied expenditure, but the enhancement in fee should be rationale. He was of the view that the Dean of Students Welfare should not give any version in the newspapers in this regard. He pointed out that it was proposed in the item that Rs.30/- p.m. may be charged from the University Students, wherever the Wi-Fi facility is made available. This amount shall be used for maintenance and up-gradation of Wi-Fi, intranet and such infrastructure. He was of the view that charges for Wi-Fi should commensurate to utilization of students. Instead of writing in the item that the fee/fund structure as approved by the competent authority be incorporated in the Handbook of Information Rules for Admission for the session 2015-16 onwards, it should be mentioned that the Syndicate members were of the view that nominal hike in the fee was essential. He was of the firm belief that the stakeholders should take the students into confidence. There is unrest among the students and that was why they were saying that University should generate revenue from other sources instead of enhancing the fees/funds. The House should approve the proposed fee hike of 5%, but subject to maximum of Rs.1000/- instead of Rs.1500/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are some courses in the University where the fee is very minimal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are certain courses where even by enhancing Rs.500/-, they are hardly increasing anything.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the University had been given directives during the meeting/s of the Board of Finance by the representatives of Government of India, U.T. Administration and Punjab Government for trying to enhance its revenue by making increase in different kind of fee/funds and it is only in that background, the proposed hike in the fee is essential. They were of the view that every source of revenue should be explored by the University. As far as Wi-Fi was concerned, they had received PURSE grant as Panjab University is among five top Universities in the country. They would explore initial expenditure, recurring expenditure and maintenance expenditure on Wi-Fi and thereafter a Revenue Model would be prepared.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that this facility of Wi-Fi had to be extended to all the students.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that Wi-Fi facilities should be extended to the residents at North as well as South Campus of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Wi-Fi would be practical service and it would be made viable by assessing how much they had already spent and what they have needed for annual maintenance and up-gradation of this system. They would bring it again before the Senate meeting of March 2015.

Professor B.S. Bhoop said that Wi-Fi facility should be extended to the residents of both North and South Campus. He was of the view that if needed, some money could be charged from the residents, but there should also be an increase in the band-width. He further suggested that a sum of Rs.100/- per house per month for extending this facility might be charged.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That -

- (1) Fee hike of 5% be approved subject to a minimum increase of Rs.500/- and maximum of Rs.1200/- for all courses run by the University and its Regional Centres for the session 2015-16; and
- (2) Wi-Fi charges of Rs.30/- P.M. be charged from the University Students.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 09.06.2014 for benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension under the Regulation 3.9 appearing at Page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007**

**16.** Considered the cases of the following employees for grant of benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension under the Regulation 3.9 appearing at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, in pursuance of the recommendations of the committee dated 09.06.2014 (Sr. No.1,3 & 5) & 18.09.2014 (Sr. No.6,14,16,18 & 26) (**Annexure-I & II (Appendix-XXI)**):

1. Dr. Surya Kant (appendix-III)
2. Dr. Ram Niwas Gupta (appendix-IV)
3. Dr. Dharam Pal Maini (appendix-V)
4. Dr. H.L. Vasudeva (appendix-VI)
5. Dr. Gurdeep Singh Sodhi (appendix-VII)
6. Dr. (Mrs.) Tehl Kohli (appendix-VIII)
7. Dr. Manmohan Singh (appendix-IX)
8. Dr. Asha Mohan Sethi (appendix-X).

**NOTE:** 1. The Regulation 3.9 at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, is reproduced below:

“An employee appointed to a service or post, shall be eligible to add to his service qualifying for superannuation pension



(but not for any other pension), the actual period, not exceeding one fourth of the length of his service, or the actual period by which his age at the time of recruitment exceeded twenty five years, or a period of five years, whichever is less, if the service or post to which he is appointed is one.

- (a) For which post-graduate research or specialist qualification or experience in scientific, technological or professional field is essential, and
- (b) To which candidates of more than twenty five years of age are normally recruited.

Provided that this concession shall not be admissible to an employee unless this actual qualifying service at the time he quits University service is not less than ten years.”

2. In the cases of the above employees the original advertisement against which the concerned teacher was appointed was not available in the record of the Establishment Section. Therefore, the Committee considered their cases in the light of the essential qualification as per other advertisement in the contemporary period.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that in the meeting of the Committee dated 09.06.2014, there were six cases and in the meeting of the Committee dated 18.09.2014, there were 26 cases of the employees for grant of benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension under the Regulation 3.9 appearing at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. He pointed out that why only eight person's cases out of 32 were placed before the Syndicate. He was of the view that no pick and choose policy should be adopted. During the meetings of the above said Committees, the members were of the unanimous view that benefit should be given to all. He pleaded that benefit should be given to each and every person.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there should be uniform decision for all the affecting persons and it should be applicable to all.

It was clarified that the Committee had considered all the cases. In the case of these eight employees the original advertisement against which the concerned teacher/s was/were appointed was not available in the record of the Establishment Branch. Therefore, the Committee considered their cases in the light of the essential qualification as per other advertisement in the contemporary period. It was placed before the Syndicate for approval. These were very old cases and there was no pick and choose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these cases were hanging for so long. He himself has brought these to this stage, it should be understood in right spirit and also that there is no pick and choose policy and if they have any such case which did not cover under this. They could give in writing and he would consider it.

**This was agreed to.**

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the employees who had equivalent research work and those who have no Ph.D., the benefit should be given to them also.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.06.2014 & 18.09.2014 (**Appendix-XXI**), in respect of the cases of the following employees mentioned at Sr. Nos.1,3 & 5 and Sr. Nos.6,14,16,18 & 26 for grant of benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension, be approved, under the Regulation 3.9 appearing at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007:

1. Dr. Surya Kant
2. Dr. Ram Niwas Gupta
3. Dr. Dharam Pal Maini
4. Dr. H.L. Vasudeva
5. Dr. Gurdeep Singh Sodhi
6. Dr. (Mrs.) Tehl Kohli
7. Dr. Manmohan Singh
8. Dr. Asha Mohan Sethi.

**Rectification of Syndicate decision pertaining to remuneration for paper-setting and evaluation**

**17.**

The following item on the agenda was read out, viz. –

To rectify the following decision of the Syndicate dated 18.05.2014 (Para 47 (x)) (**Appendix-XXII**), with regard to the rates for payment of remuneration for paper-setting and evaluation for (i) LL.B. 3 Years Course, and (ii) BE MBA Integrated Course (IX & X Semester) at par with the rates of M.A./M.Sc., to meet with the audit objection:-

<b>Syndicate decision (Para 47 (x)) dated 18.05.2014</b>	<b>Rectification in Syndicate decision</b>
“Resolved that the rates for payment of remuneration for paper-setting and evaluation for (i) LL.B. 3 Years Course, and (ii) BE MBA Integrated Course (IX & X Semester) at par with the rates of	“Resolved that the rates for payment of remuneration for paper-setting and evaluation for (i) LL.B. 3 Years Course, and (ii) BE MBA Integrated Course (IX & X

M.A./M.Sc., as the said courses are Post-graduate Courses”	Semester) be at par with the rates of M.A./M.Sc.
------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------

**NOTE:** An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

**RESOLVED:** That the rates for payment of remuneration for paper-setting and evaluation for (i) LL.B. 3 Years Course, and (ii) BE MBA Integrated Course (IX & X Semester), be at par with the rates of M.A./M.Sc.

**Qualification for the post of Plumber-cum-Mechanic at Dr. Harvash Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital**

**18.** Considered the recommendation of the Academic & Administrative Committee of Dr. Harvash Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, dated 17.07.2014 (**Appendix-XXIII**) that the qualification for the post of Plumber-cum-Mechanic (Rs.5910-20200+GP-1900), be approved, as **Certificate/Diploma in the Plumber Trade from an ITI or equivalent.**

**NOTE:** An office note is enclosed. The qualifications for the post of 'Dental Chair Technician' as mentioned in the said note at (i) have already been approved by the Syndicate dated 26.10.2014, under item 37 R-(vii) (**Appendix-XXIII**).

**RESOLVED:** That the qualification for the post of Plumber-cum-Mechanic (Rs.5910-20200+GP-1900), be approved, as Certificate/Diploma in the Plumber Trade from an ITI or equivalent.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 21.10.2014 for finalizing the Intellectual Property Right of P.U.**

**19.** Considered minutes dated 21.10.2014 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for finalizing the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Initiating discussion, Professor B.S. Bhoop stated that an Item regarding finalizing the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University had been placed before the Syndicate. He was sorry to point out that the document which had been prepared by the University on IPR is merely an academic exercise and not a pragmatic experience. Nothing had been mentioned in the proposed IPR of the knowledge which the University is providing to various industries for their products for the societal benefits. The University has sufficient knowledge, knowhow, expertise and big experience to emerge as a hub of knowledge to help launch various products by the industries.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor B.S. Bhoop to suggest his viewpoints in this regard and he would work with him and revise the IPR document accordingly.

Referring to page 168, 4.9 (c) regarding revenue sharing between the Inventor/s and the University on 60:40 ratios, Professor B.S. Bhoop pointed out that in one of the earlier meetings of the Syndicate; it was decided 70:30 ratio. He was of the view that it should be 80:20 or 90:10.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the University had already passed 70:30 ratios.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 70:30 was a most liberal ratio. If Professor B.S. Bhoop wanted to enhance it from 70:30 to 80:20 or more, the University could consult the IIT Ropar and Bombay, respectively.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that he was the founder of IIPP Cell in the University in the year 1995. To his surprise, nothing has come out with respect to patent rights in this University except some instances from the UIPS. He was of the view that there should be a Patent Attorney which could help in patent matters from the legal point of view. He further stated that in Foreign Universities, there are companies, which examine the commercial value of the invention. If a particular Company/Organization finds the invention worth a product, thereafter the University pays for filing the patent. He suggested that there must be commercial feasibility studies and patent attorney in the University; otherwise, the proposed IPR would remain a mere document.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that on the pattern of the IIT, Delhi and IIT, Bombay, Panjab University should also think of floating its own company, where the faculty and students could go for patent matters. All such things should also be included in the proposed IPR Policy Document.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever they wanted to be included in the proposed IPR Policy, they might let him know so that the same could be incorporated in this Policy before its finalization.**

**This was agreed to.**

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 28.11.2014 regarding addition in the Syndicate decision dated 13.12.2010 (Para 20) for appointment of Principal/Lecturer in the Affiliated Colleges**

**20.** Considered the recommendations dated 28.11.2014 (**Appendix-XXIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the following addition in the Syndicate decision dated 13.12.2010 (Para 20), be made for the appointment of Principal/Lecturer in the affiliated Colleges of P.U., where only single candidate appeared in the interviews:-

1. that the policy for the interviews as applicable to University Teaching Departments as per Senate decision dated 12.10.2003 vide Para XV be made applicable to the affiliated Colleges also. Further, if only one application is received in response to the advertisement made by the College, the College may advertise the same posts second time within three months and even if single application is received in response to second advertisement, it may be considered for holding the interview for the posts of Principal/Lecturer in the College.
2. that the Pending cases where single person has been interviewed and recommended by the

Selection Committee for the posts of Principal/Lecturer be processed for approval, as they have already joined the Colleges and are working there.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate dated 13.12.2010 (Para 20) has resolved that:

- (i) since the decision of the Syndicate dated 23.5.2003 (Para 8) and Senate dated 12.10.2003 (Para XV) was only for the University Teaching Departments, the cases which had been received/are to be received in future from the affiliated Colleges in the office, where single person has been interviewed and recommended by the Selection Committees for the posts of Principal/Lecturer in the Colleges, be processed for approval.
- (ii) a Committee be constituted to look into this matter for affiliated Colleges.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that as there is no nomenclature as Lecturer in the affiliated Colleges, the word Principal/Lecturer should be replaced with Principal/Assistant Professor.

It was clarified that if second time only single candidate applied then the University might not give Panel for appointment/s, but the cases where the Colleges had already given the advertisement and only single candidate applied, as per the orders of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, the University has to give Panels. For future, they could decide.

Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh said that if they took a decision not to process the single application for the post of Principal/Lecturer in the affiliated Colleges, it would badly affect the rural Colleges where nobody is ready to apply.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nowadays there is a rampant unemployment so, how it could be possible that only a single candidate is there for the post of Lecturer/Principal in the Colleges.

To this, Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh said that for the post of Principal in rural areas, no one is ready to apply.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the reason for applying by less number of candidates might be that the Colleges gave only 21 days time to respond to the advertised posts.

It was clarified that the time-limit be extended to one month instead of 21 days.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in the cases of Colleges of Education, it happened that not more than one candidate responded particularly for the post of Principal.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the Syndicate had already taken a decision that where only one candidate applied for the advertised posts could be applicable in the cases of University Teaching Departments only. If one candidate apply and appeared in the interview, he/she could be considered for appointment on *ad hoc* basis and next year when the Selections has been made, he/she could be considered again for the advertised post. It was specifically decided that in the case of affiliated Colleges, it would not be applicable.

Professor Preeti Mahajan said that the availability of the number of candidates varies from College to College keeping in view the location/station of the College.

Shri Jagpal Singh said that it happened number of times that 2-3 candidates responded for the post, but finally none of them appear before the Selection Committee, such contingencies should be catered for.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he found the recommendations of the Committee are non-conclusive. He pointed out that if only one application is received in response to the advertisement or only one person appeared for interview, in that case the post/s be re-advertised.

It was clarified that it is number of applications only.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Committee in its recommendations at page 174 of the Appendix, states "that for holding the interview, the minimum number of eligible candidate/s for the posts of Professor/Reader/Lecturer in the University Teaching Departments be as under:

- (i) General Category  
For the posts of Professor/Reader/Lecturer: Two candidates
- (ii) Reserved Category (SC/ST):  
For posts of Lecturer only: One candidate.

It appeared that the recommendation of the Committee is silent about the number of candidates for the post of Professor/Reader in the Category of SC/ST as mentioned at (ii) above. It needed to be re-looked. He suggested that whenever any College made any

advertisement, it should be properly inserted as per the University guidelines.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath pleaded that the earlier decision of the Syndicate should be implemented.

**RESOLVED:** That the earlier decision of the Syndicate be applicable for the appointment of Principals/Lecturers in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 28.11.2014 regarding addition in the Syndicate decision dated 13.12.2010 (Para 20) for appointment of Principal/Lecturer in the Affiliated Colleges**

**21.** Considered the withdrawal of approval of appointment granted to Dr. N.K. Sharma as Principal at Kalgidhar Institute of Higher Education, Kingra Road, Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib, as he could not prove the genuineness of his experience certificate within the stipulated period. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XXV**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. The appointment of Dr. N.K. Sharma S/o Shri Pitamber Sharma as Principal, Kalgidhar Institute of Higher Education, Kingra Road, Malout was approved on permanent (on probation for one year) basis w.e.f. 07.06.2010 subject to the condition that he will submit the proof of having passed Punjabi within one year from the date of his appointment, vide letter dated 23.05.2011 (**Appendix-XXV**).

2. The Chairman, Kalgidhar Institute of Higher Education informed vide letter dated 19.08.2011 (**Appendix-XXV**) that Dr. N.K. Sharma has passed Punjabi exam from Punjab School Education Board, Mohali as additional subject in July, 2011 (**Appendix-XXV**).

3. One Shri Gurbinder Singh vide application dated 24.04.2012 (**Appendix-XXV**) informed that Dr. N.K. Sharma has got the job as a Principal by submitting fake experience/educational certificate. He also supported his complaint by submitting an affidavit.

4. A show-cause notice vide No.Mis./A-7/2733-34 dated 01.04.2014 (**Appendix-XXV**) was served to Dr. N.K. Sharma with the direction to explain within fifteen days from the date of receipt of the said notice.

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that this is a peculiar case, which had been pending in the University since 2011 and ultimately it had seen light of the day. He felt that enough benefit has been given as based on forged documents he had served as Principal for more than four years. He further stated that in case of a student committing any such error during examination, the University debars him/her for two-three years and thus affecting his/her career, but in the case of Dr. N.K. Sharma who is Principal at Kalgidhar Institute of Higher Education, Kingra Road, Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, the University is proposing only withdrawal of approval of his appointment. It is not sufficient. He was of the view that at least F.I.R. should be lodged against him instead of D.D.R. as proposed by the University authority.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that it is a wrong statement that Dr. N.K. Sharma had not given any reply to the letters of the University. Dr. Sharma at page 184 of the Appendix said that if the University wants to verify his experience certificate, transparently, the University should ask for the valid documents like Salary Register, Balance Sheet, Audit report, etc. He further quoted from the Appendix at Page 185 Sr. No.2 and 4, which are reproduced below:

2. "On verification of the record of this office, it is seen that Dr. N.K. Sharma worked as Principal in this College from 12.01.2006 to 15.2.2006. During this period he also availed leave from 19.01.2006 to 26.01.2006".
4. "Reference letter on the subject cited above, it is informed that this experience certificate has not been issued by the Institution".

He pointed out that private institutions did not issue any experience certificates. As far as Sr. No.4 is concerned, the College authority had not mentioned that he had not worked here. He pleaded that this case should be thoroughly probed/investigated before lodging F.I.R.; otherwise, the University would lose its credibility.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Dr. N.K. Sharma was provided ample opportunity to prove his non-involvement in the forged case. He was issued show-cause notice by the University and on his demand he was given 90 days more to prove his innocence, but now after elapsing more than 200 days, he could not prove the same. He was of the view that an F.I.R. should be lodged against him.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that an F.I.R. should be lodged against him immediately to give strong message to the people involved in such forged activities.



Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that by this time the approval of appointment should be withdrawn and rest of the punishment should be exercised after verifying the facts. He further said that if an FIR is lodged against him without verifying the facts as stated by him, his dissent should be recorded.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That a complaint be lodged with the Police against Dr. N.K. Sharma, Principal, Kalgidhar Institute of Higher Education, Kingra Road, Malout, for seeking appointment as Principal on the basis of forged documents.

**Award of degree of 22.  
Doctor of Philosophy**

Considered reports of examiners of certain candidates on the theses, including viva-voce reports, for the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that in respect of Sr. No.5 and Sr. No.8, the thesis reports were received in the month of March 2014 and the viva voce had been conducted in the month of December 2014 and due to this, the concerned candidates might have lost job opportunities. As per the existing provision, the viva voce should have been conducted within 120 days after the receipt of the reports from the examiner/s. The delay may be checked.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the degree of Doctor of Philosophy be awarded to the following candidates in the Faculty and Subject noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
1.	Ms. Jagminder Kaur Grewal Niwas Jain Bhawan Road Mandi, Mullanpur, District Ludhiana	Education/ Education	A STUDY OF TEACHING COMPETENCE OF TEACHER TRAINEES IN RELATION TO THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING OCCUPATIONAL EFFICACY AND PERSONALITY
2.	Ms. Shailja Kumari D/o Sh. A.C. Thakur Block-G, H. No. 201 Astha Apartment Nabha-Pabhat Road Zirakpur	Science/ Botany	CYTOMORPHOLOGICAL STUDIES IN SOME MEDICINAL ANGIOSPERMOUS PLANTS OF CHANDIGARH AND ITS ADJOINING AREAS
3.	Ms. Neeta Rani H. No. 654, Street No.2, Nanak Nagri Abohar	Arts/Defence & Strategic Studies	INDIA'S INTEREST IN THE CENTRAL ASIAN REGIONS : PROSPECTS OF ENERGY CO- OPERATION WITH TURKMENISTAN AND KAZAKHSTAN

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Candidate</b>	<b>Faculty/ Subject</b>	<b>Title of Thesis</b>
4.	Ms. Beant Kaur V.P.O. Gholia Kalan Tehsil Baghapurana District Moga	Languages/ Punjabi	PUNJABI NATAK : NARI CHETNA 'CH AUNDE BADLAO (BALWANT GARGI, AJMER SINGH AULAKH, ATAMJIT ATE SWARAJBIR DE PRITINIDH NATKAN DE SANDHARBH VICH)
5.	Ms. Meenal House No. 965/7 Dawarika Puri Jagadhri (Haryana)	Business Management & Commerce	GREEN MARKETING STRATEGIES AND CONSUMER RESPONSES: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF CONSUMER DURABLES IN NORTH INDIA
6.	Ms. Rajnish Sharma C/o Aakash Gautam 5283-B, Sector-38(w) Chandigarh	Education/ Education	PREDICTING CAREER INDECISION AMONG UNDERGRADUATES: THE ROLE OF CAREER DECISION MAKING SELF-EFFICACY FAMILY INERACTION PATTERNS AND VOCATIONAL IDENTITY
7.	Ms. Ranju Devi Village Jolly P.O. Mohal District Kulu (H.P.)	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHEDULED TRIBES IN INDIA: A CASE STUDY OF LAHAUL & SPITI (H.P.)
8.	Mr. Amandeep Singh Jaito District Faridkot	Arts/ Philosophy	A PHILOSOPHICAL STUDY OF THE CONCEPT OF PRATIBHA IN INDIAN POETICS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE
9.	Mr. Vijay S/o Shri Sajjan Kumar V.P.O. Ugalan Tehsil Hansi District Hisar	Languages/ Sanskrit	KADAMBARI UTTARARDHA : EKA SAHITYIKA ADHYAYANA
10.	Ms. Khushboo 1011, L T-3 Sector-1, Talwara District Hoshiarpur	Science/ Chemistry	METAL SULFIDE NANOSTRUCTURES: GROWTH, PROPERTIES AND POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS
11.	Ms. Ashima Bhardwaj H.No. 251, Sector-18 Panchkula	Languages/ English	BEAT ICONOCLASM: A STUDY OF RADICALISM IN THE WORKS OF JACK KEROUAC
12.	Ms. Sheetal Sharma Village Bhoor P.O. Nangal Bhoor Tehsil/District Pathankot	Science/ Physics	STRUCTURAL, ELECTRONIC, OPTICAL AND MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF TERNARY CHALCOPYRITE SEMICONDUCTORS
13.	Ms. Harneet Kaur V.P.O. Patrewala Via-Khuvia Server Tehsil & District Fazilka	Arts/ History	RIGHT TO LIFE: A STUDY OF THE GIRL CHILD IN THE PUNJAB FROM THE MID 19 <sup>TH</sup> TO 20 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY
14.	Ms. Kumari Seema Village Sughal P.O. Bharmar Tehsil Jawali District Kangra (H.P.)	Science/ Physics	STRUCTURAL AND ELECTRONIC PROPERTIES OF DILUTE MAGNETIC OXIDES AND HEUSLER ALLOYS

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
15.	Ms. Gurvir Kaur V.P.O. Gehal Tehsil Tapa District Barnala (Pb.)	Science/ Physics	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERIZATION OF SEMICONDUCTOR TYPE-1 CORE/SHELL NANOPARTICLES AND THEIR INTERACTION WITH BIOMOLECULES
16.	Mr. Ibadat H. No. 717/1, Burail Sector-45/A Chandigarh	Arts/ Psychology	A STUDY OF DEPRESSION, HOPELESSNESS, ANXIETY, COGNITIVE RIGIDITY, AFFECTIVE DYSREGULATION AND FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AS PREDICTORS OF SUICIDE IDEATION
17.	Mr. Kanwardeep Singh H.No. 1024, Sector 23-B Chandigarh	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	ROLE OF NGOs IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF CHANDIGARH
18.	Ms. Rupneet Kaur Randhawa Banga Road Taru Ka Wada Phagwara, Kapurthala	Business Management & Commerce	AN ASSESSMENT OF OUTREACH, SOCIAL ROLE AND SUSTAINABILITY OF SELF HELP GROUPS IN RURAL PUNJAB
19.	Mr. Prakram Singh Chauhan Hostel No.1, Block No.3 Room No.52, P.U., Chandigarh	Science/ Microbiology	PRODUCTION, CLONING, CHARACTERIZATION AND APPLICATION OF AN ALKALI-THERMOSTABLE $\beta$ -MANNANASE FROM AN ENVIRONMENTAL ISOLATE
20.	Ms. Ranjana H. No. R-604 Sector-12 Panchkula	Education/ Education	ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY OF COLLEGE STUDENTS OF PUNJAB IN RELATION TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND AND MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOL

**Routine and formal matters**

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

**(i)** In partial modification to this office Endst. No. 10059-66/Estt.-I dated 30.10.2014 (**Appendix-XXVI**), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has:

**(i)** transferred Dr. Anuj Sharma, Assistant Professor (re-designated), from the Department of Mathematics to the Department of Computer Science & Applications, immediately instead of next session 2015-16, against the vacant post of Assistant Professor to be converted from the vacant post of Associate Professor to Assistant Professor with the following conditions:

1. Dr. Anuj Sharma will take full workload allotted to him in the Department of Mathematics for the Academic Session 2014-15 and he will continue taking classes, as usual, for the session 2014-15.
2. After the transfer of Dr. Anuj Sharma from the Department of Mathematics, the post of Programmer which will fall vacant, be filled up at the earliest.
3. From the next Academic Session, since the Department of Computer Science & Application will be having adequate faculty, the teaching of subsidiary (Computer Science) classes of B.Sc. (H.S.) Maths & Computing 1<sup>st</sup> year and 2<sup>nd</sup> year will be taken care of by Department of Computer Science and Applications, as is the practice in other Science Departments viz. Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry etc.
4. He will perform the duties as Assistant Professor in the Department of Computer Science and Applications and after his retirement/on vacation, the post shall be filled up as Assistant Professor and he will be governed by the rule and regulations of UGC/University as applicable to the teachers.
5. His seniority as Assistant Professor (re-designated) shall be next to the person/s already selected/appointed (if any) to the post of Lecturer/Assistant Professor prior to 20.12.2011, i.e., date of decision of the Senate dated 20.12.2011 (Para

XLIV) vide he was re-designated as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 20.12.2011.

- (ii)** allowed that the following conditions, mentioned in the earlier office Order No. 10429-435/Estt. Dated 7.5.2014, be treated as withdrawn:-

1. Dr. Anuj Sharma, Programmer, Department of Mathematics, P.U. be re-designated as Assistant Professor w.e.f. the date of decision of the Senate i.e. 20.12.2011 on the conditions noted below & his salary be fixed as per rules of the University and his re-designation will be personal to him and after his retirement/on vacation, the post shall be filled up as Programmer and he will be governed by the rules & regulations of the UGC as applicable to the teachers.
2. He will continue to perform the same duties as were being done by him in the previous post/designation also.

**(ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Ramandeep Kaur, Medical Officer, BGJ Institute of Health, P.U., w.e.f. 03.11.2014, by waiving off three months notice (in full), in view of her personal and domestic pressed circumstances, under Rule 16.1 at pages 82-83 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009.

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 16.1 at pages 82-83 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009, is reproduced as under:-

**16.1.** A permanent employee shall not leave or discontinue his service in the University without first giving a prior notice to the Registrar/Vice-Chancellor, as the case may be, of his intention to leave or discontinue service. The period of notice shall be:

(i) Three calendar months in case of Class "A" and "B" employees.

(ii) xxx xxx

Provided that such notice may be waived off in part or in full by the appointing authority for valid reasons.

In case of breach of this provision, he shall be liable to pay to the University, in lieu of notice, a sum-equal to his pay and allowances for the period failing short of notice required to be given by him, which sum may be deducted from any money due to him.

2. Dr. Ramandeep Kaur was appointed as Medical Officer on one year probation w.e.f. 16.04.2014 i.e. the date of her joining as such.

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Programmers for further period of three months, i.e., w.e.f. the dates as noted against each after giving them one day's break, or till the posts of System Manager are filled in through regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions:

<b>Name of employee/ Department</b>	<b>Earlier term upto</b>	<b>Date of break</b>	<b>Period of further extension</b>
Mr. Bhawan Chander, Computer Centre, P.U.	27.11.2014	28.11.2014	29.11.2014 to 25.02.2015
Mr. Deepak Kumar, Computer Centre, P.U.	11.12.2014	12.12.2014	13.12.2014 to 11.03.2015

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request of Ms. Raj Rani, Assistant Section Officer (Stenography), Department of Research Journal (Science), for voluntary retirement from the University services w.e.f. 31.01.2015 and sanctioned the following retirement benefits:-

- a. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at Page 131 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I, 2007.

- b. Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has sanctioned an amount of Rs.10,14,000/- for renovation of the toilets in the Auditorium Complex of S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology in P.U. Campus out of budget head "Development Fund" by collecting tender on the spot by the Committee comprising the following members:-

1. Chairperson, S.S. Bhatnagar, U.I.C.E.T
2. Er. B. Bhargava, SDE-I
3. Er. R.K. Bhalla, SDE-III
4. Er. R.K. Rai, Executive Engineer-I
5. Professor A.S. Ahluwalia

**NOTE:** 1. The Hon'ble Vice-President of India, have to visit Panjab University in the month of December, 2014 and function will be held in the Auditorium of S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology.

2. An estimate of Rs.10.14 lacs prepared by the office of Executive Engineer-I along with office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXVII)**.

**Routine and formal matters**

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

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

Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
Dr. Sanjay Wadwalkar Professor School of Communication Studies	15.07.1981	30.09.2014	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Mohan Lal Syal Superintendent Estate Branch	05.05.1975	30.11.2014	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Smt. Saroj Bhardwaj Superintendent Fee-Checking	15.11.1976	31.12.2014	
3.	Shri Roop Lal Superintendent Department of Sociology	19.11.1973	31.12.2014	
4.	Shri Shingara Singh Superintendent Estate Branch	23.09.1980	31.12.2014	
5.	Smt. Neelam Sharma Senior Assistant Account Branch	08.11.1983	31.12.2014	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
6.	Shri Daleep Singh Pathania Senior Assistant Publication Bureau	03.10.1989	31.12.2014	
7.	Shri Ram Sukh Record Lifter Directorate of Sports	19.11.1971	31.12.2014	

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



During general discussion just before the conclusion of the meeting, the following issues were raised:

- (1) Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2014, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath had raised the issue of one of the Private Colleges proposed to be opened near Moga had applied for affiliation a few days (4-5 days) late. He pleaded that this case should be entertained. In that meeting, the Dean, College Development Council was not present and the Vice-Chancellor had suggested that the case of the College, in question, should be brought as an Item in the next meeting of the Syndicate. In spite of that the Item was not placed before the Syndicate. The Syndicate authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take decision in respect of that College, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**This was agreed to.**

- (2) Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the University Counsels are filing undertakings in the Courts without any instructions from the University authority. In some of the cases, even if there is no violation and there is no order of the Court and the University Council filed undertaking in the Court. Sometime they create fear telephonically in the minds of the officials of the concerned Department/Colleges about contempt of court. He suggested that such things should be stopped immediately.

Shri Ashok Goyal supplemented the idea proposed by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath that unless and until instructions are given to the University Counsel in writing, no undertaking should be filed in the Courts on the part of the University by the University Counsel.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a very serious issue and would be taken care of.

- (3) Shri Ashok Goyal raised the issue of promotion of Ms. Arun Prabha, Librarian, which was approved during the Senate meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2014, but it was recorded wrongly as "it would be looked into". He pleaded that it should be corrected accordingly.

**This was agreed to.**

- (4) Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that they should keep in mind the instructions of the Regulatory Bodies. He pointed out that at Dr. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, the Bar Council of India (BCI) had reduced the number of students from 100 to

60 in each section. In this way, the course had not remained financially viable. He pointed out that the infrastructure had been created for 100 students. He pleaded that keeping in view the physical size of infrastructural facilities, the sections should be increased accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Chatrath to give him representation in this regard.

- (5) Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh pleaded that on the pattern of promotion of Assistant Professors to the post of Associate Professors and Professors in the Government Colleges, the same promotional benefits should also be extended in the Aided Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh to give him a letter in this regard and he would forward the same to the Director of Higher Education, Punjab.

- (6) Principal Gurdip Sharma handed over one of the case of College Teacher to become guide for Ph.D. student in the Department of Physics to the Registrar on the floor of the House, which has been gaining dust for the last five months.

- (7) Dr. Dalip Kumar handed over a case of Ms. Jaspreet Kaur, a student of Cyber Crime Course being run at Post Graduate College for Girls, Sector 42, Chandigarh.

- (8) Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that a Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath for the promotional avenues for the teachers of the Homoeopathic College, Sector 26, Chandigarh and he was also a member of that Committee. He pointed out that till date no meeting of the said Committee had been convened. He pleaded that the meeting of that Committee should be convened at the earliest. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath assured that the meeting would be convened before 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014.

(G.S. Chadha)  
Registrar

Confirmed

**(Arun Kumar Grover)**  
**VICE-CHANCELLOR**